

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 17, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living. Psalm 27: 13.

Eternal Father, whose strength undergirds those who trust in Thee and whose love gives understanding to those who walk in Thy way, amid the shifting scenes of this earth help us to look up and to see the shining truth of Thine eternal presence. Forgive us when we forget that above our pride and prejudice Thou art calling us to higher principles, underneath our frailties and faults Thou art offering us the strength of Thy spirit and around our failures and frustrations Thou art summoning us to wider fields of human service.

Make our country worthy of Thy blessing and willing to be a channel through which the spirit of democracy may flow into our world. Grant us grace to heal the broken relationships of mankind, to give light to those who sit in darkness, and to lead the nations in the ways of peace.

In the spirit of Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 58. An act providing for the addition of the Freeman School to the Homestead National Monument of America in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes;

S. 621. An act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; and

S. 2208. An act 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.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3558) entitled "An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide continued financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. GRIFFIN, and Mr. BAKER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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. 6778. An act to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 6778) entitled "An act to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. TOWER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROTECTION OF GOVERNMENT WEAPONS

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is time for more security at military installations and Reserve component armories for the protection of weapons. An increasing number of thefts in recent months point to the growing seriousness of the problem. Additional occurrences are to be anticipated in view of higher militancy among some of the protest groups and in view of the rising crime rates. Stolen weapons have figured in terrorist activities where lives were lost, and there will be other instances of their unlawful use.

Apparently there has not been sufficient recognition of the problem by those charged with the protection of Government weapons, and easy access can be had to these weapons in some instances. There have been times when I personally have been struck by the obvious lack of security at armories and other storage areas where weapons are kept. This carelessness and indifference cannot be tolerated by those in authority. It is time to understand the serious nature of the problem and time for stronger steps to be taken to protect these weapons and to keep them out of the wrong hands.

CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that today, Constitution Day, we commemorate the signing of the Constitution. The Constitution is by its nature, of course, a limitation on the powers of Government. Unless a governmental function is expressly stated therein or can be fairly implied from it, the Federal Government has no power to perform that function. And, of course, we are all familiar with the express prohibitions against certain governmental action that are contained in the Bill of Rights' amendments to the Constitution.

Perhaps the most important of the prohibitions against governmental action is the first amendment to the Constitution's guarantee of our right of free expression, as this freedom guarantees our right to express our views and opinions on any subject. But even this most im-

portant right does not exist in a vacuum. The Founding Fathers did not intend for this to be an absolute right which would automatically override the public's interest in other values, such as law and order. In other words, Mr. Speaker, nothing in the Constitution holds that freedom of expression goes to the extent of justifying violent and raucous behavior which would infringe on the rights of others.

Today's anarchists and terrorists who shout down other speakers and who destroy buildings in the name of some nameless anarchist-Marxist theory would also do well to reflect on the fact that the chaos they create might someday lead to the erosion of the personal and political rights that the Constitution guarantees. Some of them might at first welcome such an event but they should realize that it is the Constitution that presently protects their right to peacefully protest and parade. Should they destroy the Constitution, the real winner would be some harsh, repressive authoritarian regime brought to power in reaction to chaos and anarchy. Under that kind of repressive regime, today's violence-prone anarchist would enjoy far less freedom, if any at all, than they do under the Constitution. They would be the first to suffer.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would remind you that anarchy creates nothing but disorder and violence, and that disorder and violence are the opposite of stable, progressive and equitable government under the Constitution. I urge all of our people to study the history of governmental repression and cruelty that inspired our Founding Fathers to frame the Constitution as they did. I urge them to consider the danger that anarchy and chaos might lead to a reversion back to unbridled and repressive governmental power.

JOINT MEETING TO RECEIVE COL. FRANK BORMAN, SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PRESIDENT ON PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Tuesday, September 22, 1970, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, to receive in joint meeting the special representative of the President on prisoners of war, Col. Frank Borman, U.S. Air Force, retired.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ERADICATION OF CRIME IS THE FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the United States stands at a curious point in time. We have achieved a technological apogee that the wildest science fiction paperbacks of 20 years ago could not have foreseen and at the same time our

cities are reverting to the medieval. Crime, organized or spontaneous, ranges from the downtown streets to the suburbs and we appear powerless to stop it. It has gotten far beyond the ugly stage, it is now beyond reason. Our citizens die in meaningless attacks, robbed and murdered for the princely sum of a dollar and 18 cents, or are killed in public buildings by a blast of explosives.

President Nixon made the eradication of crime the first order of business in his administration. The President sent to this Congress a monumental amount of legislative requests to combat what has become a national crisis. It took a year and a half for the model bill of the whole package, on the District of Columbia crime, to finally pass. Most of the remainder is still stalled and for that, I point an accusing finger at the Democrats. They control both Houses of this Congress and they have made those bodies almost untenable for the Nixon administration's legislative program. In the case of the anticrime bills, there just is no excuse. The partisan exercise of blocking the crime program beggars rationality. I say to those Democrats responsible: Forget which side of the aisle you are on in this critical time and help us act.

TERRORIST BOMBING

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, almost 6 months ago, President Nixon asked for legislation to combat bombing—a recent and terrible outgrowth of extremism. The President requested a tough law that would make the sale, possession, and transportation for illegal use of explosives punishable by \$10,000 fines or 10 years in prison. That legislation would place the act of terrorist bombing where it properly belongs, out of the category of simple dissent and demonstration and into the classification of murderous intent. There is no other way to deal with the rash of explosive attacks on institutions and public and private property.

Where is that badly needed legislation at the moment? It is stalled, hung up in this Congress. The tragic events at the University of Wisconsin, where a graduate student lost his life, make us painfully aware that the problem we must deal with is vitally serious. A Justice Department survey shows that at least 50 persons have died in explosive and incendiary attacks in this country since January 1969. It is time for our Democratic colleagues to get this legislation to the House of Representatives for action. I recognize this legislation is now being considered by the Committee on the Judiciary in executive session but, quite frankly, Congress has delayed long enough and this bill at least should be reported promptly.

COMMENDATION OF CONGRESSMAN LARRY WINN, JR., OF KANSAS

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, as president of the Republican 90th Club, which is composed of 58 Members of the House elected in the fall of 1966, I am happy to call the attention of my colleagues to the following resolution which was passed at a recent meeting of the club.

The resolution honors one of our most active and respected members, the Honorable LARRY WINN, JR., of Kansas, for his notable contribution to this country in the 90th and 91st Congresses.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the prudent and wise spending of public funds is a precept of long-standing for dedicated and loyal Republicans;

Whereas, Congressman Larry Winn, Jr., Kansas, has consistently used his talents as a businessman in the citizen-interest and has demonstrated initiative and leadership in making positive recommendations toward achieving greater economy in the Federal Government;

Whereas, Congressman Winn's recent recommendations to the President's Advisory Council on Management Improvement promise to result in substantial savings in Federal expenditures;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that his colleagues and peers in the Republican 90th Club do hereby specially commend Larry Winn, Jr. for his leadership work in the fight for economy in the Federal Government;

Be it further resolved, that the 90th Club publicly declare this commendation and proclamation.

WILEY MAYNE,
President, 90th Club.

SO-CALLED CONGRESSIONAL CONFERENCE

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has become apparent within the past few days that the Republic has been blessed with a new, self-appointed congressional body.

I refer to the so-called Congressional Conference To Examine Nutrition Policy.

Prior to reading its news release, I had heard of no such conference being appointed by the Speaker.

I had heard of no such group requesting permission to meet while the House is in session.

I had heard of no legitimate congressional committee holding hearings on nutrition, at least not in recent days.

I have, therefore, reached the conclusion that there is no such congressional conference.

I have reached the conclusion that the so-called congressional conference is nothing less than an attempt by the Democratic Study Group to "grab" publicity under the guise of a duly appointed House Committee. I note that television coverage has been mentioned which is unheard of in any House committee meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is an election year. I do not object in any way to the Democratic Study Group Holding hearings on whatever subject they desire, although a committee or subcommittee could and would not with-

out provision. I do, however, object to them inferring that they are a congressional committee.

I can well understand their reluctance to use their rightful and chosen title, but I remind them they are stuck with it.

Let me make it clear. There is no congressional conference to examine nutrition. Many of us know the difference between malnutrition and hunger. There are some Members of Congress, who are also members of the Democratic Study Group, who are having a conference to play politics.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
September 16, 1970.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It has been a privilege and an honor for me to work with the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency during the Second Session of the 91st Congress. My association with and participation in the deliberations of this group will always remain a pleasant and rewarding experience.

However, I wish to submit my resignation from the Committee on Banking and Currency effective today, September 16, 1970.

With best regards,
Sincerely,

CLARK MACGREGOR,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is agreed to.
There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 302]

Abbitt	Derwinski	Myers
Alexander	Dingell	Ottinger
Anderson,	Dowdy	Patman
Tenn.	Edmondson	Pelly
Baring	Edwards, La.	Philbin
Barrett	Fallon	Pike
Beall, Md.	Flynt	Powell
Belcher	Ford,	Price, Tex.
Berry	William D.	Fryor, Ark.
Blaggi	Gallagher	Rarick
Blatnik	Garmatz	Reid, N. Y.
Bow	Gettys	Riegle
Brock	Gilbert	Rogers, Colo.
Brooks	Gubser	Rosenthal
Brown, Calif.	Hebert	Roudebush
Broyhill, Va.	Hollifield	Roybal
Burton, Utah	Horton	Ruth
Bush	Howard	Scherle
Button	Hungate	Scheuer
Celler	Ichord	Schneebeli
Clark	King	Skubitz
Clawson, Del	Kleppe	Staggers
Clay	Kluczynski	Stokes
Collier	Lujan	Stratton
Colmer	McCulloch	Thompson, N. J.
Conyers	McMillan	Tunney
Corman	Macdonald,	Widnall
Cowger	Mass,	Wold
Dawson	Melcher	Zion
Delaney	Meskill	
Denney	Minshall	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). On this rollcall 341 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 18127, PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971, H.R. 18127.

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

There was no objection.

RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP BY PRESIDENT NIXON

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's masterful speech yesterday at Kansas State University recalls a speech he delivered on June 25 to the Jaycees Convention in St. Louis. On both of these occasions, the President was careful to point out the problems which face America, but he was equally careful to emphasize that America is not falling apart at the seams.

I think it is significant to note that on both of these occasions the President received an overwhelmingly favorable and enthusiastic response. The conclusion to be drawn is that America's young people do not believe the incessant propaganda from the extremists that America is on the wrong course—either at home or abroad.

No responsible leader would deny that America is confronted with many problems today. But our foreign problems will not be resolved by a retreat into isolationism. Neither will our problems at home be resolved by a retreat before those who would tear down the American system.

What the students at Kansas State University—and the young businessmen in St. Louis—want is responsible leadership. They clearly have faith that President Nixon is providing that kind of leadership.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 17654) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The 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 fur-

ther consideration of the bill H.R. 17654, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through part 6 of title IV ending on page 137, line 19. It had also been agreed that part 1 of title IV, beginning on page 104 line 12, through line 26 on page 124 of the bill, would be temporarily set aside.

If there are no further amendments to part 6 of title IV, the Clerk will read.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Sisk was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make a few comments as we approach what certainly we expect to be the final day of debate on this legislative reform or legislative reorganization bill, whichever one prefers to call it.

I do this because of the fact that there were a great many people—both Members, I am sure, from time to time who spoke to me, as well as news media sources and others—who said that we would never reach this day.

So, after almost 2 years of work, 2 years less some 3 or 4 months, I am happy that we do come to what I believe will be a final vote on a legislative reform bill in this year of our Lord 1970.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the urgency of this and the desire of all Members to finish as rapidly as possible today. Again I say this is one of the reasons why I do take just a few moments here kind of to sum up as to where we are. We do propose to proceed just as rapidly as we can today on the balance of the amendments that are outstanding. I would appreciate the cooperation of all Members in trying as much as possible to limit those things that will be discussed to the subject matter in order that we can bring this matter to a final vote today as early as we possibly can. At the same time I wish to assure everyone who has amendments that there is no intent to try to cut off your amendment, but there are many of us who hope that we can finish fairly early this afternoon. It is the desire of the committee to do that.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. May I say that I concur entirely with what the gentleman from California has just stated. If you were present on the floor during the last couple of days, during the consideration of this bill, and you must have noted that there has been a marked absenteeism on the part of those who supposedly were so interested in this bill. I think we are justified in moving along as rapidly as possible this afternoon.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to express our deep appreciation to all Members of the House for the cooperation that we have had from all sources, the chairman and the individual Members of the House. At this time particularly I want to express my personal appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the present occupant of the chair, for his patience with

what at times I am sure have been rather amateurish efforts on my part. I wish to thank him for bearing with us. I appreciate his courtesy and appreciate the manner in which the Committee of the Whole has been chaired during the past many weeks. So I particularly want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think we ought also to pay our respects to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who has handled this bill on the floor of the House and who has been very patient and who has been very considerate of the feelings and the views of all Members of the House. He has handled in a masterful manner a most sensitive and delicate bill. I know I express the sentiments of all of my colleagues in paying tribute to and expressing our thanks to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

Mr. SISK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again let me say that I want to express my deep appreciation to our leadership, to the Speaker, to Mr. ALBERT, the majority leader, and to Mr. GERALD R. FORD, the minority leader, to the whips, Mr. ARENDS and Mr. BOGGS, to the parliamentarian of the House, Lew Deschler, and especially to his staff for helping and assisting us in devising and developing the language that we have brought to you, as well as to all others who have worked and cooperated with us.

At this time, also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to express deep appreciation to the staff of our subcommittee and to the staff of the full Committee on Rules. I am not sure whether you are aware of it, but this subcommittee has not hired one single additional staff person and not one person was put on the payroll additionally as a result of the subcommittee's work during the past 2 years. We borrowed and utilized the staff of the full Committee on Rules. We borrowed the staff from the Legislative Reference Service. We borrowed Mr. Walter Kravitz, senior specialist in American National Government of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, who has done an outstanding job for us. We also borrowed from Mr. David B. Carper, assistant counsel, Office of the Legislative Counsel, House of Representatives, who has also contributed greatly to the committee's work.

At this time I particularly want to pay tribute to all members of the staff who have been here on the floor and to our many good friends who have worked so diligently with us. I mention among others Laurie C. Battle, counsel, Robert D. Hynes, Jr., minority counsel, Jonna Lynne Cullen, staff member, and Waller Batson, professional staff member, Walter Oleszek, analyst in American National Government, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Gordon Nelson, my administrative assistant, and Eleanor Lewis, assistant to Representative RICHARD BOLLING from the State of Missouri.

I would like to say to the House that, contrary to what sometimes happens, the subcommittee has not gone out and hired any great big staff, or spent any money in connection with this; we have utilized 100 percent the staff made available through cooperation of the Committee on Rules and of the various agencies within the Congress itself. We also have had the cooperation of a working group on the Republican side and a working group on the Democratic side. They have worked with us, and they furnished us copies of amendments which have been helpful in being able to discuss intelligently the subject matter before us.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I do hope that we may have the complete cooperation of all Members. I recognize, as my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, said a while ago, that there have been times when we have not had as much attendance as there should have been, as indicated by the number of bills that have been introduced on this subject, but we do appreciate the attendance of those who have been here.

So if we may at this point proceed to discuss as briefly as possible and yet intelligently such amendments as we have remaining, we will assure you that before today is over this bill will come to a final close.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BENNETT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT: On page 137, immediately after line 19, insert the following:

"(G) (1) The Committee on House Administration is authorized and directed to rent or otherwise acquire a suitable resident, within a reasonable distance from the Capitol, to be maintained as a home for pages employed by the House, and to appoint an individual or individuals of mature years to act as supervisor of the home and to be responsible for its operation under rules and regulations made by the committee.

"(2) Each page employed by the House shall be required to reside in such home unless he is authorized to live elsewhere by the committee. Pages employed by the Senate, with the approval of the committee, may reside in such home.

"(3) The expenses of renting and operating such home shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers approved by the committee and signed by the chairman thereof. The committee shall establish such rates for room and board as it may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this resolution and to make the maintenance of such home, including the supervisor's salary, a self-sustaining proposition. The obligations for room and board incurred by each page shall be deducted by the House Disbursing Office from the compensation which such page is entitled to receive from the United States and shall be transferred to the contingent fund."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, during the years I have been here in Congress I have had many, many pages, and they have all reflected well upon Congress, and departed themselves properly, but I have always had the feeling that there should be a greater maintenance of supervision. And, therefore, in 1951 I introduced the first bill I introduced on this subject, and I have had a bill pending on this subject ever since 1951.

The bills have varied from time to time, because occasionally we would have hearings, and when those hearings were held various points of criticism were cited against the bills which were suggested by me and other Members of the Congress. Many Members of the Congress have introduced such legislation and, as a result of this, from time to time I have changed the proposed legislation to meet these criticisms. The legislation that you have before you now is the composite of all the things that were said in those hearings which have been held, to try to make the legislation conform with what seemed to be the most practical thing.

As you will see, it provides for the Committee on House Administration to regulate and have responsibility in this field. Of course, they can delegate this to Members of the Congress or to staff members, but they have been given wide latitude in what they will do. They are furthermore even given wide latitude as to whether they would rent or whether they would purchase, or whether condemnation would be required.

Very wide latitude is allowed in all of this, including whether or not Senate pages would be required to be here. All this sort of thing is left this way because it is the result of hearings. I sincerely hope that you will give serious consideration to this and favor it, because it is needed.

The idea of bringing young people here as pages is a good one. It has been inspiring to them and it has been helpful to the country. But we cannot escape the responsibility that comes with that. You cannot say that these people are not people for whom we have some responsibility. Overlooking responsibility does not relieve you of the responsibility.

The major argument that is usually made against having a page home and proper school facilities is that it establishes new responsibilities. That is far from the case. It is not true that it establishes any new responsibility. The responsibilities are already here when you have a page system. What this does is to fulfill that responsibility.

Therefore, I hope, Mr. Chairman, and all Members of the Congress here, that you will approve of this measure because I think it is long overdue.

We, Members of Congress, face a responsibility which for years we have in fact failed to meet. Most of us favor a page home but pay only lip service to the idea. Yet the years go by and many of the pages remain adolescents foot-loose and fancy free.

The young men who would live in the home, work and go to school on Capitol Hill and are not supervised after they complete their work in the Capitol.

There's no need to document the need for a page home. Nearly everyone acknowledges that the need exists, and even that it is urgent, especially in light of the House action Wednesday to retain the present page system.

Not long ago we got a timely reminder of the risk we have been running. Four pages—one whom I appointed—were robbed, cut, and beaten up by a band of young hoodlums. Perhaps such inci-

dents would occur even with a page home, but certainly the present lack of adult supervision for the pages during their off-duty hours invites trouble.

When something shocking enough occurs to arouse the public we will have to establish a page home. Our consciences will be so troubled and the public demand for action so insistent that we'll have no other choice.

During the debate yesterday on the legislative reorganization bill and the amendment to continue the 16- to 18-year-old pages, our distinguished and beloved Speaker challenged the House to build a page dormitory. He said we should take the necessary steps to build such a dormitory. I hope the House will approve my amendment and a page home can be established.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. GREEN OF OREGON FOR THE AMENDMENT OF MR. BENNETT OF FLORIDA

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT: On page 137, immediately after line 19, insert the following:

"DORMITORY BUILDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL PAGES

"Sec. 462. (a) There is hereby authorized to be constructed, on a site jointly approved by the Senate Office Building Commission and the House Office Building Commission, in accordance with plans which shall be prepared by or under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol and which shall be submitted to and jointly approved by the Senate Office Building Commission and the House Office Building Commission, a fire-proof building containing dormitory and classroom facilities, including necessary furnishings and equipment, for pages of the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Supreme Court of the United States.

"(b) The Architect of the Capitol, under the joint direction and supervision of the Senate Office Building Commission and the House Office Building Commission, is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States, by purchase, condemnation, transfer, or otherwise, such publicly or privately owned real property in the District of Columbia (including all alleys, and parts of alleys, and streets within the curblines surrounding such real property) located in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Grounds, as may be approved jointly by the Senate Office Building Commission and the House Office Building Commission, for the purpose of constructing on such real property, in accordance with this section, a suitable dormitory and classroom facilities complex for pages of the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Supreme Court of the United States.

"(c) Any proceeding for condemnation instituted under subsection (a) of this section shall be conducted in accordance with subchapter IV of chapter 13 of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any real property owned by the United States, and any alleys, or parts of alleys and streets, contained within the curblines surrounding the real property acquired on behalf of the United States under this section shall be transferred, upon the request of the Architect of the Capitol made with the joint approval of the Senate Office Building Commission and the House Office

Building Commission, to the jurisdiction and control of the Architect of the Capitol.

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any alleys, or parts of alleys and streets, contained within the curblines surrounding the real property acquired on behalf of the United States under this section shall be closed and vacated by the Commissioner of the District of Columbia in accordance with any request therefor made by the Architect of the Capitol with the joint approval of the Senate Office Building Commission and the House Office Building Commission.

"(f) Upon the acquisition on behalf of the United States of all real property under this section, such property shall be a part of the United States Capitol Grounds and shall be subject to the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes', approved July 31, 1946.

"(g) The building constructed on the real property acquired under this section shall be designated the 'Congressional Pages Residential School.' The employment of all services (other than that of the United States Capitol Police) necessary for its protection, care, maintenance, and use, for which appropriations are made by Congress, shall be under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol. Such supervision and control shall be subject to the joint approval and direction of the Speaker and the President pro tempore. The Architect shall submit annually to the Congress estimates in detail for all services, other than those of the United States Capitol Police or those provided in connection with the conduct of school operations and the personal supervision of pages, and for all other expenses in connection with the protection, care, maintenance, and use of the Congressional Pages Residence. The Speaker and the President pro tempore shall prescribe, from time to time, regulations governing the Architect in the provision of services and the protection, care, and maintenance, of the Congressional Pages Residence.

"(h) The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate jointly shall designate an officer of the House and an officer of the Senate, other than a Member of the House or Senate, who shall jointly exercise supervision and control over the activities of the pages resident in the Congressional Pages Residence. With the approval of the Speaker and the President pro tempore, such officers so designated shall prescribe regulations governing—

"(1) the actual use and occupancy of the Congressional Pages Residence including, if necessary, the imposition of a curfew for pages;

"(2) the conduct of pages generally; and

"(3) other matters pertaining to the supervision, direction, safety, and well-being of pages in off-duty hours.

Such officers, subject to the approval of the Speaker and the President pro tempore, jointly shall appoint and fix the per annum gross rate of pay of a Residence Superintendent of Pages, who shall perform such duties with respect to the supervision of pages resident therein as those officials shall prescribe. In addition, such officers, subject to the approval of the Speaker and the President pro tempore, jointly shall appoint and fix the per annum gross rates of pay of such additional personnel as may be necessary to assist those officers and the Residence Superintendent of Pages in carrying out their functions under this section.

"(i) Nothing in this Part shall affect the operation of section 243 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 88a) or the proviso under the heading 'Education of Senate and House Pages' in title I of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947 (2 U.S.C. 88b), relating to educational facilities

of pages and other minors who are congressional employees."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is very similar to the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Florida. I am sorry I did not have the opportunity to talk with him before this and I hope, indeed, that it does meet with his approval.

The primary difference would be to construct a combined dormitory and classroom facility instead of just providing a dormitory.

I think the statements made by the gentleman from Florida are entirely accurate. I think we are living on a powder keg. So far we have been just plain lucky that a major scandal has not occurred.

This is the only school in the United States that the Members of Congress are directly and entirely responsible for. Yet, the Speaker of the House of Representatives yesterday very accurately and eloquently pointed out that for 3 years this school has been threatened with loss of accreditation—this in spite of the fact that we are spending on an average per pupil per year cost, \$1,616 while the national average per pupil per year cost is \$696—that is if you do not include the construction of facilities.

The \$1,616 figure for the page school does not include any capital outlay at all. If capital outlay is included, the national average is \$834 per pupil per year.

At the present time, as you know, these young men get up sometime early in the morning and they report at 6:30 a.m. Then they have an 8 o'clock break and go down to the snack bar or cafeteria in the Library of Congress. From my personal observation, breakfast often consists of a candy bar and a coke. Then they report for classes. They are dismissed at 9:45 a.m. and then they report to the House for their jobs for the day.

There was a combination of reasons why the school was about to lose its accreditation, and in fact it was threatened a few years ago. It was only because of the intervention of people in powerful positions that really prevented that loss of accreditation from actually occurring.

I know of nothing that could be any more embarrassing to any Member of the Congress of the United States than to have to go back to his congressional districts and admit that the one school that you are directly responsible for—because you bring these young people here to Washington and supervise it and have control of it—as I say, have to admit that this school would lose its accreditation in spite of the fact that 2½ times as much is being spent per pupil per year than in the average school in this country.

In addition, the Library of Congress is concerned about this high school in the attic. They are concerned about the danger of fire.

There are certain science courses that

cannot be provided in the page school because of this danger of fire. The Library of Congress desperately needs additional room for their own books, their own manuscripts, and so if we build a combination dormitory and classroom facility, it would allow the attic to be returned to the Library of Congress, where it would be put to good use.

I would also suggest that part of the cost of the construction of the dormitory and classroom facility could be recovered through setting a nominal amount for board and room, the same as college dormitory housing throughout the United States is financed. When kids go to college, they pay for board and room, and this helps to amortize the cost of dormitory construction.

Mr. Chairman, it is inconceivable to me that this situation has been allowed to continue, when we appropriate millions of dollars in loans and debt service grants for college housing across the United States, and that for years we have provided no housing facilities for 14-, 15-, 16-, and 17-year-old high school youngsters for whom we are personally responsible and whom we brought to Washington.

We bring youngsters—oftentimes from rural areas—turn them loose in a metropolitan area with more money than they have ever before had in their pockets and with absolutely no supervision in off hours. We pay the pages over \$6,300. They receive more a week than the average full-time workingman in this country who has three dependents to support. The page receives \$531 monthly. The Bureau of Labor Statistics advises me that as of July—the salary earned—the average salary of U.S. workers with three dependents is \$512.72 a month. It is not unreasonable for the Committee on House Administration to see that a reasonable sum would be withheld from their salaries to cover the cost of board and room in the dormitory facilities and require them to live there under supervision.

I suggest, that since the House did decide yesterday or at least in the committee that it would retain the 16-year-olds as the age for pages, it is incumbent upon us to provide these facilities in terms of housing and also in terms of classrooms. They find their own rooms in rooming houses or in tourist homes. I repeat—they have no supervision at all in their spare time. There is absolutely no one who is looking after their nutrition, their meals. You have seen them out there in the cloakrooms grabbing a meal on the run.

In 1965, the Evaluation Committee of the Middle Atlantic States Association for Secondary Schools said this:

It seems inconceivable to the members of this committee, all but one of whom are parents, that a 14-year or 16-year-old boy should be turned loose in a large metropolis to find his own room, to make his own arrangements for eating well-balanced and nourishing meals, engage in healthy and moral activities, and watch over his own physical and moral well-being. It is one thing for a page to live at home or in the home of his sponsor, where he can be a part of normal family living so necessary at this stage in growth. It is something else again to give these youngsters the great opportunity to be of direct service to their gov-

ernment, and at the same time, *deprive* them of the *basic protections* to which they are entitled at this stage in their development. The Washington of today is a different city from that of 20 years ago.

As I say, this statement was made in 1965 at the time we still were appointing 14- and 15-year-olds but the statement is equally true today for 16- and 17-year-olds coming to the large urban area where the crime rate has increased immeasurably. If the committee which appoints the pages limits the appointments to junior and senior high school students, it would allow the school to concentrate its resources in a more limited area and enrich the academic program. Proper supervision in a dormitory would also provide a setting which would lead to greater academic progress.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this situation can no longer continue. I do hope that the gentleman from Florida will accept my amendment as an alternative.

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

(On request of Mr. WAGGONNER, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the very able and distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I agree completely with the conclusion, as I almost always do, of the gentleman who is without a peer in this House that we cannot continue as we have been doing. I do agree, although I was not present yesterday, with the action the House took in deciding to stay with high-school-age students to serve as pages here in the Chamber. I believe that we do need a facility such as the gentleman projects. I know that they do need supervision. It is fortunate we have not had more trouble than we have had. I think it is because we have had good pages, by and large, that we have not had the trouble that is ever possible.

It would seem to me that to provide this facility, Mr. GRAY's subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works of the House would probably be, though I am a member of the Committee on House Administration, the appropriate committee to handle the facility if we do proceed to provide it.

The thought I really wanted to express is that in concurring with the recommendation you have just made, it seems entirely appropriate to me that, since our Great Speaker has contributed so much to the education of the youth of this country, this might well be named, if the gentleman will accept an amendment, the JOHN W. McCORMACK Page School.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana. There is nothing that would please me more than that. I think the gentleman's suggestion is simply great and I hope we may see it become a reality.

In conclusion, may I just suggest that my own preference probably would be college age, but the House has decided otherwise. However, even if it remained college age, I think we would still be

obligated to build a dormitory as we do for other college students in every State in the country. The residential page school here in the Nation's Capital ought to be the greatest school in the United States, instead of being threatened with loss of accreditation. I think it ought to be the greatest honor for any 16- or 17-year-old young person in this country to be a page in the House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, or the Supreme Court. Let us take the preliminary steps today to build the JOHN McCORMACK School in the Capital area.

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

(On request of Mr. CAREY, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York, who makes such a tremendous contribution on the Education Committee of the House.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I know of her long-term dedication to better schooling facilities for the pages, and her work particularly when she headed up our study committee on this subject.

In supporting the gentleman's amendment, I wish also to concur in the suggestion made by our colleague from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) that we recognize not only the Speaker's great dedication to youth but also his continued and everlasting dedication to better educational facilities in our country, and make this truly the kind of model school which would be worthy of the name of Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York. This would not be simply a monument to cement and concrete. It would be a monument to his great works. What finer tribute could there be than a living memorial such as has been recommended—a living memorial down through the decades ahead that speaks of JOHN McCORMACK's lifetime concern about boys and girls.

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur with the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Oregon. I think the Speaker would not only concur in this, but I think nothing would delight him more. I think the basic legislation should be adopted now and the details worked out later. Therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

(On request of Mr. FRASER, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the proposal which the gentleman from Oregon

has made. I would have preferred to have college-age students, but the House made its decision yesterday.

In the judgment of the gentlewoman, would her proposal permit appointment, and under it would it be feasible to appoint young ladies as well as young men as pages under these circumstances?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not touch upon that matter at all. I think under the present law it would be possible and we would not be violating that law if we did appoint girl pages. However, I would have to say to my colleague, my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, that I would recommend against anyone sending a 16- or 17-year-old daughter to Washington as a page under present conditions. I think the gentleman from Minnesota knows of my deepfelt sentiments about discrimination against women and girls in the country. In spite of this, I just do not happen to think that under the present circumstances and conditions this is the time to discuss whether we should have girl pages. After the dormitory is constructed and maybe crime in the city is reduced, then we could discuss it in realistic terms. I would not want to take the responsibility for bringing a 16- or 17-year-old girl to Washington. But I leave it to the wisdom of the committee that has jurisdiction over such appointments.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I support the bill.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that the language of the substitute offered by the gentleman from Oregon is language that at one time was in the committee bill. Frankly, I supported the idea of developing a dormitory and a system of classrooms for our pages. I well recognize the problem we have today in this country with high school youngsters who are here without proper chaperoning and the problems resulting from a lack of proper facilities in which they can spend their time.

So actually, as I say, this conforms to the position that I took in the very beginning. It was unfortunately dropped out of the text of our original bill quite some time ago, because of some possible new approaches, and, of course, because of what at one time was the idea of having college students, and that finally became the committee version.

I supported the Dingell amendment on our page system. Therefore, I think this amendment by the gentleman from Oregon would place the system on a sound basis. It will place our school, I think, in a good condition. Certainly it will protect the accreditation, which, as many of us have heard, has been questioned recently because of the living conditions of the pages.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the substitute amendment.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order at this time to ask unanimous consent to include in my amendment that it shall be called the

JOHN McCORMACK Residential Page School? If so, I ask unanimous consent to do this.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment, with the additional words which have been included.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, the modification should occur on page 3 at about the third line of the second paragraph under (g). The present language states it shall be designated the congressional page residence. That would be stricken out, and it would be designated in line with the unanimous-consent request of the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mr. Chairman, there will be a need for a conforming amendment on page 3, also and elsewhere throughout the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification of the substitute amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3 of the substitute amendment, line 9, after the quotation mark, strike out "Congressional Residential School" and insert "John W. McCormack Residential Page School."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN)?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I conclude by saying I certainly support the unanimous-consent request of the gentlewoman from Oregon. This is a tribute to a great man, to a man who has contributed his entire life to the building of America and certainly to education and the enhancement of education. I wholeheartedly support this addition to the language which is pending before the House.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my modest proposal has much improved over what I originally suggested.

If I am any judge of the sense of the House, I believe the substitute is also something most of the Members would like to have.

It is a big improvement over what I originally introduced.

I am delighted to join the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) on this very constructive improvement. It is a particularly heartfelt thing to have the name of our great Speaker attached to it, so I delightedly accept the suggestion of the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend and congratulate the gentlewoman from Oregon, Mrs. EDITH GREEN, and the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CHARLES BENNETT, for proposing the amendments providing for the construction of a long overdue dormitory and adequate educational facilities for Capitol pages.

Even prior to the year I had the privilege of appointing a page, I was deeply concerned about the conditions under

which pages resided in Washington. As the sponsors of the amendments so adequately stated, pages have lived under conditions with little or no supervision, inadequate housing and generally poor meals. Under this system of pursuing educational activities and living conditions, it is surprising that there have not been a great number of embarrassing incidents reflecting unfavorably upon the entire Congress.

In 1961, I first introduced H.R. 601, legislation to provide a permanent residence for congressional pages and measures were reintroduced in succeeding Congresses because of my continuing interest in this important matter. Although the boys are supervised at school and on their jobs, after work they are on their own, at a time when they need the direction, guidance, and supervision which they would ordinarily receive at home.

Most of the pages, I wish to emphasize, are good boys. They leave Washington with more than a passing knowledge of how our democratic society functions, and their stay is a fruitful one.

But I am less than satisfied with many aspects of their lives while they are in Washington. Too often their environment is not conducive to good health, good behavior, or good study habits.

The responsibility to remedy the situation lies with the Congress, therefore, I heartily support the proposals made today and I am confident they will receive the unanimous approval of the committee and the entire Congress.

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Oregon, Mrs. EDITH GREEN, to establish a dormitory and school for pages. To be called the John W. McCormack Residential Page School, the new facility would answer the pages' most pressing need: a place where they can live together and go to school together under pleasant conditions.

Pages are now scattered all over Capitol Hill, living in roominghouses and old hotels. Their quarters, needless to say, are often cramped and dingy. Such living conditions make close supervision virtually impossible and, still worse, make impossible the sense of close comradeship that schoolboys away from home need. School quarters are nearly as bad as living quarters. The attic of the Library of Congress, where page school is now held, is something less than an ideal educational atmosphere.

I am particularly delighted, Mr. Chairman, that the proposed school-dormitory would be named after Speaker McCORMACK. An ardent advocate of expanded educational opportunities during all of his 40 years in the Congress, the Speaker would feel honored more by this residential school than by any monument. Mr. McCORMACK always made a special effort to help pages, often engaging them in conversation and offering them advice. His friendship and counsel was extended to hundreds—indeed, thousands—of pages over the years.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on

the substitute amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), as modified.

The substitute amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT), as amended by the substitute amendment, as modified.

The amendment, as amended and modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JACOBS

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACOBS: On page 135, line 14, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma; and on page 135 insert after line 14 the following: "nor shall any person be denied employment as a page of the House of Representatives on account of sex, race, color or religion."

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I, of course, listened with interest to the remarks of the gentlewoman from Oregon, but I think really that we have overlooked one of the possibilities to achieve what I assume everyone in this body favors; namely, the opportunity for little women to have the same rights as others in our country. Certainly, girls should have the opportunity to serve as pages in the House of Representatives. It was mentioned yesterday that nobody ever heard of a page girl and there have only been page boys. That does not necessarily make it right. Let us face it. It is a fact that there are only page boys in the U.S. House of Representatives, but there are both page boys and girls in the Indiana General Assembly. The fact that there are only page boys here in the Congress is a throwback to an earlier era when women did not have full citizenship in this country or the right to vote. The possibility I had in mind is clearly indicated by a proviso in the amendment just adopted. That proviso was that residence elsewhere than in the dormitory could be authorized by the committee. For example, there are several Members of Congress who live here in Washington who have daughters who live in their homes and go to school here in Washington despite the crime rate and despite the other problems that have been indicated here concerning living in a large city. There is no reason in the world why a little girl could not be appointed as a page and stay with some relatives in Washington. Indeed, perhaps she could stay in the home of the appointing Member. There are some Members who have families here in Washington with whom summer interns stay during the summer. The young girl could be brought in to attend school and to perform her page duties during the day.

It was said yesterday that the page boys should not continue under the present circumstances here at the age of 16 and 17 and it was really not proper to maintain them here under the present circumstances. Somehow or other, although it would seem bad for them, it seems even worse for the girls.

I am reminded of a story about Presi-

dent Grant, who at a stag party at the White House arose and showed indignation when a rather vulgar story was being told. One of the persons present said, "Mr. President, there are no ladies present." The President replied, "There are gentlemen present."

So I think that the same high standards should be maintained for girls and boys and that at long last, at this late date, in our Republic, we should not stand on a ceremony or deal with this question superficially. We should recognize that facilities are indeed available and can be made available for girl pages. Certainly when those facilities are available under circumstances where relatives do live in Washington, a girl should have the opportunity to serve as a page.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further comments to make other than to respond to questions.

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

Mr. JACOBS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman. In yielding I might also echo the comments made by the majority leader of my deep admiration for the gentleman from California and the job he has done on this bill.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Let me say that the reason why I asked him to yield was in order to withdraw my reservation of a point of order. The reason why I raised the reservation was because I was thinking in the initial glance at the amendment that it was to a Senate provision rather than general in nature, but I now find that it does conform.

Let me say to the gentleman that so far as I know at the present time actually there is no discrimination. I recognize that certain problems exist, but I certainly agree completely with the intent of what the gentleman's amendment is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair inquires of the gentleman does he withdraw his point of order?

Mr. SISK. I withdraw my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACOBS. I might say finally that the committee, of course, will have to continue to use good, sound discretion in administering the program, but under the circumstances where proper facilities are available, such as an aunt living in Washington or perhaps parents living in nearby Virginia or Maryland, I think it would be well for us to be on record to the effect that it is a fundamental act of justice that young girls in this country have an opportunity to serve here.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS).

The question was taken; and the chairman being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were—ayes 16, noes 26.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

**PART 7—MODERNIZATION OF HOUSE GALLERIES
MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF GALLERY
FACILITIES IN THE HOUSE CHAMBER**

SEC. 471. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint a special commission of the House, to be designated the "Special Commission on Modernization of House

Gallery Facilities", composed of five Members of the House, three from the majority party and two from the minority party. The Speaker shall designate as chairman of the commission one of the Members so appointed. A vacancy in the membership of the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. The commission shall conduct a study of the structure and uses of the gallery facilities in the Chamber of the House of Representatives and shall formulate and develop a program for the modernization and improvement of the House gallery facilities in order to improve the physical conditions under which the proceedings on the floor of the House are conducted and to provide for spectators in the House galleries modernized and improved accommodations for their enlightenment, information, and understanding with respect to the proceedings on the floor of the House and the role of the House generally in the legislative branch of the Government. Any such program formulated and developed by the commission shall provide for—

(1) the enclosure of the galleries with soundproof transparent coverage in such manner as to preserve the visibility from the galleries of proceedings on the House floor and eliminate the audibility on the House floor of noise in the galleries;

(2) the installation of facilities and devices which will permit the proceedings on the floor of the House to be heard by spectators in the galleries, together with facilities and devices by which appropriate comments and explanations may be made to spectators in the galleries with respect to the proceedings on the House floor; and

(3) such other items or features of modernization and improvement of the House galleries as may be directed by the commission.

(b) At the request of the commission, the Architect of the Capitol shall provide advice, counsel, and assistance to the commission in the conduct of its study.

(c) Such study shall be completed not later than the close of the first session of the Ninety-second Congress.

(d) After the completion of such study, the commission through the Architect of the Capitol, subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose, shall put the program for the modernization and improvement of the galleries into effect. The Architect of the Capitol may procure or make such plans, enter into such contracts, employ such personnel, and take such other actions and make such expenditures, as may be necessary to complete such program of modernization and improvement of the House galleries. In all matters connected with such program, the Architect shall be subject to the supervision, direction, and control of the commission.

(e) The commission shall cease to exist when the Speaker determines that the program for modernization and improvement of the galleries has been completed.

(f) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Mr. SISK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that part 7 of title IV 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 California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 137, line 23, insert "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 471."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRASER
Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRASER: On page 138, line 21, strike lines 21 through 25 and renumber the succeeding clauses accordingly.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman I will be very brief.

This is an amendment which strikes out the mandatory direction to the Study Commission on Modernizing the Galleries that they must proceed to enclose the galleries with transparent coverages.

If my amendment is adopted it would not preclude the Commission from considering this, but it takes out the mandatory direction that the Commission shall do it. I think many of us have had misgivings about the proposals in the past to enclose the galleries in glass or other material in the belief that in a free society that we do not want to interpose this kind of insulation between the public and the press on the one hand, and the Members of the House of Representatives on the other.

Now, it may be that as this Commission studies the problem they will conclude that this is desirable. My amendment will not preclude their reaching such a conclusion, but it would take out the mandatory direction that they must do this prior to the commencement of their study.

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

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

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I believe the last statement clarifies the question that I had in mind. I will, however, ask it for legislative history, and that is that actually what the gentleman seeks to do is to simply change what amounts to a requirement that they shall do those things enumerated here in the language which he strikes.

Mr. FRASER. Just to clause (1).

Mr. SISK. And it makes it possible that they could still do those things, and they might do them if they felt it was necessary to conform to the other objectives of the legislation. Is that basically the intent of the gentleman?

Mr. FRASER. Yes, the gentleman has accurately stated my intention.

Mr. SISK. In other words, that the gentleman would not then find any inconsistency in striking part (1) at the bottom of page 138 with leaving in, of course, the material on part (2) at the top of page 139?

Mr. FRASER. No, clauses (2) and (3) are left in and simply renumbered.

Mr. SISK. They are renumbered.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONABLE. I would like to thank the gentleman from California for clarifying the intent here because the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota indicated that he had grave doubts about interposing a barrier between the people and the Representatives on the floor.

I want to tell you that we have the worst barrier between the people in the galleries and the Representatives on the floor frequently now, namely, the barrier of misunderstanding about the processes of representative government.

By improving the possibility for some sort of sound system or a current commentary about what is going on on the floor, the enclosing of the galleries will add greatly to the educational opportunities of a visit to the Capitol.

Frankly, when I am sitting with my constituents in the galleries, I find that they get a great deal more of what is going on on the floor than just wondering about it and having no way of knowing what is happening here.

As I said yesterday, we have to get our best foot forward with respect to this situation to a greater degree than we have heretofore.

Mr. FRASER. I agree with the gentleman. An illustration of one of the systems the committee could consider is what they do in Ottawa, where they have a bilingual parliament. They provide earphones and visitors can pick them up.

We could use the same thing with simultaneous translations when we have foreign visitors. We could have running commentaries.

There are a number of options. One option is to enclose the galleries. This is a simple amendment to avoid a mandate on that particular feature before the study is begun.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. On the question of a sound system—I am a member of the House Committee on Appropriations for the legislative branch and we are now engaged in appropriating funds to improve the sound system up in the gallery.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REES. According to your amendment, you knock out clause 1 so clause 2 is still there?

Mr. FRASER. That is right.

Mr. REES. Clause 2 is in the bill and mandates that the Commission shall provide for the installation of facilities or a device which will permit proceedings on the floor of the House to be heard by spectators together with a facility or device which will interpret appropriate comments and explanations and so forth.

So we are still mandating the type of facility which will explain to the people in the gallery what we are doing—and maybe we might also have such facilities down here.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment and commend this very sound suggestion for enclosure of the galleries which should not be mandatory but discretionary.

I rise in support of part 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the

gentleman be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of California. What I do not understand is why you just did not strike the word "shall" on line 19 and then leave the other things in—so this commission could conduct a study and proceed to implement its program.

We suggest a study and we want it to be comprehensive.

Why did not the gentleman just change the word "shall" next to the last word on line 19 and say "may provide for, et cetera" and then leave it at that.

Maybe this commission will find out that we need to enclose the galleries. It depends on the study. But you make the remaining two provisions here mandatory.

I simply propound the question. From a parliamentary standpoint, it seems to me much simpler and much more in keeping with proper legislative procedure if you would simply amend it and change the word "shall" and make it permissive.

I think you are defeating your own purpose by proceeding this way.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman. Originally I had an amendment which would do just that, change the word "shall" to "may." But I found that if I simply dealt with the question of enclosure and left that discretionary, it would be sufficient. I have no objection to mandating the doing of other things, such as providing for more effective hearing by those in the gallery and the possibility of the commentary. The language does provide that once they have completed their study they may proceed. It might have been wise to have them come back to the House with the results of their study, but I do not feel strongly on that point.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Was the gentleman here in 1953 or 1954, whatever the year—I believe it was 1953—when the Puerto Ricans shot up the House?

Mr. FRASER. No, I was not here, but I have heard of the incident.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman had been here, I think he probably would want to mandate the House to do something about enclosing the galleries.

Mr. FRASER. I appreciate that problem. I do not intend to foreclose that possibility. I know of a number of Members who have reservations about moving in that direction. I would just hope the Commission would look at it very carefully rather than mandate it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman had seen three Members on the Democrat side wounded, and another Member lying in the well of the House badly wounded and apparently near death, and still another on the Republican side shot in the back, I think he would change his mind about the mandatory provision in this bill to do something about enclosing the galleries.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to participate in this discussion. I think it might be all right to mandate the Congress to get this thing done. I was here that day. I was sitting on the floor when it happened. I saw it happen. But that does not disturb me; that is, somebody carrying a pistol in the gallery, nearly as much—because there is a limited amount of damage that can be done with a pistol—as what I predict will happen here one of these days with some of these crazies who are running around this country, and that is some nut coming in here and throwing a hand grenade down on the floor which may kill a dozen, 15, or 20 Members.

I do not want to isolate the galleries any more than anyone else does, but I think we ought to do something before it is too late, before something like this happens, and then everybody will say, "Why didn't we do it?"

The only thing that bothers me about the gentleman's amendment is that it might be taken as an indication that we do not want anything done, and I think it is time that something is done.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I hope the gentleman from Minnesota does not mean that he hopes or does not expect anything to be done. I was here in 1954. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, at the time of the incident. We had just had a quorum call. The Committee on Agriculture was in charge of the bill. Our friend from Kentucky, who is now the chairman, was saying, "They are just firing blanks." But many of us were lying on the floor. There were over 200 Members present. I do not see how they missed so many. It was like shooting into a covey of quail sitting on the ground. I am not opposed to the gentleman's amendment, but I think this commission had better take a good look at this subject.

Mr. HAYS. I appreciate the majority leader's contribution.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman makes an excellent point. Suppose the Puerto Ricans had used four fragmentation grenades instead of four automatic pistols. They would have made a shambles out of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAYS. There is no doubt about it. This is something that actually took place in 1954. Enclosing the gallery was talked about at that time, but I for one did not think it was urgent to do it. A lot of things have happened since 1954. There are many more of these nutty people running around hijacking airplanes without any regard for human life whatever.

This morning we had a hearing in the Foreign Affairs Committee on the subject of what to do about airplane hijackings. A young stewardess from one of the airlines told about an experience she had had with a fellow who not only had a Molotov cocktail on board the plane, but who lighted the thing and carried it up

through the aisles and told them to go to Cuba or else.

I do not think we ought to weaken this in any way. Frankly, I would not mind if the gentleman's amendment were defeated and it was mandated, because if we do not mandate it some time, it is never going to be done.

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

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the statements made by the gentleman from Ohio.

I recall rather vividly the shooting, but I share the concern voiced as to a more extreme form of attack on this body. It is frequently held up to public contempt. It is not the best understood institution of government, because it is composed of men and women of strong individual views. It is difficult for this body to project a single image. But there are certainly the elements of unrest in this country that could cause the kind of thing the gentleman has voiced fear over. I think mandating a security provision now would be a very prudent thing for the House to do.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I think the gentleman is exactly right. As I say, if we do not do something, we are going to live to regret it or maybe I should say some of us may live to regret it. These witnesses this morning had all kinds of suggestions, such as making treaties with every country. As I pointed out in the committee, most of the hijacked planes go to Cuba or to areas controlled by guerrillas, and we cannot make treaties with them.

Then it was suggested there be electronic devices, and I bring this up because it is relevant. We can have an electronic device at every door up there, but it will not detect a plastic bomb, and it will not detect a grenade encased in plastic—and they are made like that. As I pointed out over there this morning, at London Airport, at Heathrow, they have electronic detectors, and according to the front page of the newspapers, the detectors are going crazy detecting, among other things, the metal in women's bras, car keys and everything else with metal in it, so they are not foolproof.

I tell the Members I do not fear for myself particularly, and I do not say that in a spirit of bravado. I do fear that some crazy person is going to come in here some day and wipe out 15 or 20 Members who happen to be sitting adjacent to one of the galleries.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat again what I think was the spirit back of the original amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota. Our emphasis here should not necessarily be on security, although I acknowledge that security is a problem. Our emphasis should not be on putting barriers between the people who come to see their representative government function and those of us here on the floor.

Our emphasis, Mr. Chairman, should be on trying to find some way of making our procedures here more readily understood by the visiting public. There is

real reason for concern if people come to Washington to see their Government function and do not have the opportunity of understanding it because of the pressure of time, because of the problems of acoustics, or because our procedures here are complicated. We can add a great deal to the public relations of representative government—and after all, there is nothing more important to the survival of this Government than preserving its representative character—if we are willing to take the steps necessary to improve the opportunities for the visiting public in the gallery to hear what is going on here on the floor, to understand it and to have some concurrent instruction in the nature of our rules.

I oppose the amendment. I want to mandate the glassing of the galleries, not to put a barrier between us and the people, but to make possible a new opening of understanding for the visiting public.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, as we discuss this portion of the bill I should like to relate a little experience. As the bill now stands there will be recorded teller votes, votes which according to some who write for the press are devices through which a Member of Congress can hide his vote from constituents.

Now, what I should like to note at this point is that the recording of teller votes will provide a protection for Members which is now lacking.

On May 27 the House had before it an SST amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from Illinois (Mr. YATES). There was a teller vote.

Apparently what we have now, in lieu of record teller votes, is a monitoring system from the galleries. The monitor who was in charge of watching me declared that I had voted a certain way on a teller vote—and this is indeed an interesting observation because, as a matter of fact, at that very moment I was in Iowa 1,000 miles away trying to save a packinghouse operation in my district.

When I noted this fact, the newspapers carried a story sponsored by a little political group certifying that I had voted against the Yates amendment on a teller and decrying the fact that I would try to deny it.

Subsequently we have had apologies from about everyone concerned, but the point of the story still stands. A Member can get some protection by recorded teller votes rather than having them monitored by some anonymous person in the gallery.

There is a little more to this story. The person who did the monitoring, according to his own word, was a staff member—I say, was a staff member—of a Congressman. He did the monitoring, he said, not for his boss but for the Democrat study group. The Democrat study group then relayed this information to another organization which announced the vote but attributed it to two fine organizations who had not given them permission to use their names.

The nondescript little political group,

of course, was trying in this endeavor to gain a little unearned respectability for itself.

Here we see there may be a little thickening of the plot when we consider all this reform. The Democrat study group, which is not the only such organization around here, operates from offices in the House Office Building, frequently utilizing as staff members people who are actually on the payroll of Members of the House. These people are paid from tax funds and are supposedly working for the people rather than for organizations, political or otherwise.

It occurred to me that while we are in a reforming mood we ought to do something about that kind of situation wherever it exists. I seriously considered offering an amendment to try to do something about it, but having taken a small head count I concluded it would be futile. One of the most interesting things about some reformers is that they really do not want to be reformed.

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

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. I thank the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the House. I was somewhat similarly involved. In the case in which I was involved, I was not absent but was on the House floor and on three separate teller votes I have been misrepresented.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECHLER OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia: On page 139, immediately before the period in line 10, insert a comma and the following: "including items and features of modernization designed to provide for and facilitate the consultation of legislative materials and the taking of written notes by visitors to the House galleries, under such regulations as the Speaker may from time to time prescribe, without any distraction to or disturbance of the conduct of proceedings on the floor of the House".

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a few minutes, since this subject has been very thoroughly aired in the past few days.

As the Committee knows, in the Senate galleries it is within the rules to read and consult a seating chart of the Senate in order to ascertain where the individual Members of the Senate sit and to try to identify who is speaking. It is unfortunate that we cannot take our constituents into the public galleries of the House and even open a pictorial directory to find out who is addressing the House, providing that the photos are reasonably up to date. Nor is it within the House rules to look at a copy of the bill being debated, or pencil out a section of the bill as it is being amended on the floor.

I am very happy that the House has voted to include the provision in the bill which enables the modernization of the House galleries. For many months the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) and I have jointly advocated the program which is outlined on page 138 of the pending bill, which requires the "Special Commission on Modernization of

House Gallery Facilities" to develop a program to be presented not later than the close of the next Congress. I am particularly pleased that the strong language of the pending bill was retained; namely, that—

Any such program formulated and developed by the commission shall provide for the enclosure of the galleries with soundproof and transparent coverage in such manner as to preserve the visibility from the galleries of proceedings on the House floor and eliminate the audibility on the House floor of noise in the galleries.

On this point, the record should show that Prof. Arthur W. Macmahon of the Department of Public Law and Government at Columbia University first proposed the concept we are discussing not long after the armed attack by a group of Puerto Rican nationalists in 1954. Professor Macmahon, now retired, would modestly deny his major role in bringing to this point his fine idea, but I am honored to call attention to and acknowledge his efforts as we debate this bill.

Down through the years, I have never hesitated to advocate and support this idea whose time has now come. I was privileged to serve as a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which made its report in 1966. Although I could not persuade a majority of my colleagues to support this proposal, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND), and a former member, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Curtis, concurred in the following proposal which I offered in my supplemental views:

The galleries should be enclosed with soundproofed, transparent covering, with the floor debates piped into the galleries. The floor proceedings would then be clearly audible to visitors, and gallery noises would not disturb floor proceedings. Gallery visitors should be provided with a periodic commentary on bills being debated, the issues at stake, the legislative leaders, etc. Gallery visitors should be allowed to consult bills, committee reports, and pictorial directories of members.

I made these comments in 1966, supplemental to the Final Report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

In conjunction with the enclosure of the galleries, it follows that measures should be taken to allow visitors in the public galleries to consult materials which relate to the legislative process, and to take notes on the same. Nowhere in the House rules is there a prohibition against reading or notetaking, yet it is one of the rules listed on the back of every visitor's pass, and the rule is strictly enforced by the doorkeepers.

Notetaking or consultation of legislative materials by visitors to the House gallery in no way would detract from the dignity of this Chamber, nor disrupt any of its activities. We already allow members of the press to take notes on our floor proceedings, and it is only fair that we allow this same privilege to be granted to those who come to witness the House in session. Many observers, scholars, and everyone from the general public would benefit from increased knowledge and understanding of Congress if this rule could be altered to al-

low notetaking and consultation of legislative materials. Many members have indicated to me their support of this simple amendment, and I urge its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the committee divided and there were—ayes 32, noes 23.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for an interpretation of the language of the bill on page 138 concerning enclosure of the gallery. Under the bill as it now is the enclosure of the gallery is mandated. Would this affect the Press Gallery?

Mr. SISK. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SISK. It would not be my assumption it would. The Press Gallery, of course, is separate and apart from the Visitors Gallery. Basically the intent of the subcommittee in dealing with it is strictly that area set aside for visitors to the gallery.

Mr. REES. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any additional amendments to this section of the bill?

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SISK

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee now return to part 1 of title IV.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read part 1 of title IV.

Mr. SISK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that part 1 of title IV be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do so only to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, one of the Members having a series of perfecting amendments to part 1 of title IV and understanding that another Member intends to offer an amendment to strike part 1, my parliamentary inquiry is, in the event the amendment prevails to strike or in the event that it is defeated, in either event would it then be in order to offer perfecting amendments to part 1?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inform the gentleman from Missouri that if the amendment to strike was agreed to, a new germane part 1 could be offered. If the motion to strike is not agreed to, further germane amendments would be in order.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Chairman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California that this part of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—CONGRESS AS AN INSTITUTION

PART 1—JOINT COMMITTEE ON DATA PROCESSING

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND POLICY

SEC. 401. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that there is an urgent, critical, and continuing need on the part of the Congress and the legislative branch generally for a modern, effective, and coordinated automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval system—

(1) to assist the Congress, its committees and Members, its officers and employees, and its offices and other organizational units, and the respective agencies, offices, and other organizational units in the legislative branch generally, in obtaining and analyzing information;

(2) to expedite their operations and activities; and

(3) to facilitate and improve the performance of the legislative and representative functions of the Congress.

(b) It is, therefore, the policy of the Congress, in view of this need—

(1) that the Congress and the legislative branch shall be provided with, and shall acquire, establish, and maintain, by purchase, lease, or otherwise, the most modern, up-to-date, efficient, effective and coordinated automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval equipment and facilities which are appropriate to the needs and requirements of the Congress and the legislative branch generally;

(2) that a method of continuous, coordinated, comprehensive, and efficient planning and review shall be established and maintained by the Congress for the continuing development and improvement of such equipment and facilities and the use thereof; and

(3) that the supervision, control, regulation, and coordination of the acquisition, operation, maintenance, development, improvement, and use of the automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval equipment, facilities, and system of the Congress and the legislative branch shall be effectuated by, under, and through a single comprehensive authority under the Congress—the Joint Committee on Data Processing created by this Part.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE DATA PROCESSING

SEC. 402. (a) There is hereby created a Joint Committee on Data Processing (hereafter in this Part referred to as the "Joint Committee").

(b) The Joint Committee shall be composed of twelve members, as follows:

(1) six Members of the Senate, appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate; and

(2) six Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House.

(c) Of the Members of the Senate, or of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, appointed to the Joint Committee, three shall be from the political party having the greatest number, and three shall be from the political party having the second greatest number, of Members of the Senate, or of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

(d) Any vacancy in the membership of the Joint Committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Joint Committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) The Joint Committee shall select, in the manner provided by this subsection, a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The chairmanship

and the vice chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and the House of Representatives with each Congress. The chairman during each even-numbered Congress shall be selected by the Members of the House of Representatives on the Joint Committee from among their number. The chairman during each odd-numbered Congress shall be selected by the Members of the Senate on the Joint Committee from among their number. The vice chairman during each Congress shall be chosen in the same manner from that House of Congress other than the House of Congress of which the chairman is a Member. The vice chairman shall not be of the same political party as the chairman.

(f) The members of the Joint Committee shall serve without pay in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Joint Committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the Joint Committee in the District of Columbia when the Congress is in session.

FUNCTIONS, POWER, AND DUTIES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

Sec. 403. (a) It shall be the general duty of the Joint Committee to implement the policy of the Congress stated in section 401 (b) of this Part.

(b) In the implementation of the policy of the Congress and in carrying out the purposes of this Part, the Joint Committee—

(1) shall prepare, develop, place in effect, and maintain, and may revise as it considers necessary, a comprehensive and coordinated program for the establishment and maintenance of a comprehensive, modern, up-to-date, and efficient automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval system for the Congress, its committees and Members, its offices and other organizational units, and the respective agencies, offices, and other organizational units in the legislative branch generally, which is appropriate to the needs and requirements of the Congress and the legislative branch;

(2) shall prepare, develop, and place in effect, and may revise as it considers necessary, plans and programs for the acquisition, by purchase, lease, or otherwise, including the lease, as necessary, of the use, for specified periods or at regular or irregular intervals, of automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval equipment, Machinery, and facilities of private enterprise, of such equipment, machinery, and other facilities as may be necessary for the operation and maintenance of such automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval system;

(3) shall conduct, on a continuing basis or from time to time, as it considers necessary, comprehensive and coordinated reviews and studies, and prepare comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs, for the continuing development and improvement of such automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval system;

(4) shall conduct, on a continuing basis or from time to time, as it considers necessary, comprehensive and coordinated reviews and studies of uses and applications of such automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval system for the Congress and the legislative branch in order to achieve the most effective, efficient, and coordinated uses and applications of that system and the maximum benefits therefrom for the Congress, its committees and Members, its officers and employees, and its offices and other organizational units, and the respective agencies, offices and other organizational units in the legislative branch generally;

(5) shall have the authority as it considers necessary and appropriate—

(A) to establish, operate, maintain, develop, and improve an automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval system of the Joint Committee;

(B) to regulate and prescribe the uses and applications of that system of the Joint Committee;

(C) to acquire for that system, by purchase, lease, or otherwise, equipment, machinery, supplies, and related items; and

(D) to employ, for the operation, maintenance, development, and improvement of that system, personnel, as members of the staff of the Joint Committee, at respective per annum gross rates of pay, fixed by the Joint Committee, not in excess of the highest rate of basic pay, as in effect from time to time, of the General Schedule of section 5332 (a) of title 5, United States Code, and terminate the employment of such personnel;

(6) shall prepare, establish, and promulgate, and may revise from time to time, appropriate standards, criteria, and priorities governing the acquisition, operation, use, and application of all automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval equipment, machinery, and facilities for the Congress, or either House, and the legislative branch generally;

(7) shall prepare, establish, and promulgate, and may revise from time to time, such appropriate standards, criteria, and priorities as may be necessary to ensure that automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval equipment, machinery, and facilities for the Congress, including those of the Joint Committee, and the legislative branch generally shall be available for use, on a fair and equitable basis, by the respective committees and Members of each House of Congress, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and the respective officers, offices, and organizational units of the Congress, or of either House;

(8) shall have the authority to issue such directives and to take such other action, in accordance with law, as it considers necessary to eliminate duplication, waste, and inefficiency in the operation, maintenance, development, use, and application of the automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval equipment, machinery, facilities, and system of the Congress, either House of the Congress, and the legislative branch generally; and

(9) shall have such general authority and power of supervision, coordination, regulation, and control over the acquisition, operation, maintenance, development, improvement, use, and application of automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval equipment, machinery, and facilities for the Congress, or either House, and the legislative branch generally, as may be necessary to implement and educate the policy of the Congress and the purposes of this Part.

(c) With respect to any automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval facility and operation of the Congress, or either House, or any committee, officer, office, or organizational unit of the Congress or either House, or of any agency, office, or other organizational unit in the legislative branch generally, other than those of the Joint Committee, each officer or other authority having jurisdiction and control over any such facility and operation—

(1) shall obtain the approval of the Joint Committee before that officer or authority—

(A) acquires new or additional automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval machinery; or

(B) places in effect and operation any new or different use or application of automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval machinery for the Congress, or either House, or any Member, committee, officer, employee, office, or organizational unit of the Congress or either House; and

(2) shall observe and follow the standards,

criteria, and priorities promulgated by the Joint Committee under subparagraph (7) of subsection (b) of this section with respect to the availability, on a fair and equitable basis, of automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval equipment, machinery, and facilities, for use by the respective committee and Members of each House of Congress, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and the respective officers, offices, and organizational units of the Congress or of either House.

(d) In carrying out its functions, powers, and duties, the Joint Committee shall consider, observe, and conform to the rights, powers, and prerogatives of the two Houses of Congress as separate legislative bodies in the legislative branch of the Government, the internal organizational structure of each House and the organizational units therein with regard to separate automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval facilities in payroll administration, pay disbursing, and any other operations of any nature, and the general needs, requirements, customs, rules, procedures, and methods of operation particularly applicable to or followed in each House.

(e) In carrying out its functions, powers, and duties, the Joint Committee shall accord to the respective agencies, offices, and other organizational units which are outside the organizational structure of the Congress but within the legislative branch generally the maximum practicable administrative and operational independence in connection with their respective functions, projects, and activities which involve automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval but which are not directly connected with the legislative and representative functions, and the informational needs and requirements, of the Congress.

(f) The Joint Committee shall establish, and may revise from time to time, such policies, procedures, standards, and safeguards as the Joint Committee considers necessary and appropriate to protect and preserve the privacy, security, and confidentiality of information and data stored in the automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval facilities under its jurisdiction by Members and committees of the Senate and House, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, the respective offices and other organizational units under the Congress, and the respective agencies, offices, and other organizational units in the legislative branch generally.

STAFF OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

Sec. 404. (a) The Joint Committee may—

(1) appoint, as chief of staff of the Joint Committee, a Director of Data Processing;

(2) prescribe his duties and responsibilities; and

(3) terminate his employment as the Joint Committee considers appropriate.

The pay of the Director of Data Processing shall be at a per annum gross rate not in excess of the rate of basic pay, as in effect from time to time, for Level III of the Executive Schedule of section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The Joint Committee may—

(1) appoint, as deputy chief of staff of the Joint Committee, a Deputy Director of Data Processing;

(2) prescribe his duties and responsibilities;

(3) fix his pay at a per annum gross rate not in excess of the rate of basic pay, as in effect from time to time, for Level V of the Executive Schedule of section 5316 of title 5, United States Code; and

(4) terminate his employment as the Joint Committee considers appropriate.

(c) The Joint Committee may—

(1) appoint, as members of the staff of the Joint Committee, such professional, technical, clerical, and other personnel as the Joint Committee considers appropriate;

(2) prescribe their respective duties and responsibilities;

(3) fix their pay at respective per annum gross rates not in excess of the highest rate of basic pay, as in effect from time to time, of the General Schedule of section 5332(a) of title 5, United States Code; and

(4) terminate their employment as the Joint Committee considers appropriate.

(d) The Director of Data Processing, the Deputy Director of Data Processing, and all members of the staff of the Joint Committee, whether appointed under subsection (c) of this section or section 403(b)(5)(D) of this Part, shall be appointed on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions.

(e) The Joint Committee may reimburse any member of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the functions, powers, and duties of the Joint Committee while outside the District of Columbia.

CONSULTANT AND ADVISORY SERVICES FOR THE JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 405. (a) (1) The Joint Committee may procure, as it considers necessary and appropriate, the temporary or intermittent assistance of individuals who are experts or consultants in the field of automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval—

(A) by nonpersonal service contract with the individual expert or consultant concerned as an independent contractor for the furnishing by him to the Joint Committee of a written study, analysis, summary, opinion, synopsis, treatise, monograph, or other end product pertaining to the field of automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval to assist the Joint Committee in carrying out its functions and duties; or

(B) by temporary employment, by personal service contract or otherwise, of the individual expert or consultant concerned to perform services for the Joint Committee at a rate of pay fixed by the Joint Committee not in excess of the per diem equivalent of the highest rate of basic pay then currently in effect for the General Schedule of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including payment for necessary travel time of the rate fixed by the Joint Committee.

(2) The Joint Committee may procure, as it considers necessary and appropriate, by contract, the temporary or intermittent assistance of organizations of experts and consultants in the field of automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval to assist the Joint Committee in carrying out its functions and duties.

(3) Contracts, agreements, and arrangements under this subsection are not subject to any requirements of advertising for bids thereon.

(b) (1) The Joint Committee may establish, appoint, maintain, and utilize, and revise or discontinue, from time to time, such panels, groups, or other bodies of advisers as the Joint Committee considers necessary and appropriate to provide, from time to time, advice, counsel, and assistance to the Joint Committee in carrying out its functions and duties.

(2) A person appointed to serve on any such panel group, or body of advisers who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government or the Government of the District of Columbia shall be paid, for each day of service performed by him for the Joint Committee, at a rate fixed by the Joint Committee not in excess of the per diem equivalent of the highest rate of basic pay then currently in effect for the General Schedule of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code. A person appointed to serve on any such panel, group, or body of advisers who is an officer or employee of the Federal Govern-

ment or the Government of the District of Columbia is not entitled to any pay for his services for the Joint Committee other than his pay as an officer or employee of the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia.

(3) Each person appointed to serve on any such panel, group, or body of advisers may be allowed and paid his actual and necessary travel expenses, and a per diem allowance for his subsistence expenses, as determined and approved by the Joint Committee, while away from his home or regular place of business or official duty station to perform advisory services for the Joint Committee.

COORDINATION WITH AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING AND INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL FACILITIES IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SEC. 406. (a) The Joint Committee may negotiate and enter into appropriate agreements and arrangements with appropriate authorities in the executive branch pursuant to which—

(1) automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval machinery, equipment, and facilities in the executive branch may be made available, at regular or irregular intervals, and to the extent consistent with the efficient operation of the executive branch, and on such reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis as may be agreed upon by the Joint Committee and the executive branch authority or authorities concerned, for use by the Congress, its offices and organizational units, and the respective agencies, offices, and other organizational units in the legislative branch generally; and

(2) data stored in the automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval facilities of the executive branch may be made available for use, to the extent consistent with the national security and the public interest, by the Congress, its offices, and organizational units, and the respective agencies, offices, and other organizational units in the legislative branch generally.

OPERATIONAL AUTHORITY OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 407. The Joint Committee may—

(1) hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places;

(2) require, by subpoena (to be issued under the signature of the chairman or the vice chairman and to be served by any person designated by the chairman or the vice chairman) or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, papers, and documents;

(3) administer oaths;

(4) take such testimony;

(5) procure such printing and binding;

(6) make such expenditures; and

(7) adopt such rules regarding its procedures;

as it considers necessary and appropriate.

RECORDS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 408. The Joint Committee shall keep a complete record of all of its committee actions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. All records, papers, documents, and files of the Joint Committee shall be the property of the Joint Committee and shall be kept in the offices of the Joint Committee or at such other places as the Joint Committee may direct.

PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF SUGGESTIONS REGARDING USES AND APPLICATIONS OF THE AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING AND INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM

SEC. 409. The Joint Committee shall establish, and may revise from time to time, appropriate and equitable procedures—

(1) for the submission to the Joint Committee, by Members and committees of the Congress and its officers, offices, and other organizational units, and by the respective

agencies, offices, and other organizational units in the legislative branch generally, and by other appropriate parties, of suggestions and proposals with respect to uses and applications of the automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval facilities for the Congress and the legislative branch; and

(2) for the consideration and evaluation by the Joint Committee of the suggestions and proposals so submitted.

CONTRACTS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE TO BE OPEN TO PUBLIC INSPECTION

SEC. 410. The Joint Committee shall keep in its offices copies of each contract entered into by the Joint Committee and shall make such copies available for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Joint Committee.

REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 411. (a) The Joint Committee shall submit to the Senate and the House of Representatives, on such day in each odd-numbered year as the Joint Committee considers appropriate, but not later than April 1 of each such year, a report, in summary and in detail, of its programs, studies, reviews, operations, and activities during the immediately preceding Congress. Such report shall include detailed and informative discussions, statements, and explanations with respect to—

(1) the automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval facilities then currently available to the Congress and its committees, Members, officers, offices, and other organizational units;

(2) the respective uses and applications of those facilities then currently being made;

(3) the plans and programs of the Joint Committee regarding the acquisition or replacement, or both, by purchase, lease, or otherwise, of automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval facilities in the immediate future, and new or additional uses and applications of such facilities;

(4) the operation and results of the program of the Joint Committee for the submission, consideration, and evaluation of suggestions and proposals regarding uses and applications of automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval facilities.

(5) each contract entered into by the Joint Committee with any person or organization in private enterprise for the acquisition, by purchase, lease, or otherwise, of automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval equipment, machinery, and facilities, including the name of such person or organization and the monetary cost to the Government under such contract; and each agreement or arrangement entered into by the Joint Committee with the executive branch under section 406 of this Part;

(6) the total monetary cost to the Government under all contracts covered by subparagraph (5) of this section;

(7) the procurement by the Joint Committee of the services of individual experts or consultants and organizations thereof, and of panels, groups, or other bodies of advisors to the Joint Committee, including the name of each such individual or organization and of each such advisor, the cost to the Government for the services of each, and the total cost of all such services; and

(8) such other matters as may be necessary to provide the Congress with full and complete information regarding the activities and operations of the Joint Committee.

(b) Each report of the Joint Committee under this section shall be printed as a House Document and as a Senate Document.

EXPENSES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 412. The expenses of the Joint Committee shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, from funds appropriated for the Joint Committee,

upon vouchers signed by the chairman or the vice chairman of the Joint Committee.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 104, line 13, strike out "PROCESSING".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 106, line 4, strike out "Legislative".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 119, line 18, strike out "(a)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOORHEAD

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORHEAD: Page 105, line 20, immediately after "(3)" insert "except as otherwise provided in this paragraph."

Page 106, insert the following immediately after the period in line 3: "Nothing in this Part shall impair the continuing authority of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, after consultation with the Joint Committee, to acquire and use, to any extent otherwise authorized, such automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval equipment and facilities as they may respectively deem appropriate to aid them in the discharge of their respective functions."

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered on behalf of myself and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. McCLORY. This amendment, which we think clarifies and strengthens the intent of title IV, establishing a Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing, charged with the responsibility of bringing computers to Congress. You have all received our letter explaining this amendment.

This letter states:

As the original authors of legislation to create such a Joint Committee to bring ADP support to the Legislative Branch, we want to make it clear that we did not intend to infringe in any way upon the jurisdiction of the House Administration Committee, and we do not believe that Title IV does so. However, to avoid any misunderstanding, we intend at the proper time to offer the following amendment:

The amendment is as follows:

Page 105, line 20, immediately after "(3)" insert the following: "except as otherwise provided in this paragraph."

Page 106, insert the following immediately after the period in line 3: "Nothing in this Part shall impair the continuing authority of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, after consultation with the Joint Committee, to acquire and use, to any extent otherwise authorized, such automatic data processing and information storage and re-

trieval equipment and facilities as they may respectively deem appropriate to aid them in the discharge of their respective functions."

In H.R. 20422, which I introduced in the 90th Congress, and again in H.R. 7012, the Moorhead-McClory bill of the 91st, I called for an independent facility under the jurisdiction of a Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing, aided by a professional staff to operate the facility, an independent advisory board comprised of key legislative branch individuals and outside data processing experts.

I am delighted that the Subcommittee on Congressional Reorganization, under the able leadership of Chairman SISK, has unanimously adopted this concept of the Joint Committee and has provided broad enough language in the report which would not rule out adoption of the other provisions should we pass this legislation.

We are all indebted to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER), chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Equipment of the House Administration Committee for his leadership in this area, and I must emphasize that the creation of a joint committee would in no way detract from the efforts of the working group on automatic data processing set up by this committee for the House. Indeed we will learn from it, as we did from the pioneering efforts of the Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Let us not get lost in jurisdictional disputes. Congress needs help.

I was one of the eight signers of the resolution adopted by the Democratic caucus February 19, 1969, which stated:

Resolved, That the Committee on House Administration be fully supported by Democratic members in efforts to improve the efficiency of operations of the House of Representatives and we urge that these efforts include, but not be limited to the use of computers and of a centralized mail processing system.

In signing this resolution introduced by my able colleague (Mr. BRADEMAS), I said:

That the Resolution we offer is but the first step, and we should take it, but if we are really to accomplish our purposes, we need much more. We need to develop a coordinated system where the computer capabilities of the Library of Congress, the Clerk of the House, the Secretary of the Senate, all of whom are going their separate ways, can communicate with each other, and those systems downtown.

As Congress moves into the computer age, it is my feeling that the biggest mistake we can make is to acquire one system for mailing service and find that another is required for research, another for file maintenance, another for publication of the Digest, and so forth. The result will be an expensive, inefficient group of incompatible machines and programs which will leave the Congress little better served and probably as far behind as it is now.

Coordination on Capitol Hill is not the easiest of tasks when one realizes that we have a bicameral legislature, one House having 435 Members and the other 100, and no single leader over both Houses. In addition there are semiauton-

omous bodies such as the Library of Congress, the Comptroller General, the Public Printer, and the Legislative Counsel of both Houses.

Mr. Chairman, I am all for continuing our support of the particular and special computer activities now being handled by the Clerk, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the GAO and most importantly, the House Administration Committee.

But we must not continue to be short sighted. A single authority is urgently needed to set policy, coordinate existing programs, acquire equipment, continue to study improved technology and techniques, and plan for the future.

Testifying last November before the Sisk Subcommittee on Congressional Reorganization, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks) said:

In terms of the Congress, a unified approach to achieve compatibility and to avoid duplications in computer capability means that some organization must coordinate computer acquisition and use for both the House and the Senate, as well as all of the support units of the Congress.

He further went on to state that as a result of the work done by the Government Activities Subcommittee, of which he is chairman, in the coordinated, business-like approach to the management of computers in the executive branch, more than a billion and a half dollars has been saved, and additional savings are accruing at the rate of between four and five hundred million dollars annually.

THE SURVEY OF THE USE OF ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING BY STATE

"Legislatures," recently published by the Institute of Government at the University of Georgia, states that 34 States, or 84 percent are currently employing computerized legislature information systems or are actively planning to do so in the near future, and all systems in the State legislatures are set up for the joint use of the House and Senate. Twenty-two States have systems for statutory retrieval in full operation and five more are definitely planning to do so.

Of particular note to me is that the State of Louisiana, has established a Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing, composed of two Senators, three Representatives and the Commissioner of the Division of Administration.

A Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing is our best bet to achieve strong congressional computer coordination without infringement upon the proper prerogatives of either House.

With the adoption of this amendment to the Joint Committee concept we would assure ourselves of the best of all possible worlds. One, the House Administration Committee and the Clerk of the House of Representatives could provide us with computer capability when the House alone is concerned and two, the Joint Committee could move to achieve coordination of computer capability when both the House and Senate are concerned or when both Houses of Congress are involved with such semiautonomous bodies as the Library of Congress, the Legislative Counsel of both Houses, the Public Printer, the General Accounting Office, and the Bureau of the Budget.

I urge all of my colleagues who have

been active in their own way to modernize Congress to come together on this, and vote for this perfecting amendment to title IV.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD) has with good intentions offered this amendment. But I want you to pay careful attention to the reading of this amendment, because I doubt seriously that most of you have, at this point.

The amendment says:

Nothing in this Part shall impair the continuing authority of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, * * *

And listen carefully now to these next words—

After consultation with the Joint Committee, to acquire and use, to any extent otherwise authorized, such automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval equipment and facilities as they may respectively deem appropriate to aid them in the discharge of their respective functions.

Now exactly what does this mean? It means that the House Committee on Administration—no committee to the House of Representatives—no officer of the House of Representatives can provide anything in the way of ADP services for their committee or for this body without consultation—and consultation requires approval of the joint committee.

Now how many of you Members of the House are willing to make subordinate to the joint committee, to the U.S. Senate, the services provided for the House of Representatives? We, for example, are in the process of trying to devise a system of computers for addressing the mass mailing of Members of the House. The Senate already has a computerized addressing system.

If we adopt this amendment, this means that we, in effect, have to have the approval of the Senate before we can proceed to provide these services for the House.

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

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. I want to assure the gentleman that it is my intention in using the language consultation to mean consultation and only that. You must talk to the committee, and if the committee says, "Get an IBM 110 and if the Committee on House Administration does not want to go along with it, then under this amendment it would not have to." It would have completed its duty as long as it consults.

It would have completed its duty—

Mr. WAGGONNER. Then the gentleman's amendment is totally meaningless.

Mr. MOORHEAD. No.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Then why should we consult if we are not forced to comply with the result of the consultation?

Mr. MOORHEAD. If the gentleman wishes to offer an amendment stating that no approval is necessary in order to clarify the matter, that would be satisfactory. I merely want to make legislative history on the floor of the House.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The argument

was advanced Tuesday—I said at the outset the gentleman offered this with good intent, but the argument was made here then, "Let the House run its business and let the Senate run its business" when we were arguing germaneness. Is there anything more proper for the House to work its will and the Senate to work its will than in the area of housekeeping and services for Members of the House?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I agree with the gentleman, but where there are joint things such as bill retrieval—if the House cannot retrieve from the Senate and the Senate cannot retrieve from the House—we do not have an effective bill retrieval system.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Of course, the gentleman is aware that the Senate has done nothing while the House has done something.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I agree, the House is far ahead of the other body. I congratulate the gentleman for it. Ultimately there will have to be coordination.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman that if you want to kill any possibilities of the House of Representatives having any computerization, you set up a joint committee with the other body. I do not speak with lack of experience. I have been a member, or was a member of a joint committee with the other body for 20 years, and it did less in 20 years than a subcommittee of this House will do in 30 minutes.

In the first place, you never get them to attend. You never could get a quorum. The only time they came was when a Senator who had been chairman of it for years wanted to be reelected chairman. Then they never met again for another 2 years when he ran again for the office.

If you want to have a retrieval system, this whole section should be stricken out and the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania ought to be defeated. The gentleman from Louisiana will offer an amendment to let the House go ahead, and it ought to be adopted. If you have ever been in a conference with Members of the other body, you do not need any more experience. You have had enough.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that any further debate on my part is necessary. I think I have made the point. I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I joined in the amendment because it is my hope that the hard work, the effort, and the very thorough consideration which has been given by the Committee on Reorganization can be sustained in the provisions that they have included in this bill.

I would say at the outset that the subject of applying data processing to our work in Congress is an extremely complex and difficult one.

I introduced legislation several years ago—and I think mine was the first bill—which would have vested in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, which is jointly util-

ized by the other body and this body, the establishment of an automatic data processing facility. That would be the appropriate agency where we would be able to store the vital information which can help us to do our jobs better. That concept was enacted, as a matter of fact and was embodied in the reorganization bill passed by the other body in 1967.

It is true that automatic data processing has a great many applications. When I served formerly on the House Committee on Government Operations I learned of the terrible overlap, the terrible waste which was involved in the executive branch, which I understand now has over 4,600 pieces of computer hardware costing hundreds of millions of dollars. So, when we get into this new area of data processing and the purchase or lease of ADP equipment, we are talking about an awful lot of money and we are talking about equipment which most of the time, no matter what we do here, will not be in use. In other words, most of the time the ADP hardware, will be idle. It seems to me that what we should try to do in this bill is to try to advance the efficiency of Congress. We should try to develop a means whereby we can utilize the hardware to a maximum.

I want to say this, that insofar as the independent operations of the House are concerned, insofar as our attendance records, insofar as House bills and amendments are concerned, the entire operations of the Clerk of the House, and things of that nature. In other words, our housekeeping and our payroll and all the other House applications of ADP, should be entirely and exclusively in the control of the House Administration Committee. But when we talk about ADP in the General Accounting Office and in the Legislative Reference Service, it does not seem to me that it is our exclusive prerogative to control what is going to be there.

If we are talking about having an exclusive facility, it seems to me what we are doing is to authorize duplication and added expense. So, I am hopeful we can support the validity of the Special Committee's recommendation, which is embodied in the bill before us.

I am reminded that in connection with the Penn Central bankruptcy, it was pointed out that another affiliate of this great railroad had a computer operation which could not be meshed with the Penn Central, and that was accounted as one of the principal bases for its bankruptcy, because one computer could not talk to the other. If we are speaking about an independent computer facility, one for this body and one for the other body, with respect to needs which we have jointly, then we are talking about adding waste and not efficiency.

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

Mr. McCLODY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman on everything he said except the final conclusion. The problem I have is with respect to overlapping jurisdiction of these two parts of the bill, the original bill and the gentleman's amendment. It seems to me we are authorizing both committees to do the same thing.

Mr. McCLODY. It seems to me what we are doing with the joint committee is establishing the professional technical assistance both for the other body and for this body of a kind which the House Administration Committee can utilize. In the committee bill we are going to take advantage of this service which is jointly available to both bodies and available to all the Members, and to all the committees of this body, and the other body. In utilizing that professional talent we can apply automatic data processing to our benefit almost endlessly.

Mr. NEDZI. That is not what the bill says. The bill says the Joint Committee:

(1) shall prepare, develop, place in effect, and maintain, and may revise as it considers necessary, a comprehensive and coordinated program for the establishment and maintenance of a comprehensive, modern, up-to-date, and efficient automatic data processing and—

And so forth.

Mr. McCLODY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and I have said in a sense that the provisions as contained in the bill do not tread on the toes of the House Administration Committee and do not impair their prerogatives with regard to the individual applications of ADP of the House which are for the exclusive benefit of the House.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me amplify this business of joint committees and joint operations a little further. I am chairman of the Accounts Committee. The jurisdiction of that committee covers finances for the radio and television department around here. We had a joint operation and we had to quit it, because the House Members could not get in. It was preempted by the Senate. Every time a Senator wanted it, the staff made arrangements for the Senator to have it. If we have a joint data retrieval system, the House will be able to use it when no Senator wants to. We do not have joint mail rooms, because if we did, at this time of the year, our mail would not get through until Christmas. There would be too much Senate mail around there. If we had a joint addressing arrangement, Members could bet their bottom dollar they would be coming in last.

If Members do not believe me, they should go on a joint trip with Members of the other body some time, and they will get whatever seats are left in the plane if they are House Members, and when they arrive, if the embassy has enough cars, the Senate will ride and our Members will walk.

I believe in the two Houses working together, if possible, but one cannot work together with some of those people because they feel, "We are superior to the House Members," and that they should come first.

Do the Members want to junk everything the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER) and his subcommittee have done? I am not on that subcommittee. I am glad I am not, because they have worked too hard, too long for too many hours. I would not like to put in all those hours. They are right in the discussion as to getting something for the House.

Do Members want to establish a joint

committee and start all over? They can bet their bottom dollar who is going to run the joint committee. I already know, so I am asking the Members to defeat the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Let us get on with the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER) adopt it, wrap this bill up, and quit for the weekend.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to get into this particular aspect of the subject. I no more enjoy tangling with the gentleman from Ohio on this subject than on anything else.

The gentleman from Ohio said a couple of things with respect to which I have had some experience, also. I do not know, frankly, whether the gentleman from Ohio has used the recording facility. I have, from the day I got here. I recorded regularly when it was a joint facility. I never was kept waiting by anybody. I would make an appointment, I would be there, and I would get my time.

When the matter broke up into separate groups, it broke up for a very specific reason of conflict of personalities, which had very little to do with anything except staff.

Furthermore, I have been a Member for 20 years on the Joint Economic Committee. There has never been a time when I have had the experience the gentleman from Ohio seems to have had with the U.S. Senators. They are treated just like other members of the committee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD) can testify to that. He serves on that committee.

It may be that in different ways there are greater difficulties in other circumstances, but my experience has been a perfectly pleasant one, and when I have been on trips with them, there has never been anything about front and back seats.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman when we asked why the recording facility was being compartmentalized into the Senate and the House, my committee was told that the Senate was setting up its own facility because the staff here, where it was, had been instructed not to give the Senators preference. So they said, "If that is the case we will set up our own."

Mr. BOLLING. I am not questioning the gentleman's word.

Mr. HAYS. I understand the gentleman is not, but that is how I got the information.

Mr. BOLLING. I am interested in that, because at the time of that breakup I was actively involved in the problem and my understanding was different. I am not prepared to go into it. It had to do with personalities and individuals rather than Senators and House Members. I do not know what the explanation is today.

The committee gave very careful consideration to the question whether there should be a joint operation or a singular operation. There is absolutely no question that the gentleman from Louisiana has done a great deal of work. At one time, as a matter of fact, the gentleman from

Louisiana was working quite closely with our committee and seemed in agreement with our approach. But, as things developed, he apparently changed.

I am perfectly willing, obviously, to accept the decision of the House.

Without going into vast detail or pretending to be a great expert on computers, although I do have some knowledge of them and have made some study of the problem, I for one am totally convinced that while it may be a little bit more difficult to accomplish and a little bit more difficult to do in the long run the American people and the people on the Hill, including the House Members and the Senate Members, and all the agencies which work with and for them will be better served by a coordinated operation stemming from a joint committee.

I also believe, further, that there is a possibility and even a probability that a significant sum of money may be saved if we have an umbrella approach rather than a series of singular approaches to the problem.

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

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

Mr. McCLODY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I might say that the Committee on Government Operations and this House has taken steps to prevent the executive branch from doing what we are about to do if we reject the special committee's approach to this subject. In other words, each of the executive departments want to have their own computer facility, each one separately. That is terribly wasteful. We have taken steps to see to it that they are coordinated under the General Services Administration. It has effected savings and enabled a much better and more efficient use of the computer facilities. That is what it seems to me we should try to attain in connection with this reorganization bill.

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman.

I say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Moorhead amendment preserves the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration and that the provisions of the bill are in the interests of this institution and of the whole Congress and its various agencies and, above all, in the interests of the American people.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes.

We have heard some pretty potent arguments against the amendment. I rise against it not because I am against data processing—I am very much in favor of it—but I want to testify as a member of the committee, and I think the chairman will say that I am a very active member, because I have never missed a meeting in considering data processing. I want to testify that I think that progress on data processing is very important. We must proceed on this front. But I also point out that this bill has yet to pass the Senate. There are some who say that it may not pass the Senate when we pass it here today, which I certainly hope we will do. Then we should have no

data processing at all and three-point action will make no progress in this field unless the Committee on House Administration continues in the field. This, of course, they will do. It seems to me that it would be wise for us to defeat the amendment here and follow the leadership of our chairman [Mr. WAGGONNER], who has done a magnificent job in investigating this matter and holding hearings and getting testimony and information on it. We have made significant progress which I am sure that he will tell you about.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment because we may not get a bill at all, which will be some handicap, although I am sure that the Committee on House Administration will continue on it.

More than that, though, the committee will move ahead very rapidly. If you want real reform, therefore, and want it soon, let the Committee on House Administration proceed by knocking out this amendment. First of all, let us defeat the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY) on the very strong statement he has made pointing out the dangers of duplication and the great cost of this computer equipment. While computers can be very useful, there is no product of modern technology that is more expensive and which has been more subject to waste. Many corporations have rushed into computer programs willy-nilly, getting more of them than they should or procuring the wrong types of systems for their real present or projected needs.

There is an unfortunate tendency to do the same in Government. Too often computer procurement within the Federal agencies has resulted through failure to coordinate programs in duplication and waste. I certainly hope that we will not make that mistake here but, rather, will make a good-faith effort to try to coordinate the procurement and use of these computers so that great savings can be made for the American taxpayer.

I am pleased that the House Rules Committee has provided in the pending Legislative Reorganization Act for establishment of a Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing, responsible for upgrading and improving congressional sources of information and coordination of the development of computer facilities for the Congress. As pointed out by the House Committee on Government Operations, in its reporting H.R. 10791—

Any effort to apply data processing techniques to the legislative branch is immediately confronted by two considerations: First, the need for a unified and compatible approach to system development, and, second, the need to avoid any unnecessary duplications in computer system capability. . . . If systems are developed independently, there will be voids or duplications which will also limit system effectiveness and waste public funds. . . . The development of a compatible system to support the legislative branch without duplications or voids in system capacity, therefore, requires coordination among those units having common information needs.

It may well be that a coordinated study of the needs of the Congress would find that one computer system could be adopted or devised to serve both Houses and the Library of Congress. I do not believe it could be in the interests either of the House, the Senate, or the American taxpayer for either body of this Congress to pursue independent acquisition and use of automatic data processing and information storage and retrieval equipment and facilities for use by that body alone, without first coordinating with the other body and considering fully the possibility of obtaining such a data processing system or systems as would serve to meet the real needs of the whole Congress. The Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing which would be established by the bill as it would be modified by the pending amendment would provide the mechanism for such study and coordination. I commend the able and foresighted leadership of the distinguished gentlemen from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY) and Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD) in this effort, and urge the House approval of the proposed language providing for this coordination.

The Legislative Reorganization Act as amended is the first congressional reorganization measure since 1946. The bill would incorporate important changes in procedures of the House and its committees. It would provide the Congress with new sources of information and research, including development of an automatic data processing system, expansion of the present Legislative Reference Service into the proposed Congressional Research Service, increased budgetary information and expansion in committee staff.

The bill would write into the House Rules more democratic and equitable committee practices. As amended, the bill would give greater protection to all members of each committee by insuring them time in which to file supplemental, minority or additional views for inclusion in committee reports. It would provide greater investigatory staffs on committees for minority members if they want it, insuring that the minority party members be provided with at least one-third of the funds allocated to the committee for such purposes. The bill as amended would ban proxy votes in committees and require names and numbers on record votes taken in committees to be made public. It would open more committee proceedings to the public and permit committee hearings to be broadcast under stringent regulation. Although I am disappointed that the bill fails to make needed corrections to remove the strangleholds of the present seniority system, the other changes made by the bill as amended are of great significance.

Most important of all reforms in this bill, by itself in my view sufficient justification for enactment of this bill into law, the Legislative Reorganization Act as amended enables one-fifth of a quorum of the Committee of the Whole—20—to ask that clerks record the names of Members voting on teller votes, how they voted, and the names of Members who did not vote. This major change along with the others contained in this

bill as amended, should go far in enabling the House, to regain public confidence in its ability to respond effectively and with relevance to real needs.

I commend and congratulate the Rules Committee and other Members who have helped evolve the bill to this point and I strongly urge my colleagues to support wholeheartedly the enactment of this legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the full 5 minutes. I certainly do not this afternoon pose as an expert on the subject of data processing, and use of computers in connection with the words of the House of Representatives, but I would certainly want to express my wholehearted support for the committee bill, and for the provisions of title IV, as they begin on page 104 of the bill, and express the hope that with the assurance that the House has now received, that is, if we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD), that it will not in any way impinge on or curtail the activities of the House Committee on House Administration; that they will accept the language of the committee bill.

I for one certainly would join in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER), and the other members of the committee, for the many months of work, and very fine work, that they have done in researching this whole subject of how we can use automatic data processing equipment to the benefit and advantage of the House.

But as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), and others have pointed out on the floor this afternoon, what we are talking about essentially is a retrieval system, an information retrieval system. What a tragedy it would be if we were to go off in an uncoordinated manner and at great cost to the taxpayers of this country, prepare and install a system that was incompatible with other branches of the Government, with other organizations within the Government like the General Accounting Office, the other body of the Congress, and so on.

It seems to me that the case is very strong indeed for making sure that we do make a coordinated approach to this whole problem. And what better way—what better way of doing it than by setting up the kind of joint committee that has been proposed in the language of the committee bill.

So I would seriously urge—

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Yes, of course I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman aware that the chairman of the full committee, at the request of the subcommittee, addressed a letter last year to the majority leader and the minority leader of the U.S. Senate, asking them if they would come and work with us, and they refused to even give us the courtesy of a reply?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am informed that, regrettable as that incident

was, that there was a change in attitude on the part of the gentlemen on the other side of the Capitol. I am sorry that the gentleman suffered that sort of a slight, and I do not believe the gentleman should have been turned off in that very cavalier manner, if indeed he was.

Mr. WAGGONER. The slight was not to this gentleman. It was to the gentleman who addressed the letter to the majority and minority leadership of the U.S. Senate, and that was the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FRIEDEL).

Further, I would ask the gentleman if the gentleman is aware that since hurriedly the Senate committee has created an ADP Subcommittee, that they sent some staff over to talk with us about what we were doing. And they were specifically asked if the Senate now wanted to work with us, and their reply was, "No, we only want to know what you are doing."

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am not aware of what the gentleman has just related, but I feel sure that if we proceed in the manner suggested in the bill by setting up a joint committee, and this bill is approved, as I hope—and seriously hope—it will be by the other body, and they are able to appoint Members to the joint committee, I see no reason at all why we cannot and should not work effectively and harmoniously with the other body in order to have, not an added voice interfering with the intermural affairs of this body, but in an effort to attack the broader problem of retrieving information from various sources, from various branches of the Government so that we can coordinate the whole approach, that we ought to make on the whole subject of legislation, and be more effective legislators.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, first let me say that I agree with what we have heard as far as the tenor and thrust of what should be accomplished, but I think the gentleman should be informed that that is exactly the attitude that the subcommittee has taken. That is the manner in which we are proceeding. We have already expended in the form of contacting this problem some half a million dollars to do exactly this. And nothing that this committee anticipates doing, and nothing that we have even discussed so far would limit what we have done just to the House.

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

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me conclude merely by saying that my support of the joint committee and my support of this title of the bill is not in any way based on any desire to criticize what we have done and what other members of the Committee on House Administration have done.

I think it rather is out of a desire to correct some of the very things that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGON-

NER) has been talking about—to bring the Senate in on a formal basis in the planning and coordination of that study and the acquisition and procurement of this equipment and to avoid some of the very problems that you have pointed out that have arisen in the efforts you have made in informally consulting with the other body.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKINSON. We are agreed where we want to get and to go as to the final point. The question is—how best to arrive at that point? We are well down the road now. We do know how to get there. We will accomplish what you seek.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the House Committee on Administration and of Mr. WAGGONER's subcommittee in connection with the study of the computerization for the House of Representatives.

I have the utmost regard for the gentleman from Illinois and the Committee on Rules who propose that we establish a joint committee with the Senate.

The only problem is that this desire for establishing a joint committee with the Senate may be a one-way desire. It is obviously not the desire of the other body to work with us—and not only in this instance. It might interest the Members to know that we tried to do a similar thing with the radio and television room downstairs and we tried to work in connection with the other body and they refused to work with us and this would save us a considerable amount of money.

More important, however, we have gone a long way in discussing the use of computers for the House of Representatives. We worked closely with a working group of people from the GAO and the Legislative Reference Service who are very familiar with computer programming throughout the entire administration and in the Senate. We have worked with these people who are familiar with the Senate operation and it is our intention to make sure that the hardware we do use will be the same hardware that could lead into the computers presently in existence throughout the administration—let alone that which is in existence in the Senate and even in the Library of Congress.

I think what you are going to do by frustrating the attempt of the Committee on House Administration to continue in its work is delay and unnecessarily encumber our activity.

I would personally feel extremely frustrated because I worked many arduous hours—attending committee meeting after committee meeting, both in session and out of session on this subject. We have gone a long way—we have let out contracts, we are on our way.

If we have to consult with the other body it will frustrate all of our efforts.

Historically we have worked hard and long on this and so have other Members of the House. I think this body should permit the Committee on House Administration to continue these efforts.

Yes, we would be delighted to consult with the other body if they wish to consult with us. But if they do not and we want to continue on our own and in our efforts, I can assure the body at the end of next year we will have a complete system to submit to this House in the same manner as we shall have a system of electronic voting to be submitted to this House before the end of this session.

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

Mr. PODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. The thing that bothers me is this. If we are going to store information in computers, we can certainly store the same information for the benefit of both the other body and of this body in the same manner as we utilize the legislative reference service at the present time. It seems to me rather odd that we would establish a facility for our independent use which would not be available to both bodies.

It seems to me further that it would be a waste for us to do that. So with regard to the legislative reference service and the GAO, and in numerous other areas it should be a joint operation or it is going to be a complete duplication.

Mr. PODELL. In response to the gentleman, let me say first of all that the legislative reference service have three men at this time who are working together with the GAO, and have been working together on this from the very inception.

The other body could establish their own hardware. We certainly would be delighted if they would share the cost of our own hardware. But this is up to the other body. They can work with us if they wish. But up to now they did not wish to participate.

If they wanted, they could go out and install their own equipment and that is their prerogative to do so. We invite them to participate with us, but we do not make it a mandate so that we cannot continue without their prior consent and approval.

Mr. McCLORY. If the gentleman will yield further, in the earlier reorganization bill which passed the other body there was a provision that an automatic data processing facility would be established in the Legislative Reference Service. Also there was provision for a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations which would specifically study improvements in automatic data processing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PODELL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PODELL. I would just like to point out you are referring to the legislative reorganization bill of the other body.

Mr. McCLORY. That is correct, the bill that passed the other body but did not pass this body.

Mr. PODELL. That particular bill may have passed the other body, but there has certainly been no indication that they have had any desire to deal with us ever since.

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

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Let me say to the gentleman that if my amendment is adopted, the only obligation on your committee would be to consult with the Joint Committee. You could continue to do everything that you are now doing. The only thing is that if the Joint Committee says, "Maybe you can share time on this machine," or "Maybe you could consider using this machine," such use of the facility could be made. But if you say, "No," this amendment says the House administration can proceed regardless.

Mr. PODELL. If the gentleman would be satisfied, for purposes of legislative history I am sure the chairman of our committee would state that he would be delighted to consult with the other body if they would be willing to consult with us. By putting the committee provision into the language of the bill, you would be mandating something that may not be possible.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I merely say that if the other body enacts this legislation, you will have machinery to effect coordination.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MOORHEAD) there were—ayes 20, noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAGGONNER

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAGGONNER: Strike out part 1 of title IV, which includes all of section 401 through section 412, beginning on page 104, line 12, down through page 124, line 26.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just read would strike part 1 of title IV of this legislative reorganization proposal. It specifically would remove everything from the bill which makes in order or makes mandatory a Joint House-Senate Committee on Automatic Data Processing.

Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Administration has for nearly 2 years now, for the better part of the 91st Congress, been looking into the need and the possibility for providing the House of Representatives and the Congress, if the Congress as a whole wants it, a system for retrieving storable information.

We have been looking into all the aspects of updating the operation of the Congress. We have been considering, for example, something this bill deals with as well, and that is what we shall do about our voting procedures. I mentioned earlier, and I want to specifically talk about it now, that on July 9 of last year, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FRIEDEL) the chairman of the House Committee on Administration, addressed a letter, which I have a copy of here in my hand, to the majority leader of the other body, which said this—and it is important:

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

JULY 9, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Because of the ever increasing demands on the Congress and because of the tremendous strides which have been made in the automatic data processing field, the Committee on House Administration has undertaken an in depth study of a data retrieval program calculated to fill the needs of the Congress in meeting its obligations. In this connection our special Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Office Equipment has been designated to undertake the development of an automatic data retrieval system for the House of Representatives. Most of the work for the Subcommittee will be accomplished by a task force comprised by experts in the computer field from the General Accounting Office, the Library of Congress and the office of the Clerk of the House. This group has been selected because of its wide experience in the data processing field with expertise which we believe could not be matched anywhere in the computer industry. Furthermore, those individuals who comprise the group have excellent knowledge of the needs of the Congress.

Much of the planning will involve data relative to the status of legislation in the Senate as well as the House of Representatives and other information, most of which is of common interest to both the House and the Senate. It is expected that the ultimate system will go far beyond the legislative field and the retrieval of data calculated to assist Congressional committees. The system we hope to develop will readily provide Members with necessary material for the day by day operation of a Congressional office.

Because it would appear highly desirable that any system designed for the House be compatible with any system which might be considered or under study in the Senate, you may wish to consider joining with the House of Representatives in this effort which is still in the initial stage. Should you wish to learn more of our plans you may want to designate a committee or staff group in the Senate to discuss the objectives and procedures we have in mind. I would be available for such a discussion and so would Chairman Joe D. Waggonner, Jr., of the Subcommittee handling the project. The staff of the Subcommittee would be glad to assist in any way that is possible. Attached for your information is a copy of the procedural outline which the study group will generally follow.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, *Chairman.*

Mr. Chairman, that letter was completely ignored by the other body. The word—when we made an inquiry as to why we had not had an answer—which came back to us, was that the majority leader of the other body did not do business with committee chairmen, he did business with the Speaker and the majority leader of this body.

If we cannot communicate any better than that, there is no way under God's blue canopy of heaven that a joint committee can succeed.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WAGGONNER was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, after we created our committee and after we were at work, the other body came back to us and wanted to know what we were doing. They were asked, as I told the Members a few moments earlier, "Do

you now want to work with us?" Their answer was, "No, we only want to know what you are doing."

As of last night the Senate had created a sham committee, because they have not hired a single employee. It is a paperwork committee in its entirety.

In November of last year this body, as a result of our work and at our request, passed a resolution which gave the committee \$500,000. To do what? To do exactly this: It authorized the committee to incur such additional expenses, not in excess of \$500,000, as it deemed advisable in carrying out its duties, including the development of a computer system for the House of Representatives.

In the process of this we have held 22 special subcommittee meetings and some full committee meetings. We have had 14 presentations from corporate groups. We have had 30 working group meetings. We have interviewed 101 Members of Congress, 210 staff members of the House of Representatives which is a total of 311 interviews in number.

In June, earlier this year, we let a contract to the Stanford Research Institute as the primary conceptual planning contractor, and also to the Mitre Corp., to be our auditor to review what we were doing, to be sure that the contractors we were doing business with did not get off base. We let contracts to the Computer Sciences Corp., to the System Development Corp., to EDP Technology, Inc., to General Computing Corp., and Scientific Resources Corp., to InTech Corp., and to Systems Consultants, Inc., to design the concept of this system.

If the Members want to proceed now and get a system, which we have to have, which is something as important to this Congress as it was years ago to establish a Library of Congress, then I say we should not undo this work. It is our only chance to begin to free ourselves from domination by the executive. If the Members reject this they are going to be 3 years getting back to where we are now, and make no mistake about it.

Mr. Chairman, we are taking into account completely the need to interface with the executive branch of the Government and the other body of the U.S. Congress, if they want to. We are behind in designing a system which must interface with what the executive branch of the Government has already done, and it will likewise be necessary, if we do our work properly—and we are—for the Senate merely to tie on in an expansionary way with whatever we do.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan, a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. NEDZI. Is it not true in consulting with all these corporations the working group and the subcommittee has consulted with all the major corporations involved in this kind of a program and at every step of the way we have always inquired of them to make certain that they take the Senate requirements into consideration and that any computer system devised for this House had to interface not with just the executive branch but also with the Senate?

Mr. WAGGONNER. Exactly. We have talked with every computer corporation, every software corporation in the country which wanted to talk with us. I believe they now number 59. They are the best in the business.

Mr. NEDZI. If I may correct the chairman, it is 65.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I do not want to apologize for the other body, and I do not want to question any affronts directed toward this body or personalities in this body by representatives of the other body. Also, I do not like to have our decision here made on the basis of pique or on the basis of insult or something like that. It seems to me we are dealing with a very practical problem, a dollars-and-cents problem. That is the basis on which I am trying to make my decision.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman is exactly right, but it is a practical fact of life that they have said they do not want to work with us. If we are going to deal on a dollars-and-cents basis, we have already done the preliminary work. If we want the service then we should vote to strike the provisions of this proposal which require the establishment of a Joint Committee on Data Processing because that would mean we would have to start all over again.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SISK was allowed to revise and extend his remarks and proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, we have come down to what our committee feels to be probably the most important amendment, the most important subject that faces this body and has faced it in the past 2 months of discussion on this bill.

As has already been stated, of course, I bow to the judgment of Members of this House. There is no question in my mind but what at some point—and I would hope in the next hour—we make a decision on this matter, but I want to say that if there is any validity to the study, the effort, and the consultation that your subcommittee has gone through and has developed in the last 18 months, then we will be making a terrible mistake if we adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

I have great respect for the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) and, as he knows, he and I consulted from time to time on this matter at the time that the committee first began its work in connection with the creation of a Joint Committee on Computers and Data Processing.

I understand some of the miffed feelings that apparently exist. I am not here attempting to justify or to apologize for any Member of the other body as to why they did not answer their mail or anything of that kind. I will say, since the question has become somewhat current, that without a letter even having been

directed to him, I have a letter here dated February 4, 1970, direct to me as chairman of the subcommittee. It is signed by HUGH SCOTT, the Republican leader of the Senate. The letter reads as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MINORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1970.
Hon. B. F. SISK,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Congressional Organization, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SISK: I understand that a subcommittee of the House Committee on Rules, under your chairmanship, has produced a draft legislative reorganization bill upon which you are currently considering. I understand further that the bill contains provisions that will provide for comprehensive planning on congressional use of computers.

While I have not had an opportunity to familiarize myself with the details of your draft, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your subcommittee's efforts to advance the cause of congressional reorganization. I have long been a supporter of that cause and especially of any movement that would encourage Congress to make the fullest and most efficient use of automatic data processing techniques in a coordinated fashion.

May I express the hope that your efforts will result in the passage of a workable reorganization act by the House of Representatives at the earliest opportunity so that the Senate may consider it in this Congress.

Sincerely,

HUGH SCOTT,
Republican Leader.

Mr. SISK. On April 21 of this year, again unsolicited—and I had not even directed a letter to him—I have a letter addressed to me as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT
MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1970.

Hon. BERNIE SISK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BERNIE: I understand that the Special Rules Subcommittee which you head is about to report out a bill dealing with legislative reorganization, and that you are proposing a Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing.

I have long been concerned that Congress was not moving fast enough to introduce the use of data processing and have felt that very beneficial results can come from a systematic approach to match our need with data processing capabilities.

Some of us in the Senate are very interested in your proposal and I want to encourage you and your colleagues in this significant step.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

I have talked on many occasions to many Members of the other body. We have consulted with both Members as well as staff people in at least two different committees of the other body, and I can assure my colleagues that there is great interest and great concern about the need to move into the computer age, and to utilize and to make use, for the benefit of improving our operations, of this kind and type of equipment.

Now, I, as I say, have no idea why the relations between the Committee on House Administration and whoever may have been contacted exists, and I will not express comment on that.

Let me say again, as I said earlier, I have great respect for the gentleman from Louisiana, and I am particularly appreciative for the work that he and his committee have done. We have followed quite closely the work of the Committee and of the Subcommittee on House Administration, the Waggonner committee. I might say that is the reason why we did not get involved in the procedures in connection with electronic voting. We know of the great work and effort that is being made, for example, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FRIEDEL) mentioned a little while ago, and we feel that the progress they are making is substantial, and therefore that that is an area in which they have jurisdiction, and so we made a determination not to get involved.

I have very strong feeling, and certainly I believe this was the intent of the subcommittee members all the way through, that the work, the effort, the knowledge, the progress that is being made by the committee of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana would be fully utilized and made a part of any such procedure as might develop as a result of this language. I could not conceive of this joint committee not including, for example, the gentleman from Louisiana, because of his background. It was never anticipated by our subcommittee that the committee would be made up otherwise than with the proper members of the Committee on House Administration, and the comparable committee on the other side, Government Operations, and comparable Members on the other side. And that they would certainly carry the major part of the load for purposes of coordination, because of their knowledge, because of their background, because of their progress they have accomplished in connection with it.

I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio in just one moment.

Let me say that yesterday this House approved a Congressional Research Service, and for a Joint Committee on the Library, and Congressional Research Service. Maybe some of the Members are not aware that that is what the House did yesterday, because it ties right in with what we are doing here today, they are one and part of the same—we even provided that on that committee shall be members of the Committee on House Administration and its counterpart on the other side.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. You do not provide in this section that there shall be members from the Committee on House Administration, do you?

Mr. SISK. I discussed with the gentleman from Louisiana, and I am sure the gentleman will verify this—the possibility of some kind of arrangement of that kind, and that we even discussed doing it at the time, because we have done it with the other committee.

Mr. HAYS. Yes, but you did not do it; is that right?

Mr. SISK. The gentleman is correct; it is not provided for, per se.

But would the gentleman feel that in

the appointment of the members of this committee that that would be overlooked by the leadership in doing such appointments?

Mr. HAYS. I do not know. I do not know who the leadership would be, and therefore I cannot comment.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER) is not carried, does not your proposal take away from the Committee on House Administration whatever jurisdiction it has had, and what it has done, and turn it over to a joint committee?

Mr. SISK. In my opinion, it will make as a final matter of jurisdiction in connection with computer operations for the House, the Senate, the GAO, and the Library of Congress to be vested in this joint committee, and will utilize all the information and all the talent and all the material developed by both the House Committee on House Administration, as well as the Committee on Rules and Administration of the other side.

Mr. HAYS. Let me further pursue my question: If the Senate does not like something that is proposed, then they can do like they used to in the Joint Committee on Printing, not show up, no quorum, no action.

Mr. SISK. Let me say to my good friend from Ohio I accept a man at his face value. As I have indicated already, there has been substantial interest manifested to our committee by Members of the other body.

We are talking here about hardware that is going to cost hundreds of millions of dollars. If you are going to permit it to proliferate all over the place—and we have today, for example, a computer here in the House and the other body has a computer over there and the GAO has one and the Library of Congress has one—everybody is playing with one now but so far as I know not one of them is being utilized within probably 20 percent of its capacity.

Again, I am no expert but I do know this.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I shall attempt not to have to ask for any further extension of time. I know we are all anxious to vote.

But as I said, this issue is the most important single issue in this bill. If we are going to make it possible for this Congress of the United States—and I am talking of the Congress and its subservient agencies, those that work with it, the GAO, the Library of the two bodies—if we want to do a job and coordinate our efforts and save untold millions of dollars in expenditures, this committee, my colleagues, is important to bring this matter under one single operating head and to tie them together.

This again, as has been demonstrated time and time again as to how expensive it can be when you begin to permit the proliferation, as I say, that to some extent is already developing.

So far as I am concerned, and I am sure many others are too, we probably will not be around here to see the ultimate full development of this kind of program, but for the benefit of the taxpayers of the future, whether they may be our grandchildren, I think it is important that we take a look at what we are doing today.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I am concerned about this bill going over to the other body without a provision for a joint committee because of the extent to which it might stick out as a sore thumb and incur their displeasure.

Let us assume that the joint committee provision passes and is accepted by the Senate and becomes law. Let us assume that thereafter we in the House are not satisfied with our relationship with the other body in this joint committee. My question is that—at such time in the future would it not be possible for the House by resolution of the House to withdraw itself from that committee and establish its own procedure in this regard?

Mr. SISK. Of course, we today cannot bind by any action of this Congress any future Congress. You know that certainly this 91st Congress cannot bind the 92d Congress.

Anytime, by a simple House resolution, of course, this matter can be terminated.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that under this bill the chairmanship of the joint committee alternates between the House and the Senate as is the case with the Joint Economic Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy?

Mr. SISK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MOORHEAD. The House will have a chairman every other Congress.

Mr. SISK. That is right.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of title IV, which establishes a Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing.

The creation of a joint committee is our best vehicle for achieving strong congressional computer coordination between House and Senate.

In his latest book, "Recovery of Confidence," John Gardner said.

Every day at every level, outworn government machinery is wasting taxpayers' money, thwarting the efforts of elected leaders and frustrating the citizenry.

No where is this more obvious than in the U.S. Congress. It need not be so. Information can be managed.

Many of our institutions are woefully out of date and in need of change, but nowhere is this more obvious than right here in the Congress where we creak along in our offices, committees, and on the floor, using procedures and in many cases equipment reminiscent of a bygone era—yet attempting to cope with today's "information explosion."

All of us are inundated with more material than we can possibly digest, much

less analyze intelligently and make timely decisions upon concerning a multitude of complicated and controversial issues affecting our constituents and the country at large.

We have a unique opportunity to bring ourselves up to date today.

Reflect on this. At a time when there are about 70,000 computers at work in the private sector, a number expected to zoom to 120,000 by 1975, and 4,200 serving the executive branch, we in the Congress have scarcely more than a dozen computers; no overall coordination between our two Chambers, no planning effort for the future.

We have been spending about \$1 billion annually and the executive about \$1.5 billion in information technology, which puts us at a decided disadvantage throughout the whole policymaking process.

In May of 1966 I made a speech in Philadelphia in which I said:

Today except for one small unit which the Library of Congress uses to handle its payroll, the Congress of the United States does not own one penny's worth of ADP equipment. When I tell you this I am expressing my concern for the future of representative government in the United States.

Again in 1966, I said that—

Our constitutional government with its delicate system of checks and balances depends on the development of computer capability in the legislative branch. I propose that we bring Congress from the horse and buggy age into the age of the computer.

Last year I urged that—

With private enterprise, the executive branch and state legislatures in the computer age, Congress must change its ways or it will fail the American people. Computers cannot make congressional decisions, but as our world gets more complex, Congress will be unable to make rational decisions without computers.

Having reviewed the various alternatives over the years since serving on the committee which passed the Brooks bill, Public Law 89-306, authorizing ADP for the executive branch, it was my determination that the most effective support for the Congress would be provided by legislation that could offer these major points: coordination and planning for the future; permanent oversight capability; and special assistance from computer experts in the private sector.

As I mentioned earlier, in H.R. 20422, which I introduced in the 90th Congress, and again, in H.R. 7012 with Mr. McCLOY in the 91st, I call for an independent facility under the jurisdiction of a Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing, aided by a professional staff to operate the facility, an independent advisory board comprised of key legislative branch individuals and outside data processing experts.

I was delighted that this concept has been unanimously endorsed by the Sisk Subcommittee on Congressional Reorganization.

As Congress moves into the computer age, it is my feeling that the biggest mistake we can make is to acquire one system for mailing service and find that another is required for research, another for file maintenance, another for publication of the Digest and so forth. The result will be an expensive, inefficient group

of incompatible machines and programs which will leave the Congress little better served and probably as far behind as it is now.

Coordination on Capitol Hill is not the easiest of tasks when one realizes that we have a bicameral legislature, one House having 435 Members and the other 100, and no single leader over both Houses.

In addition there are semiautonomous bodies such as the Library of Congress, the Comptroller General, the Public Printer, and the Legislative Counsel of both Houses.

Mr. Chairman, I am all for continuing our support of the particular and special functions now being handled by the Clerk, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the GAO, and most importantly, the House Administration Committee.

But we must not continue to be shortsighted. A single authority is urgently needed to set policy, coordinate existing programs, acquire equipment and continue to study improved technology and techniques for the future.

A Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing is our best bet to achieve strong congressional coordination between House and Senate. I urge my colleagues, particularly those who have been active in their own way to modernize the Congress, to come together on this and accept title IV as reported by the Rules Committee. Vote "no" on the Waggoner amendment.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, in line with the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado that the House is 2 or 3 years on the way on this project, would it not be possible if the Senate shows some inclination to join in it—and I would be all for it if we had a joint retrieval system or an interlocking system—that we by simple resolution could let them into the club and give them the benefit of the 3 years of work that Mr. WAGGONER and company have done just as well as we could opt out by simple resolution?

Mr. SISK. As the gentleman has said, that is correct. That is exactly what I seek. But I am sure that my good friend from Ohio would agree with me that they would not desire to do so without some kind of joint operating committee where they, too, would have some voice. What the gentleman is proposing is exactly what I hope to accomplish by this joint committee. It would utilize the great work that has been done by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) in the Committee on House Administration. We would pull this together under a joint committee, and the language would permit us to proceed. Otherwise, we will waste untold millions.

The necessity of utilizing the capacity of this equipment up to 80 or 90 percent or full capacity is terribly important. Otherwise the efficiency goes down to such a great extent that, as I have said, there would be a substantial loss.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. It is very difficult for Members who have not studied both plans in detail to know what we have here. Does it mean that if we adopt the

language proposed the work that the subcommittee has done cannot proceed, that we would have to wait for the other body or for a joint committee to act?

Mr. SISK. Nothing in this bill and none of its language would hinder the able work and effort of our good friend from Louisiana. He has worked hard, and I admire the work he has done.

Mr. ALBERT. Could the work of the Committee on House Administration proceed without delay?

Mr. SISK. Yes. There is nothing in this bill that would stop any of the work or effort of the House Administration Committee that is now going on, once the effective date comes, as included in title V, and upon the setting up of the joint committee. As I have said, it is impossible for me to believe that the Members of the House would prevent the gentleman from Louisiana and others associated with him from beginning to put together and utilizing the progress already made in connection with this project.

Mr. ALBERT. If the the work of the Committee on House Administration proceeds and the joint committee does not function quickly, would it be an expensive and difficult thing if the joint committee and the other body were later to agree to a unified system for the use of the entire Congress? Would that be difficult?

Mr. SISK. Of course, to the extent that we are going to utilize all the progress we have made, to that extent we will have money. The point is the sooner we pull this together, the more money we will save. The permitting of the proliferation, I might say to the distinguished majority leader, which is already in existence by the fact that there are—and I name the computers—one in GAO, one in the Library of Congress, one on this side and one on the other side, none being utilized at the present time to anything close to capacity—

Mr. ALBERT. I hope that nothing the gentleman is attempting will thwart what the House has directed the Committee on House Administration to do and what data processing and use of computers.

Mr. SISK. Let me assure the gentleman that we will not do that. That is not our purpose.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Seventy-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 303]

Abbutt	Camp	Dowdy
Alexander	Cederberg	Edmondson
Baring	Celler	Edwards, Ala.
Barrett	Chappell	Edwards, La.
Beall, Md.	Clark	Evins, Tenn.
Belcher	Clawson, Del.	Fallon
Berry	Clay	Flynt
Blaggi	Collier	Gettys
Blackburn	Corman	Gilbert
Blatnik	Cowger	Gubser
Bow	Daddario	Hanley
Brock	Dawson	Hanna
Brooks	Delaney	Hébert
Brown, Ohio	Denney	Horton
Burton, Utah	Derwinski	Hull
Bush	Diggs	Hungate
Button	Dingell	Ichord

King
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Lujan
McCulloch
McMillan
Melcher
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers

Olsen
Ottinger
Patman
Felly
Powell
Price, Tex.
Purcell
Rivers
Rogers, Colo.
Roudebush
Roybal

Ruth
Scherle
Schneebell
Slack
Staggers
Stokes
Stratton
Stuckey
Tunney
Widnall
Wold

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 17654, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 345 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, now that we are nearing the end of a bill which has consumed more time than any other bill in several years in the House of Representatives, may I take the time to commend the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK), for the courtesy, the diligence and the ability with which he has managed this very important and complicated bill. I congratulate him and his distinguished and able counterpart on the Republican side of the aisle, and the committee. I congratulate all the members of the Committee on Rules.

I believe the Members of the House are to be congratulated on the interest they have shown in this matter, on the patience that the House has demonstrated. We have had fine debate. We have considered many amendments. We do not all agree on all of them, but I believe every Member can say that everyone has had his day in the House if not in court.

Mr. Chairman, before I sit down may I say the House owes a deep debt of gratitude for the patience and skill with which the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky has presided over the many sessions on this bill. His conduct in the chair has set high standards for those who will follow him in presiding over the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the comments just made by the distinguished majority leader are fully shared by myself.

I desire also to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) for the outstanding job he has done in handling this very, very important legislation.

I would be remiss if I did not ask that his day in the sun be likewise shared by another Member in this body from the State of California, the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH). Both of them in this long and difficult consideration of highly important legislation have earned the deep respect and admiration of all Members of the House of Representatives.

I know how many countless hours the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules worked on this important legislation.

I think we are indebted to them as a group of three for the masterful job that

they have done before the proposed legislation came to the floor of the House. I know of no higher performance in the consideration of legislation on the floor than that which has been shown by both of them in the manner that the House has considered this very basic and very important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I think we owe a standing tribute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. Chairman, if there is any time left, may I make an observation and comment concerning the amendment which I understand is pending at the present time, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

Some time ago the House gave authority to the Committee on House Administration and the responsibility for doing a job for all of us in the computer field and related areas. It is my best judgment that that group has done a first-class job. I am sure if they are given the continued responsibility, they will bring to the floor of the House recommendations that can be adopted by the House for the benefit of the legislative process in the House of Representatives.

Now, I know that the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Rules itself have adopted a provision that would in effect tie the efforts of the House with those of the Senate. I have no objection to that eventually being the result. However, it seems to me that we should not undercut an effort that has been underway which I believe will produce results when all we have at this stage is a good-faith promise from the other body that they will join with us in seeking to achieve something for the benefit of the Congress as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, my only feeling is that we should support the Waggonner amendment, send this measure to the other body, and, if the other body is as firm in its conviction as they allege they are, then they can take the necessary affirmative action to put what they said in words on the line in the legislation. If they do not, we have then preserved our own position to proceed and proceed effectively. On the other hand, if they incorporate in this proposed legislation when it reaches the other body affirmative legislation that shows their good faith, then I think that the gentleman from Louisiana and those associated with him would be satisfied for a joint effort.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, would the distinguished minority leader yield?

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, has hit the nail on the head. He said that he believed eventually what is done should be coordinated. I agree. The letter we addressed to the Senate in July of last year set forth exactly the same position; namely, that we thought it would be in the best interests of the Congress, of both bodies, and of the country as a whole to coordinate what we do.

I made the point earlier that if we are stopped where we are now, and com-

pletely relegate ourselves to the dictates of a joint committee, then we would make no progress that anyone would see for 3 years, because it would take us 3 years under the 93d Congress to get back where we are now.

I agree that coordination is necessary. Everything we have done is aimed at coordinating what we do so that the information which we desire may be retrievable.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GERALD R. FORD was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield further to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, we want this information coordinated, and it does seem to be desirable now to go ahead and strike this joint committee and then let us create a coordinating committee in time which does work in the area that we are concerned with, but do not create a committee now that gives a joint committee veto authority over what this House is proceeding to do.

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

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I know that all of us appreciate the splendid job which has been done by the committee chairman, and by the gentleman from Louisiana, and, as he has indicated, that he thinks it is desirable that the efforts of the two be coordinated. I was going to ask the able gentleman from Louisiana if he would accept a compromise amendment that would provide, in consideration of the provisions here, and, in lieu of the joint committee, that of a joint coordinating committee, the function of which would simply be to coordinate the efforts of the two Houses in achieving and implementing data processing.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I will not agree to such an amendment until I see it. I want to see it in writing so as to see if it expresses what it is intended to convey. If a joint coordinating committee simply has the function of mediating so that we coordinate, and has no veto authority over what the House does, and they cannot stop the House from working, then the public will benefit from it. But I want to see it in writing. I do not want it to be a deceptive amendment like we had earlier today where we had to consult with the joint committee before we could even provide computer services to existing committees of the House.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, may I ask the able gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) whether the gentleman would be agreeable to the kind of an amendment that the gentleman from Louisiana has spoken of now?

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will yield, let me say that we have had our staff people working desperately here for the last half hour in attempt to come up with language, which we actually have,

that would actually create a coordinating committee without power other than to coordinate the efforts of the two Houses.

Of course, as I understand the gentleman from Louisiana, he would of course want to read the amendment first, and I do not blame the gentleman one little bit for that.

Let me say that, in my opinion, of course, what we have proposed would not stop the gentleman and his committee, and would not hurt their activities.

I recognize the feelings of some of the members of the committee.

But if the language which we have now prepared is satisfactory, we are prepared, because it is an essential step in the right direction, and the beginning of a proposal to solve the problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure but that what I had intended to say when I started to seek recognition has not pretty largely already been said.

However, Mr. Chairman, the amendment that has been worked out here, in my judgment, meets the desired objective of the gentleman from Louisiana, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), and others.

The gentleman from Louisiana is now inspecting this amendment in the nature of a compromise. He is studying it, as certainly he should. I know of no one in this House who has worked more diligently on this question than the gentleman from Louisiana and he is certainly entitled to recognition and to credit therefor. He is a reasonable man. He recognizes that in the process of legislation there must be some compromise along the line, and I am very much in hope that he will see fit to agree to this amendment as a principal author of the opposition to the committee language.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am no authority on this matter. But I recognize the facts of life and that we have to do something here. Not for reform's sake itself, but because we do have to recognize the realities.

I wanted to say something about the work that has been done by this subcommittee. I want to associate myself with all of the remarks and the compliments that have been paid to the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

I think also that we should take public knowledge of the fact that there are three other members of the committee, including the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), who have made a substantial contribution to the work of this subcommittee. He should certainly be included in these compliments. That goes for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG). And surely the able staff, who have worked so diligently and ably over these many months, are entitled to the appreciation of the House.

I feel that this committee has done a good job on a very controversial subject.

Permit me to say, Mr. Chairman, to those who oppose this legislation, and I must confess that I was not too enthusi-

astic in the inception of the legislation, that the end result is not as bad as some believe.

But let me remind you who oppose it—who think it is radical—that you could have had a much worse bill from your point of view if it had not been for the splendid work of this committee.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COLMER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COLMER. Recurring to my main observation, I hope that the contending forces here can get together on this amendment as a substitute and that we can go on and finish this bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. First, I wish to point out that I speak for the Republican side of the aisle on the House Administration Committee, the subcommittee, in dealing with this question. We are unanimous in our support of this amendment to take this provision out of this bill. There are good reasons for it. I think many Members of the House know that I have long been an advocate of instituting a system of data processing, evaluation systems, to give ourselves the capability to more effectively legislate. I have long been an advocate of doing this through a joint committee. I was one of those who suggested that we make contact with the Senate, which we have already done, as has been pointed out, to determine whether they really did want to cooperate.

We made this effort repeatedly, and nothing has happened. So I, along with many others, changed my mind, believing that we could proceed in a manner that would enlist and encourage the Senate, the other body, to join us and set up a system that we could coordinate with any system that they would have or to cooperate with them in any way necessary. This is possible.

As has already been pointed out and is generally agreed upon, from the standpoint of saving dollars, let me say to you that the billions we could save by instituting this plan now, or as soon as possible, is a significant saving. My prediction is that if this amendment is adopted, or some version of it, some form of it that may be worked out with some amendments that may be agreed to, we can proceed to have this system probably 2 years in advance. So the dollars we would save by going under one umbrella is as nothing compared with the dollars we could save by instituting this program now, at an earlier time.

In addition, and more importantly, we would help this House to be the kind of effective legislature that it can and should be. So I urge this House to support the amendment and give the House Administration Committee the opportunity to be way down the road, 2 years ahead of what we would be if we went into a joint committee. We have authority already. There is authorization to spend \$500 million, which can be of

great service not only to the Congress but also the people whom we serve. That is our ultimate objective.

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

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman is saying is very important, it seems to me, because there is no area in which the Congress can demonstrate that it wants to advance into the 20th century more than by taking advantage of the facilities of automatic data processing. We can improve our capability, and our decisionmaking ability, and our lawmaking ability, and expedite our business.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I agree.

Mr. McCLORY. If a joint committee would delay establishment of an automatic data processing facility, certainly we should not adopt that approach, but if we can permit the House Administration Committee to proceed unabated, it seems to me, in addition, that by adopting the joint committee approach we can lay the groundwork for the efficient application of automatic data processing in areas we have not discussed and that are probably not even being considered yet.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. If somebody could convince me the Senate is ready to go to work with us now, I could not agree more with the gentleman, but I am convinced they are not. We have given them all kinds of opportunity to join us and apparently they are too busy or otherwise neglectful.

Mr. McCLORY. I suggest in the legislation we adopt that we leave the door open and that we provide the mechanics and facilities for a joint operation with the other body, so we can take advantage of such a joint operation if it is possible to work it out with the other body.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. My answer to that would be I believe it would be in the interest of the House if we go in the direction of the amendment, and then invite them to come in, and that we proceed with this legislation.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Waggoner amendment. I have followed the development of this legislation very closely. I am a great admirer of the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK). I think his patience and his endurance and his very gentlemanliness have been exhibited here on the floor as being of the top order and reflecting great tribute to himself and his committee and staff and other people who have worked with him.

I hope we can dispose of this question now very soon. The hour is late. The Rules Committee has within its power the ability to bring this question up at almost any occasion in the future if the need for further coordination arises.

The gentleman from Louisiana, as have all other Members of the House Administration Committee, has said that they were willing to coordinate with the Senate whenever the Senate wants to move on this matter. I believe they will. I have had some experience serving with those Members a few years ago when I was on that committee. I know how difficult it is though to carry out coordina-

tion like this with an independent body such as the Senate.

I think we can save time and save money and save everything else now by adopting the Waggoner amendment.

I urge its adoption.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman. I do not think it is at all necessary to adopt any form of an amendment requiring coordination, which, in itself, is implicit in the action which this body is taking. As a matter of fact, I think the best interest of this body would be served by adopting the Waggoner amendment and rejecting any amendments thereto.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I agree with that.

Mr. Chairman, as we conclude discussion on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, I just want to take this opportunity to reflect for a moment on the far-reaching effects this bill will have on the procedures of the House.

As we will all agree, the bill as reported by the Committee on Rules, H.R. 17654, was basically a good one. It made many changes in the procedures of the House and, therefore, improved its operation in significant ways.

However, many of us felt that more changes should be made, and a group of bipartisan Members began meeting in an effort to discuss and carefully draft amendments which would only add to the fine work already done by the committee.

As I have said, the group was bipartisan in nature. All in all, it consisted of well over 100 members. However, those Republicans who worked most consistently in the preparation of the amendments were BARBER CONABLE, JOHN DELLENBACK, and WILLIAM STEIGER. The Democrats included DON FRASER, TOM REES, JIM CORMAN, JOHN BRADEMAS, JIM O'HARA, JOE WAGGONER, and myself. We were ably assisted by Dick Conlon, Linda Kamm, and Dona O'Bannon who spent many hours and worked tirelessly along with several congressional staff members.

The group settled on a set of amendments which had the approval of all the members. After much laborious drafting, the text of each of these amendments was agreed to by all the members of the bipartisan group.

To recap briefly, the amendments dealt with the following areas:

- First, recording of teller votes;
- Second, providing debate time on motions to recommit with instructions;
- Third, shortening quorum calls;
- Fourth, further opening of committee business meetings and hearings;
- Fifth, disclosure of rollcall votes on measures and matters in committees;
- Sixth, providing minority with adequate committee staffing;
- Seventh, provide debate time on amendments printed in advance of discussion on House floor;
- Eighth, provide 3-day layover on conference reports;
- Ninth, establishment of Joint Committee on Operations of Congress; and

Tenth, formalizing and strengthening of legislative counsel's office.

As is now recorded, we have had great success in having many of these amendments adopted. Our biggest victory is the fact that teller votes will now be recorded in the Committee of the Whole. Votes of individuals in committees will be disclosed and made public information. An adequate amount of debate time will be allowed for amendments which have been printed at least 1 day in advance of consideration on the House floor. The minority is guaranteed at least one-third of the investigative funds for each committee so that their staffing needs can be met. Conference reports will have to be printed and available to Members at least 3 days before they can be called to a vote on the House floor. Quorum calls will no longer be so lengthy and laborious due to a shortened procedure that has been accepted by the Members of the House. These are only some of the far-reaching changes which have been made in the procedures of the House.

In addition, the members of the bipartisan group also supported the Broyhill amendment which would provide for conversion from the base to the gross system of pay in the House. This is just another example of the efforts to end secrecy in the procedures of the House.

However, we did not have complete success. Unfortunately, one of the amendments did not pass. Although we will have limited open committee hearings and business sessions as provided in the committee bill, the Members of the House did not choose to further open these business meetings and hearings to the press and public.

The efforts of this bipartisan group have resulted in resounding success. This success means not only that the House will operate under more open and fair conditions, but it means that the people of the United States will have an opportunity to know how their representatives vote on the vital issues of the day.

Secrecy has been curtailed. This is to the credit of the Congress.

Hopefully, all action on this important bill should be completed and final passage voted today. I certainly hope the Senate will act expeditiously on this important measure so that it can be signed into law by the end of the year.

Mr. Chairman, I include a list of the amendments and an explanation thereof:

BIPARTISAN AMENDMENTS WHICH HAVE BEEN PASSED BY THE HOUSE AS PART OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

1. Record Teller Votes: Provides that teller votes be recorded by clerks or electronic devices on demand of one-fifth of a quorum. Each Member's vote and a list of the absentees would be printed in the Congressional Record.

2. Provide Debate Time on Motions To Recommit With Instructions: Provides ten minutes of debate on any motion to recommit with instructions with time equally divided between the mover and those opposed to the motion.

3. Shortening Quorum Calls: Permits Member to sign in for quorum calls for 30 minutes from the start of the call and permits dispensing with the call when a quorum is reached.

4. Disclosure of Votes in Committee: Requires that a record of all roll call votes in

Committees be available to the public. In addition, where there is a record vote on a motion to report a measure, the total number of votes for and against the measure would be included in the report.

5. Committee Staffing: Provides that not less than one-third of committee investigative funds be allocated to the minority party.

6. Guaranteed Debate Time: Provides 10 minutes of debate time on any amendment published in the *Congressional Record* at least one day in advance of floor consideration.

7. Three-Day Layover on Conference Reports: Requires that conference reports be printed in the *Congressional Record* at least three days before floor consideration. Reports will also be available on floor.

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

Mr. Chairman, the time has arrived when it seems to me we could reach some kind of agreement on time. I would like to see if we can reach an agreement. Does the gentleman from Louisiana remember the day before yesterday we did discuss the intent to limit this to a reasonable amount of time?

Mr. Chairman, I think most people have pretty well expressed their opinion.

I appreciate the temper and the tenor of the debate. I recognize the differences of opinion.

It seems to me now is the time for us to reach some reasonable agreement and set a time certain to vote. At least it is my understanding there is only one other amendment on which there will be some debate. I believe the gentleman from Missouri will recall that. There is one other amendment which I understand will not require debate.

I make these statements so that Members may know the situation. It would be my hope we could start voting on this bill no later than 5 o'clock.

With reference to this, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and any amendments to the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California that all debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto close in—

Mr. SISK. Five minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes?

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

The CHAIRMAN. Reservation is heard.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Members standing will be recognized for 1½ minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief. Having introduced legislation in 1967 to provide for an Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation which would be headed by a joint committee of the Congress, I feel it is incumbent upon me to speak at this time.

At the outset I wish to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for his activi-

ties in bringing the House of Representatives into the computer age.

However, I believe it is essential that we incorporate in this legislation the concept and principle of coordination which is inherent in the proposal for a joint committee.

The private sector and the executive branch have seen the fallacy of proceedings to utilize computer services on an individual basis, whether it be an individual department or an individual activity within the private sector. I do not believe the House of Representatives, in acting upon this legislation today, can act responsibly if it does not at least recognize and profit from the errors of the past and of others.

I am sorry there is not an opportunity at this late hour to consider a substitute which might be offered so that, as I have said, the principle and concept of coordination, of joint control, of joint action can be incorporated in the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I believe it has been made perfectly clear about a dozen times today, by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER) and others on the Committee on House Administration, that we are willing and anxious to meet with and coordinate with the Senate any time they will meet.

I have not spoken on this amendment. I support the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana for a lot of reasons.

First. If it does not pass we will be set back 2 or 3 years.

Second. If it does not pass we have wasted a half million dollars.

Third. If it does not pass—and this is something perhaps the Members did not read—there is a provision in the bill for the pay of the Director of Data Processing to be at the per annum gross rate not in excess of the basic pay in effect from time to time for level III of the executive schedule. Do Members know what that means? It is \$40,000 a year. They set that up mandatorily. These joint committees are not cheap. Then they provide for a deputy director with a lot of words in there, and no figures, but when one looks it up it is \$35,500 a year.

Then they go further and say that the joint committee may appoint as members of the staff such professional, technical, clerical, and other personnel as they see fit. God knows how many thousands of dollars a year.

Now let me say to you that the distinguished gentleman from California—and I want to join with others in congratulating him on the long, hard job—talked about spending millions and maybe billions of dollars. This is not right. The estimate is a fraction of that.

Somebody over here said that the executive departments had billions of dollars worth of computers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER).

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would say to you that compared to the billions of dollars worth of computers, that this projected expenditure for the House, and if the Senate joins in, for the other body, is chickenfeed.

Now, let us not set up another joint committee with a lot of fancy salaried and fancy titled people to redo 3 years from now what Mr. WAGGONNER and his committee, with a minimum of staff, have already done.

Let us pass the Waggonner amendment. If the Senate wants to join in with us, we will be delighted. If the Committee on Rules wants to bring in a coordinated amendment which coordinates but does not give the power to them to dominate, then I will be the first one down here in the well supporting them. But at this late date I think that the Waggonner amendment is the answer. We are ready to go. We are on the threshold, and I do not want to see us back up.

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be recognized that the subject of automatic data processing for the Congress is something that has been considered for a great many years by a great many Members. Such ADP facilities and services can be utilized by all of the committees and Members of the Congress. Its applications are almost unlimited. What we should be doing today, it seems to me, is not deciding the question of who is going to have control of the computers, but we should be deciding what machinery should be established to plan and provide for a maximum utilization of ADP techniques and services.

As I say, we are going to establish this for determining the extent to which automatic data processing can be utilized by us. In this connection, we should attempt to utilize it to the maximum and with the greatest efficiency and so as to prevent duplication. That is why, it seems to me, the special committee was very wise in giving consideration to all of these factors and has recommended the joint committee concept. It seems to me it is very valid.

I also know that the other body 2 years ago passed a reorganization bill which in general endorsed this concept that we should have a joint effort for utilization of automatic data processing.

I feel we should not in any way impinge on the Committee on House Administration but that we should offer it the opportunity for the maximum joint utilization for this type of facility. This would be the clearest possible evidence that we are prepared to move into the 20th century and that we are going to take advantage of all the opportunities available to us to do a good job.

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I can read the mood of the House. I know what the outcome of this vote will be. But I hope that the debate has informed the Members that ultimately there is an absolute necessity that we set up an establishment, some organization—and I think that a joint committee is the best

way—to coordinate the efforts not only of the two bodies of Congress but also those semiautonomous agencies that are a part of the legislative branch, such as the General Accounting Office, the Library of Congress, the Legislative Reference Service, the Public Printer, and the two legislative counsels of the two bodies.

Imagine the situation where the Senate directs the Library of Congress to do such and such with this computer capability, and the House directs them to do something different. Who or what is going to coordinate? Who is going to make the decision? Let us recognize that we do have a bicameral legislature, 100 Members in one body, and 435 Members in the other body, and there is no one leader over both of them. Eventually machinery will have to be established, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the best way is the way recommended by the Committee on Rules, the establishment of a new special joint committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) to close debate.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, as my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, said, I recognize the facts of life, and certainly I bow to the wisdom of the House. Unfortunately I feel that that matter is not altogether being settled on the merits of the case, but I do feel, and would trust and hope that the debate and discussion here has brought out the fact that the Congress must proceed at some time, and the sooner in point of time the better, to save money, to bring this under one single control agency. There is no other way.

Unfortunately, the comment has been made, for example, about the salaries. I do not know but maybe some of the ladies and gentlemen this afternoon are not aware of what these top experts get in the field of computers, but \$40,000 is a pretty nominal figure, I can assure you, for those with expertise in the field of computers. Of course, if we are going to operate that kind of a setup, the one which we have proposed, we would have to have qualified people from the private sector, and we simply were attempting to provide a way to get them.

Mr. Chairman, again I appreciate the concern of all of the Members, and I would of course hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) would be defeated, and we proceed with the joint committee. However, whatever the House may decide to do temporarily, I think the results of this debate will be to serve notice upon those who follow us that it is terribly important that we proceed in as timely a fashion as possible to bring this matter into a uniform agreement between the two bodies and between its subservient agencies if we are to save untold millions of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment because I am firmly convinced that the way to develop an effective data processing and data retrieval system for the Congress is not through a joint committee. To be sure each body of the Congress should coordinate its efforts in this area and make

certain that any system which is installed has the capability for interface with not only the other body but with other pertinent agencies of Government. I can assure the House that the Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Equipment as well as the working group which has been immersed in this problem for over a year has this as a cardinal premise. Indeed, continual contact is maintained with representatives of the Senate for this reason.

As has frequently been stated the Committee on House Administration has done much work already and to deprive them of their jurisdiction at this time would be wasteful and would result in creating machinery which would not be in the best interest of either House. Members will quickly concede that there are substantial differences between the bodies. We represent with few exceptions smaller constituencies, we have 2 year terms in contrast to the 6 for Senators, we have smaller staffs, Senators have more committee assignments, House Members represent smaller geographical areas. All of these factors may have an influence on the type of system which will best satisfy the requirements of either House. Each body, therefore, should be free to work on their own peculiar requirements and then coordinate through a liaison committee which can be readily established on a less inclusive basis than is called for in this legislation. To do otherwise would necessitate Senators passing judgment on measures of particular concern to House Members and House Members passing judgment on measures of particular concern to Senate Members and except for those House Members aspiring to be Senators, this, in my judgment, is not a very satisfactory arrangement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: On page 124, immediately after line 26, insert the following:

"PART 2—JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

"ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

"SEC. 421. (a) There is hereby created a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations (hereafter in this Part referred to as the 'Joint Committee').

"(b) The Joint Committee shall be composed of ten members as follows:

"(1) five Members of the Senate, appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, three from the majority party and two from the minority party; and

"(2) five Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, three from the majority party and two from the minority party.

"(c) Vacancies in the membership of the Joint Committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Joint Committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

"(d) The Joint Committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Con-

gress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The chairmanship and the vice chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and the House of Representatives with each Congress. The chairman during each even-numbered Congress shall be selected by the Members of the House of Representatives on the Joint Committee from among their number and the chairman during each odd-numbered Congress shall be selected by the Members of the Senate on the Joint Committee from among their number. The vice chairman during each Congress shall be chosen in the same manner from that House of Congress other than the House of Congress of which the chairman is a Member.

"DUTIES OF JOINT COMMITTEE

"SEC. 422. (a) The Joint Committee shall—

"(1) make a continuing study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution of the United States;

"(2) make a continuing study of automatic data processing and information retrieval systems with a view to determining the feasibility of the use of such systems in the operations of the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, and make such recommendations with respect to the use of such systems as the Joint Committee may deem appropriate; and

"(3) identify any court proceeding or action which, in the opinion of the Joint Committee, is of vital interest to the Congress, or to either House of the Congress, as a constitutionally established institution of the Federal Government and call such proceeding or action to the attention of that House of the Congress which is specifically concerned or to both Houses of the Congress if both Houses are concerned.

"(b) The Joint Committee shall exercise all functions vested in it by section 426 of this part.

"(c) The Joint Committee shall report, from time to time, to the Senate and the House of Representatives their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee.

"(d) Nothing in this part shall be construed to authorize the Joint Committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House.

"POWERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE

"SEC. 423. The Joint Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of Congress, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths and affirmations, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The Joint Committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary, except that no recommendation shall be reported from the Joint Committee unless a majority of the Joint Committee assent. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the Joint Committee or of any member designated by him or by the Joint Committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the Joint Committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

"STAFF OF JOINT COMMITTEE

"SEC. 424. (a) In carrying out its functions under subsections (a) and (c) of section 422 of this Part, the Joint Committee is authorized, by record vote of a majority of the members of the Joint Committee—

"(1) to appoint, on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform their duties, not more than six professional staff members and not more than six clerical staff members;

"(2) to prescribe their duties and responsibilities;

"(3) to fix their compensation at respective per annum gross rates not in excess of the highest rate of basic pay, as in effect from time to time, of the General Schedule of section 5332(a) of title 5, United States Code; and

"(4) to terminate their employment as the Joint Committee may deem appropriate.

"(b) In carrying out any of its functions under this Part, the Joint Committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government, and to procure the temporary (not to exceed one year) or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof by contract at rates of pay not in excess of the per diem equivalent of the highest rate of basic pay set forth in the General Schedule of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including payment of such rates for necessary traveltime.

"RECORDS OF JOINT COMMITTEE

"SEC. 425. The Joint Committee shall keep a complete record of all Joint Committee actions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. All records, data, charts, and files of the Joint Committee shall be the property of the Joint Committee and shall be kept in the offices of the Joint Committee or such other places as the Joint Committee may direct.

"OFFICE OF PLACEMENT AND OFFICE MANAGEMENT

"SEC. 426. (a) There is hereby established for the Congress an Office of Placement and Office Management which shall be subject to the supervision and control of the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee is authorized, by record vote of a majority of the members of the Joint Committee—

"(1) to appoint, on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform his duties, a Director of the Office of Placement and Office Management to serve as the head of the staff of the Office and such personnel as the Joint Committee deems necessary;

"(2) to prescribe their duties and responsibilities;

"(3) to fix their compensation at respective per annum gross rates not in excess of the highest rate of basic pay, as in effect from time to time, of the General Schedule of section 5332(a) of title 5, United States Code; and

"(4) to terminate their employment, as the Joint Committee may deem appropriate.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Office, upon request, to assist Members, committees, and officers of the Senate and House of Representatives seeking competent personnel with specified qualifications and to furnish advice and information with respect to office management procedures.

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be held or considered to require the use of the facilities of the Office by any Member, committee, or officer of the Senate or House of Representatives, if, in the opinion of such Member, committee, or officer, the use of such facilities is inappropriate.

"EXPENSES

"SEC. 427. The expenses of the Joint Committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, from

funds appropriated for the Joint Committee, upon vouchers approved by the Chairman."

Mr. HALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I have two requests.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment on the continuing committee on the reorganization of the Congress be dispensed with inasmuch as copies have been supplied both at the majority and minority desks and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent, in view of the action just taken by the House, to strike out paragraph (2) in section 422 of this amendment which pertains to oversight of data processing and insert the word "and" at the end of paragraph (1) in section 422 and renumber paragraph (3) in section 422 as paragraph (2), which is printed on the mimeographed copy supplied to the Clerk herewith.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, we now near the completion of a program which had its birth back in March of 1965 when the Joint Committee on Reorganization of the Congress was formed. As many of you know, I was privileged to serve on that committee along with others in the House, and there are five of us remaining.

Therefore, I had more than a passing interest in the legislation that was brought forth.

As I said in the beginning, so I repeat today, I compliment the Committee on Rules for keeping this "package" alive. Much of the joint committee bill as passed by the other body and in the committee report has been adopted and implemented in the interim.

I have always been and I am today particularly interested in bringing about a continuing study of the organization and operation of the Congress as recommended by that joint committee. This would be done by the establishment of a permanent joint committee, per the amendment I have submitted herewith, which would have as its mission the constant review of the Congress—its updating and its reorganization as needed so that we would not have another 20 years, or go for 60 years with less than two completed reorganizations.

This committee would be composed of Members of both Houses and aided by a staff which would report from time to time on the relations between the Congress and the executive and even the judicial branch of our tripartite Government.

Mr. Chairman, the executive gradually, and largely by its expertise and expenditures—which we as a body have provided—has taken over the origination and the spelling out of national policy. We in the Congress are in the position of ratifying and sometimes altering or shaping that policy. The answer to that question is still to be found.

We know that it was the intent of the drafters of our form of government, a representative republic under a limited constitution, that we be the policymaking body.

What are we about to do, Mr. Chairman? More and better committee staffs, use of electronic data storage and retrieval systems, which we have just discussed may, if we can find out how to do it, help to get us back on top of this policy-formation business, or at least permit us to be a better and more intelligent participant in policy formation. The answer to that question is still to be found.

But what are we to do about the courts' abrupt, unanticipated, nor pre-announced intrusion into policymaking, through strained interpretations of constitutional phrases?

This is a new problem that no one yet in the Congress seems to have come to grips with. Rather, it seems no one recognizes what is happening, or if anyone realizes what is happening, some appear not to care.

But the responsibility for protecting and promoting the Congress as an institution is dispersed. Historically, the function has been discharged—sometimes well, sometimes not at all—as the interest of some individual legislator has led him to take up the defense of the Congress. An agency of the Congress should be established as a permanent institution—to be alert to threats to its powers and its public acceptance and to consider what, if any action should be taken for its protection.

It was quite apparent to the members of the Joint Committee, that had over 3½ years of hearings, that a study of the procedures and the organization structure of the Congress should be a continuing one, seeking to adapt the Congress to a rapidly changing society, continuously searching for methods and facilities to enable the Congress to discharge its policymaking functions more effectively and in a more timely manner.

In addition, this joint committee will identify and apprise the Congress, its committees, and its Members, of any court proceeding or action which is of vital interest to the Congress. For too long, Congress as an institution—and as a coequal entity of the Federal Government—has been unaware or has failed to act when pending litigation would affect Congress as a whole or as an institution.

If we desire to promote and protect Congress as an institution we would without doubt need, and must have such information.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will do exactly, while continuing as a committee on the organization of Congress, what was talked about profusely on the floor awhile ago as staff coordination in dealing with other adjunctive bodies of Government. It is imperative that this body do everything within its power to protect the institution of which we are a part.

I need not remind Members that the Constitution makes the Congress the chief organ of Government. The Congress bears the chief responsibility for Government, creating the structure, en-

acting our laws, levying taxes, authorizing expenditures, waging war, and Congress makes the policies.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HALL. The Congress protects the course of the Nation, Mr. Chairman. This, then, is the very reason for the formation of the original Joint Committee and the very reason why it should continue.

I strongly recommend that we incorporate in this bill here today this amendment, which would simply give a coordinating state of oversight on the needed reorganization, updating and timeliness as well as the effectiveness of the Congress. If Congress does not continually look within itself and take the necessary steps to reassert its constitutional prerogatives, it will be the Republic that suffers. I think it is time we got on with the job.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the time and effort that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL), has spent on this subject. This matter was considered by the subcommittee. The gentleman from Missouri appeared before our subcommittee, and there were other Members who supported this particular idea of a continuing Joint Committee on Congressional Operations. I think there are certain benefits that probably could be achieved. However, we have just been through a bit of a hassle here which showed that apparently joint committees are not at the moment in very good repute. I would have to say that your subcommittee, after having carefully considered it, felt that this was not a necessary adjunct to a legislative reform bill at the present time, and therefore removed it from the bill which we finally produced.

As I say, I do not feel strongly about the matter. However, it is my feeling that at least for the time being we ought to permit the various committees of each body, each one of the Houses, to continue to appraise the operations within each body, and if and when this bill should become law, in whatever form it might take—and we hope it will become law—from that time then I think we can take a look in the hopes it will not be 25 or 30 years before we attempt again to reform or to reorganize the Congress of the United States. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee, we will oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again I am not trying to rush things, but I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri about the possibility of general agreement on time on the amendment and as to how many Members may wish to speak on it. I am considering asking unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment cease within 10 minutes.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri for comment. I do not wish to cut off discussion of his amendment.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gen-

tleman will yield, in view of the gentleman's statement that he did not personally oppose the continuing committee amendment, I am ready in 5 minutes to have the vote.

Mr. SISK. Let me be quite clear about it. Of course, the gentleman from Missouri knows that on behalf of the committee we did take a position against it.

Mr. HALL. I understand that.

Mr. SISK. I do not feel very strongly. I respect the gentleman, but I did want to be sure he did understand the committee did oppose it.

Mr. HALL. I understood the gentleman full well, and I appreciate the charming and dulcet way he handled the matter on behalf of the committee. I think we ought to have the vote.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Each Member will be recognized for 1 minute.

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I urge its acceptance by the committee. It would certainly seem to me the process of continuing reform is an extremely important and desirable part of our institutional life. For that reason the existence of a permanent committee will, I think, enhance the public image of representative Government.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I have examined the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL). He has had it circulating around this body for quite some time. It is well drawn and well thought out. I support it and I hope it will be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is obviously sound and constructive and to the benefit of the country and of this body. I should like to associate myself with him in support of his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI).

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes at this time, to close the debate, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, Congress is not very good at reforming itself. About once a generation pressures accumulate to such an extent that some type of reform legislation, with much ado, is enacted. If the bill brought forth by the Rules Committee is passed without substantial modification, it is my feeling that the ado will be again about little. There are many commendable items in the proposed measure, but it can be improved.

One of the most glaring omissions in the bill is the failure to include provisions to create a joint committee on congressional operations. As you will remember, the temporary Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress recommended the establishment of such a committee. As that body noted in its final report:

In our judgement, it is essential that the Congress establish a centrally constituted agency under which certain existing functions can be consolidated, and which can be charged with new and important functions that significantly involve the Congress as an institution, as well as continuing scrutiny of its organization and operations, including implementation of the present recommendations.

Many of the reorganization bills introduced in the House and the other body in the past several years have included such a provision. I have supported such a committee in the past and today again call for its establishment.

The pending amendment, proposed by Representatives HALL, FOLEY, MOSHER, HALPERN, RUPPE, HOGAN, KEITH, BEALL of Maryland, DENNIS, CRANE, RIEGLE, DELLENBACK, COUGHLIN, MORSE, CLEVELAND, ROTH, SCHWENGEL, LUKENS, MACGREGOR, REES, and myself, would create a joint committee consisting of 10 members, five appointed by the Speaker of the House, and five chosen by the President pro tempore of the Senate. Two of the Representatives would be from the Committee on Government Operations, two others from the Committee on House Administration, with the other Representative selected from the remaining Members of the House. Two of the Senators chosen would come from the Senate Rules Committee, two others from the Senate Government Operations Committee and the final member chosen from among the other Senators. This selection procedure follows the advice of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress

"It is fitting that Members serving on these designated committees predominate the membership of the proposed joint committee because of their familiarity with issues of this nature."

The members of the proposed joint committee will choose a chairman and a vice chairman, who shall be from different Houses of the Congress. These two posts shall alternate between the two Houses with each Congress.

What will the joint committee do? It will be charged with the responsibility of making "a continuing study of the organization and operation of the Congress * * * and shall recommend improvement in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the U.S. Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution."

In other words, the creation of such a committee would eliminate the need for the Congress to create once a generation a temporary joint committee to examine the operations of the congressional process. Such temporary committees can at best tell the Congress what it has been doing wrong for the previous two decades. Their short-term duration insures that they will be unable to conduct

a continuing in-depth study of the Congress—something that we need desperately.

In addition the joint committee will "call to the attention of the Congress any court proceeding or action which, in the opinion of the joint committee, is of vital interest to the Congress, or to either House of the Congress, as a constitutionally established institution of the Federal Government."

This provision can trace its origin to a passage in the final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. That committee's report noted:

The Congress, its committees and its Members are sometimes involved as parties litigant. Traditionally, representation in these cases has been by a private counsel, sometimes not paid for by the Congress or by the Department of Justice. In addition, the constitutional authority of the Congress, the will or intent of Congress, and even the application of parliamentary rules have been passed upon by the courts. In a few cases involving constitutional powers, the Congress has been represented through appearances by Senators, Representatives or attorney as amicus curiae. This representation has been on a sporadic basis and sometimes at no expense to the Congress. In contempt and perjury cases involving the powers of the Congress and its parliamentary procedures, Congress usually has been represented by the Department of Justice. This legal representation of the Congress with respect to its vital interests is unsatisfactory and the effect upon Congress of court decisions should be a matter of continuous concern for which some agency of the Congress should take responsibility. This function appropriately can be vested in the proposed joint committee, acting with approval of the leadership of both Houses.

The joint committee will issue periodic reports to the two Houses with respect to matters within its jurisdiction. However, the committee will not be authorized "to make recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House."

The joint committee will have the power to subpoena witnesses to take testimony and make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The joint committee is authorized, if approved by a majority of the committee to appoint on a permanent basis a staff of not more than six professionals and not more than six clerical staff members.

To assist it in its operations, the joint committee "is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government, and to procure the temporary—not to exceed 1 year—or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations—by contract at rates not in excess of \$100 per diem."

The amendment before us also creates an office of placement and office management which shall be under the supervision and control of the joint committee. The committee will appoint a director of the office of placement and office management. Subject to the prior approval of the committee, the director shall appoint and set the salaries of such persons as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the office.

The duties of the office include those assisting upon request, Members, committees, and officers of the House and Senate who seek competent personnel and to furnish information with regard to office management procedures. The Office will operate as the central clearinghouse for applications for employment with the Congress, test the qualifications of individuals submitting applications for employment, assist those Members seeking to improve the efficiency of their offices. However, no Member, committee, or officer of the Congress shall be required to use the facilities of the Office of Placement and Office Management.

We need a permanent, joint Committee on Congressional Operations to insure that Congress will meet its responsibilities in the last third of the 20th century. I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REES

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 140, after line 8, insert a new title as follows—

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, we have not yet completed action on title IV. It is my understanding, or am I correct, that the gentleman is offering a new title V?

Mr. REES. It is between title IV and title V.

Mr. SISK. We have not yet completed action on title IV.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inform the gentleman from California it is the understanding of the Chair the gentleman from California (Mr. REES) is offering a new title which comes between title IV and title V, which will be in order at this time.

Mr. SISK. And therefore we have completed title IV.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is correct.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: Page 140, after line 8, insert a new title as follows:

"OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL
"SUBTITLE A—HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"PART 1—PURPOSE, POLICY, AND FUNCTION
"ESTABLISHMENT

"SEC. 601. There is established in the House of Representatives an office to be known as the Office of the Legislative Counsel, referred to hereinafter in this subtitle as the 'Office'.

"PURPOSE AND POLICY

"SEC. 602. The purpose of the Office shall be to advise and assist the House of Representatives, and its committees and Members, in the achievement of a clear, faithful, and coherent expression of legislative policies. The Office shall maintain impartiality as to issues of legislative policy to be determined by the House of Representatives, and shall not advocate the adoption or rejection of any legislation except when duly requested by the Speaker or a committee to comment on a proposal directly affecting the functions

of the Office. The Office shall maintain the attorney-client relationship with respect to all communications between it and any Member or committee of the House.

"FUNCTIONS

"Sec. 603. The functions of the Office shall be as follows:

"(1) Upon request of the managers on the part of the House at any conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, to advise and assist the managers on the part of the House in the course of the conference, and to assist the committee of conference in the preparation of the conference report and any accompanying explanatory statement.

"(2) Upon request of any committee of the House, or any joint committee having authority to report legislation to the House, to advise and assist the committee in the consideration of any legislation before it, and to assist the committee in the preparation of drafts of any such legislation, amendments thereto, and reports thereon.

"(3) Upon request of any Member having control of time during the consideration of any legislation by the House, to have in attendance on the floor of the House not more than two members of the staff of the Office (and, in his discretion, the Legislative Counsel) to advise and assist such Member and, to the extent feasible, any other Member in the course of such consideration.

"(4) Upon request of any Member, subject to such reasonable restrictions as the Legislative Counsel may impose with the approval of the Speaker on the proportion of the resources of the Office which may be devoted to the requests of any one Member, to prepare drafts of legislation and to furnish drafting advice with respect to drafts of legislation prepared by others.

"(5) At the direction of the Speaker, to perform on behalf of the House of Representatives any legal services which are within the capabilities of the Office and the performance of which would not be inconsistent with the provisions of section 602 or the preceding provisions of this section.

"PART 2—ADMINISTRATION

"LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

"Sec. 611. The management, supervision, and administration of the Office are vested in the Legislative Counsel, who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the position. Any person so appointed shall serve at the pleasure of the Speaker.

"STAFF

"Sec. 612. (a) With the approval of the Speaker, or in accordance with policies and procedures approved by the Speaker, the Legislative Counsel shall appoint such attorneys and other employees as may be necessary for the prompt and efficient performance of the functions of the Office. Any such appointment shall be made without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the position. Any person so appointed may be removed by the Legislative Counsel with the approval of the Speaker, or in accordance with policies and procedures approved by the Speaker.

"(b) One of the employees appointed under subsection (a) shall be a full-time Office Administrator, who shall exercise the management, supervisory, and administrative functions of the Office as delegated to him by the Legislative Counsel.

"COMPENSATION

"Sec. 613. (a) The Legislative Counsel shall be paid at a per annum gross rate equal to the rate of basic pay, as in effect from time to time, for Level III of the Executive Schedule of section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

"(b) Members of the staff of the Office other than the Legislative Counsel shall be

paid at per annum gross rates fixed by the Legislative Counsel with the approval of the Speaker or in accordance with policies approved by the Speaker, but not in excess of a per annum gross rate equal to the rate of basic pay, as in effect from time to time, for level V of the Executive Schedule of section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

"EXPENDITURES

"Sec. 614. In accordance with policies and procedures approved by the Speaker, the Legislative Counsel may make such expenditures as may be necessary or appropriate for the functioning of the Office.

"OFFICIAL MAIL MATTER

"Sec. 615. The Office shall have the same privilege of free transmission of official mail matter as other offices of the United States Government.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 616. There are authorized to be appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subtitle and to increase the efficiency of the Office and the quality of the services which it provides.

"PART 3—TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

"PERSONNEL, PROPERTY, RECORDS, ETC.

"Sec. 621. Any individual who on the date of the enactment of this Act is serving under an appointment by the Speaker as Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives shall continue as Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives in accordance with this subtitle. All personnel, positions, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations of or for that part of the Office of the Legislative Counsel established under section 1303 of the Revenue Act of 1918 (2 U.S.C., ch. 9) employed or held in or for the House of Representatives shall be transferred to the Office established under this subtitle; and, effective upon the date of enactment of this Act, the provisions of section 1303 of the Revenue Act of 1918 shall have no further applicability of any kind to the Speaker or to any committee, officer, employee, or property of the House of Representatives."

Amend the table of contents by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE VI—OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

"SUBTITLE A—HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"PART 1—PURPOSE, POLICY, AND FUNCTION

"Sec. 601. Establishment.
"Sec. 602. Purpose and policy.
"Sec. 603. Functions.

"PART 2—ADMINISTRATION

"Sec. 611. Legislative Counsel.
"Sec. 612. Staff.
"Sec. 613. Compensation.
"Sec. 614. Expenditures.
"Sec. 615. Official mail matter.
"Sec. 616. Authorization of appropriations.

"PART 3—TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

"Sec. 621. Personnel, property, records, etc."

Mr. REES (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, the purpose of this amendment is to codify into the statute the Office of Legislative Counsel which serves the House of Representatives. The amendment defines the duties of the Office. For example, to serve the committee, to serve the Members on the floor

when bills are being taken up, and also to serve individual Members who would desire bill drafting services.

At the present time I believe we have 12 or 13 members in the Office of the Legislative Counsel. This amendment will create a larger framework in which to expand. As an example, the Office of Legislative Counsel in the California Legislature has 46 attorneys.

This has been worked on by all parties. I believe it is a sincere attempt to upgrade the Office of Legislative Counsel and to make it an office to serve all Members of the House.

This amendment was drafted by the legislative counsel. I know of no opposition to it.

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

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

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Let me say I am most happy to say I am in complete agreement with the amendment offered by my colleague from California. I would ask the gentleman to comment on whether my understanding is correct that this has been cleared not only with our committee but also with the leadership of the House which would be affected and therefore is fully acceptable, at least so far as my colleague knows.

Mr. REES. This amendment has been cleared through the leadership and through the Office of Legislative Counsel.

Mr. SISK. I would be happy to accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. REES).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first I wish to explain what I shall attempt to do, because there was some confusion the other day when an effort was made to do this. After explaining the issue I intend to make a unanimous-consent request to return to the consideration of page 39 of the bill immediately below line 4.

When the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE) originally was adopted it was written rather hurriedly. It was almost, I guess, unanimously adopted on the floor. Subsequent to that time the staff, together with distinguished men from the Office of Legislative Counsel and the Library of Congress, advised the subcommittee that we would have to add language to this particular amendment or else we would get into a state of considerable confusion.

When it was explained the other day I believe there was some misapprehension which may have been left in some minds, that it would take away something on the minority side or some right of an individual.

The sole purpose of this language to be added, which is, "which is privileged and shall be decided without debate," can be easily explained. That means if we go through the quorum call under the new language, and if it prevails, at such

time as a quorum is reached a motion will be made that further proceedings under the call of the House be dispensed with. Unless this language is in there, "which is privileged and shall be decided without debate," it means that any Member could get up and object to the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House and could then debate that for 1 hour, and even demand a rollcall on it.

It is much the same as the situation which happened to me a couple of years ago. I agreed with the gentleman from Missouri, who is no longer present. He did not have an opportunity to talk, because there was very little time. He had a quorum call. I was ready to proceed, and I asked unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. He reserved the right to object so he was recognized at that time, and, under that particular procedure, he did get an opportunity to talk for some considerable period of time.

That is the sole purpose of this, Mr. Chairman. If we do not have this language I believe we will be making ourselves worse off. Frankly, I am not so certain I agree with the White amendment, but it has been accepted and I want it to be as workable as possible.

So with that explanation, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 39 of H.R. 17654, immediately below line 4, for the purpose of offering a perfecting amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. WHITE which was adopted in this committee. The amendment would read as follows:

In paragraph (b) of clause 2 of rule XV of the rules of the House as contained in the amendment offered by Mr. WHITE to page 39, immediately below line 4, insert "which is privileged and shall be decided without debate" after the words "a motion."

Now I would renew my request and ask unanimous consent to refer back so that I may offer this perfecting amendment which I personally feel is very essential if we are going to proceed in this way.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from California explain briefly the purpose of the White amendment and what effect the proposed amendment would have on the White amendment?

Mr. SMITH of California. You will remember the White amendment, as I recall it, was that once we have a quorum, the call of the House could have a cutoff. Let us say that somebody makes a point of order that a quorum is not present and a motion is made to have a call of the House. Then we start calling off the names. When we have reached a quorum, as I understand it, that is, the proper number of people are present who have answered to their names and the Members apparently have signed their names in, and that number is 218, then a motion can be made to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House.

My amendment is to prohibit, yes, to avoid the possibility of having another hour's debate on that particular motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House.

As I said, I am not enthusiastic about this particular White amendment, but it is in the bill, and if that is the way the bill is going to be written, I feel that we should do something about this.

Mr. GROSS. I want to say to the gentleman that I am less than enthused about the bill and the White amendment, and if there is any way to destroy the effectiveness of either; if the failure to go back to amend the bill will do that, then I certainly would be ready, willing, and able here and now to object to going back into the bill.

The present procedure is, as I understand it, that after a quorum call has been taken and the number of those responding is announced by the Speaker, he then states that without objection further proceedings under the call be dispensed with. He does not make a motion. He merely states that without objection it is dispensed with.

Mr. SMITH of California. That is true. Technically a motion has to be made. That has always been the procedure. You go through all of the names twice and you go through the procedure with the Members in the well, too.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Then, if there is objection, a motion must be made for the purpose of ending further proceedings under the call and an hour of debate can ensue if the motion is made under the present rules. What the gentleman from California would do by this, taken in concert with the White amendment, would be to strike out that opportunity for an hour's debate. Is that not correct?

Mr. SMITH of California. You had a quorum call going at the time. What I am attempting to do is not have the quorum call go on indefinitely with an hour's debate afterward.

Mr. GROSS. I understand what the gentleman says.

Mr. SMITH of California. Now, I do not say that I agree entirely with the White amendment, but we do have this language in the bill now, and this will simply make the situation even worse than it will be of going up to the point of a quorum being here, and I am merely trying to save a little time.

I have attempted to explain this to the gentleman, and I think that the gentleman from Iowa is actually on my side on this—

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether I am or not. I do not see why we should dispense with the motion and debate if someone feels constrained to object to the statement of the Speaker that "Without objection, further proceedings under the call of the House will be dispensed with." This would nullify and further deprive someone in the minority, or any Member of the House for that matter of a right that he now has.

Mr. SMITH of California. I do not believe it affects the minority any more than it affects the majority. If we had to debate this, it could be subject to a point of order, or a motion calling for a vote. So if we are going to spend 3 or 4 hours in trying to get a quorum in the House it could cause great delay. This is certainly a step in the right direction if we are going to do it that way, and not put in 2 or 3 hours before we get a quorum here.

Mr. GROSS. As far as this bill is concerned—this so-called facelifting job on the House of Representatives without benefit of beautician—it has deprived and whittled down the rights of individual Members in several instances. I am not exactly sure how this will operate, but on the face of it I do not think—

Mr. SMITH of California. If it does not operate successfully, and the gentleman objects to it next year, then let us have the Committee on Rules come down and say that it does not work, and change it back to the old way.

As I say, I am not enthusiastic about the so-called White amendment, but what I am trying to do is make it so that it will actually work.

I think the gentleman from Iowa is really talking on my side of this, and I think the gentleman agrees with me, and if the gentleman objects to the bill then the gentleman will have a chance to explain that a little bit later on.

Mr. GROSS. I am not at all sure, because I doubt that any Member of this body can predict how the White amendment is going to work. In my opinion it is going to work very badly.

Mr. SMITH of California. Please do not object to this, I would ask the gentleman from Iowa; let me get this one through.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is so persuasive, and I am so mellow, that I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would say to the gentleman from California that it is my understanding this is very similar to a motion to lay on the table, and that is not debatable at the time.

Mr. SMITH of California. That is right; it is a privileged motion.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF CALIFORNIA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITE

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of California to the amendment offered by Mr. WHITE: In paragraph (b) of clause 2 of rule XV of the rules of the House as contained in the amendment offered by Mr. WHITE to page 39, immediately below line 4, insert "which is privileged and shall be decided without debate," immediately after the words "a motion".

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I request that the matter come to a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE).

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATES
EFFECTIVE DATES

Sec. 501. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall take effect as follows:

(1) Title I, title II (except part 2 thereof), title III (except section 203 (d) (2), (d) (3), and (4) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by section 321 of this Act), and title IV, of this Act shall become effective immediately prior to noon January 3, 1971.

(2) Part 2 of title II shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning on or after July 1, 1972.

(3) Section 203(d) (2) and (3) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by section 321 of this Act, shall become effective at the close of the first session of the Ninety-second Congress.

(4) Section 203(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by section 321 of this Act, shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning on or after July 1, 1970.

Mr. SISK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of title V be dispensed with and that it be open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, many of us—from both sides of the aisle—have labored long and hard to bring about this moment in the history of the House. Today's vote will be one of the most significant actions of the 91st Congress.

H.R. 17654 in its present form is certainly not perfect. It does not accomplish by any means all of the revisions and reforms that would be required to make this House the perfect instrument that all of us would like it to be in the ideal world.

But as proposed by the Rules Committee H.R. 17654 was a good bill. By and large the amendments made to the bill in its 9 legislative days of debate on this measure have made it even better. It takes some very significant and meaningful steps in the direction of improving the process of committee deliberation, of making essential and helpful information available during the legislative process, of reducing arbitrary conduct of legislative affairs, and of making certain that the public can see clearly and know about as much of its procedures in committee and on the floor as it wants to, and cares to make it its business to.

I commend all of my colleagues who have helped to bring us to where we are today. I urge an aye vote on H.R. 17654. It is my earnest hope that this House will pass H.R. 17654 overwhelmingly, and that the Senate will then proceed to act swiftly and favorably thereon, so that the 92d and subsequent Congresses, and even more important, the Nation and all its cities, will benefit from this significant action of the 91st Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Of special significance is the amendment which would allow record teller votes. In an age when faith in our Government is becoming more and more fragile, it is our duty to bring our actions

out in the open. We owe it to the public; we owe it to ourselves. For too long the House has decided important matters in secrecy. For too long Members have failed to vote on important issues because no record would be kept of their votes. It is time that the cloak of secrecy was lifted from the actions of the House. It is time that the Members of the House stood up and were counted on the important issues of our times.

Most of the truly important decisions that occur in the House are not made during the vote on final passage of a bill. The crucial votes, particularly on vital appropriations bills, come not on final passage but rather on the amendments which decide exactly what provisions will remain in a bill, and what provisions will be deleted. As is the case with the reorganization bill we are now debating, amendments are generally considered in the Committee of the Whole, where no record of how a Member votes, or even if he votes, is kept. Because of this, the public is unable to judge a Member accurately on his record. The record simply is not there.

During the first session, such important items as the decisions whether or not to appropriate funds for both the ABM, and chemical and biological weapons were made in this anonymous fashion. This is a situation which we should not tolerate. The public has the right to know how its Representatives feel about every bill which comes before the House. Any situation less than full disclosure of the voting record of the Members of the House, is a dangerous departure from the principles of democracy.

This secrecy has a second, and equally damaging, effect on the workings of the House. Because there is no record kept of how a Representative votes in the Committee of the Whole, or even if he votes at all, the number of Members who participate in the secret teller votes is substantially less than the number who participate in the votes that are recorded. Members feel that they have more important things to do than to sit with a relative handful of other Members and participate in votes which will remain unknown to their constituents. Thus, many important votes take place with less than half of the Members participating. Indeed, many decisions are made with fewer than 100 Members voting.

The vote on last year's appropriation bill for the Peace Corps is one of the more blatant examples of this problem. An amendment which would have substantially reduced the funding for the program was defeated in the Committee of the Whole by a mere two votes. Sixty-one Members voted for the amendment, 63 against it, and 311 members did not vote at all. Even the vote on the ABM, certainly one of the most crucial legislative decisions in recent years, saw less than three-fourths of the Members participating. The effect of this massive non-participation is obvious. Its damage to the legislative functioning of the House is severe.

The amendment to allow record teller votes would do much to correct both of the problems I have discussed. It would allow a record of the Member's votes on important issues in the Committee of

the Whole to be kept, and, by doing so, it would encourage the Members to participate in the Committee by giving them the credit they deserve for casting their vote. I urge all the Members of the House to join with me in lifting the veil of secrecy from the legislative branch of Government.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I think today will go down in the annals of Congress as a day of great historical significance, for today we have passed the most monumental and comprehensive congressional reform bill since the LaFollette-Monroney Act of 1946. I want to take this opportunity to pay special tribute to those Members who served on the Monroney-Madden Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress which began working on this problem way back in 1965. They did a most commendable job and we are deeply indebted to their efforts. I also want to extend my praise to my colleagues on the Rules Committee who devoted a great deal of time and effort to this legislation both in their special subcommittee and here on the floor of the House. Their patience and perseverance have been an inspiration to us all.

I think it is especially fitting that this body has demonstrated to the Nation its commitment to the proposition that this should be a decade of government reform. Reform, like charity, should begin at home, and this body, through this sweeping legislation, has proven to the Nation that it is very serious about keeping its own house in order. At a time when our institutions are under increasing attack from all directions for not being responsive, we have passed a bill that will make this Congress more responsive to its own membership and more responsive to the people it serves. This to me is the heart of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, and I am proud to have been a part of this most historic moment.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the House, in the past weeks of debate and votes on amendments to the Legislative Reorganization Act, H.R. 17654, has undertaken its first meaningful reform in 24 years. Of course, these amendments have been added to a piece of legislation which does credit to our distinguished colleague from California (Mr. SISK) and his colleagues who produced H.R. 17654.

Several amendments have been added which, when enacted into law, will have a tremendous impact in reforming the operations of the House. As one who has, since I first entered this Chamber 10 years ago, argued, cajoled, lobbied, and pushed for reform, I am particularly heartened that the number of Members, who have now come to realize and support what I and a few others have long maintained, is sufficient to pass these amendments.

I cannot be entirely sanguine about the outcome of the debates and votes, however, for several key amendments have been rejected. Those which would have overturned the seniority system were particularly important. Given the momentum for reform which the Legislative Reorganization Act has generated, and which the growing voice of the public supports and demands, the House

must not now comfortably relax into self-satisfied approval of our actions. Only the first steps have been taken.

The key amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole, and of which I am a cosponsor, provides for the recording of teller votes. This amendment, offered by our distinguished colleagues from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) and California (Mr. GUBSER), provides that teller votes be recorded by clerks or electronic devices on demand of one-fifth of a quorum. Each Member's vote, and a list of the absentees, would be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

To understand the real importance of this provision, one need only run down the list of some of the major votes which were cast in secrecy, by means of the nonrecord teller vote system, in the 91st Congress:

The House vote on the Cooper-Church amendment to the Foreign Military Sales Act bill, H.R. 15628;

The amendment to cut the funds for the SST;

Amendments regarding the no-knock and preventive detention provisions in the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970, H.R. 16196;

Amendments regarding the infamous Whitten amendments, tacked on to the fiscal year 1970 Labor-HEW appropriation bill, H.R. 15931, and the Office of Education appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971, H.R. 16916.

The teller vote has been used as a means to shield Members from the scrutiny of their constituencies. It has been employed as a device to curtail responsive representation. The abolition of secrecy attendant upon this vote was long overdue, and certainly passage of the O'Neill-Gubser amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act is a milestone in our struggle for congressional reform.

A second amendment to the act which was passed by the Committee of the Whole House requires that a record of all rollcall votes in committees be available to the public. In addition, where there is a record vote on a motion to report a measure, the total number of votes for and against the measure would be included in the committee report. This amendment was offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) on behalf of 60 Members, including myself.

Again, this amendment will help to lift the veil of secrecy which surrounds so much of what the House does, and thereby enable the public to see and to know how the House is working.

A third amendment, offered by our distinguished colleague from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) on behalf of himself and 70 of his colleagues, including myself, provides 10 minutes of debate on motions to recommit with instruction, with time equally divided between the Member offering the motion, and the opposition. This amendment will permit Members to debate briefly, at least, motions to recommit with instructions.

A fourth amendment requires that conference reports and explanatory statements must be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3 calendar days, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, prior to consideration by the House. In addition, these reports and

statements must be available on the floor during consideration of the report. This amendment was offered by our distinguished colleague from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) on behalf of himself and more than 80 Members, including myself.

All too often, a committee report is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one night, and it is voted on the succeeding day. Its complexity and length make the report extremely difficult to analyze with sufficient scrutiny. Particularly notorious in this regard are the committee reports inserted in the RECORD by the Appropriations Committee on bills providing billions of dollars of funding. Thus, this amendment, by providing time for study, is extremely important.

Several other amendments, which have been adopted in the Committee of the Whole, also provide significant changes in the proposed Legislative Reorganization Act, and their inclusion considerably improves this bill.

These other amendments—all of which I supported—included one which gives the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico the right to vote in committee. Another very important amendment served to nullify a provision of the proposed Legislative Reorganization Act which would give any Member the right to demand a two-thirds vote for approval of a nongermane Senate amendment. This two-thirds vote requirement which was nullified would have stymied much progressive legislation originating in the Senate, such as the 18-year-old vote provision which was added by the Senate to the bill extending the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

These, then, are some of the amendments which have been added to the already significant reform provided by the Legislative Reorganization Act. Unfortunately, several equally significant—if not more so—amendments were rejected. These mark the objectives for which we must continue to fight.

An amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY) and 42 other Members, including myself, would have opened committee meetings to the public unless the committee by rollcall vote in open session, with a quorum present, decided otherwise. It would have also prohibited committees from voting to close more than 1 meeting day at a time.

Serving on two committees—the House Committee on the Judiciary, and the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—I, like my colleagues, know the importance of committee work. Much, if not most, of the important legislative work of the Congress is done in committee.

Without question, the most secretive committee is Appropriations. Each subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee holds its hearings on budgetary matters within its jurisdiction in executive session. Similarly, markup sessions are held in secret.

Thus, the amendment which was offered—and defeated—would have been a significant step in ending the secrecy which attends so much of the substantive work which Congress does. Its defeat was unfortunate; it must serve as a spur to renewed effort by those of us committed to full and effective congress-

sional reform to continue working for these ends.

The most needed reform is a change in the seniority system, which is responsible for the failure of Congress to adequately respond to, and reflect, the needs of our Nation. Above all else, this is the internal reform which I have consistently advocated. For this system places in entrenched positions of power too many chairmen committed to maintaining the status quo, and to rejecting the needs of today and of tomorrow for the outmoded measures of yesterday.

I believe an amendment abolishing the seniority system should have been adopted. At the very least, the modest amendment which was offered providing that, in electing committee chairmen, the House need not select the member with the longest consecutive service, should have been adopted.

This amendment was not adopted. Nor were the amendments which provided that the majority party members of each committee would select a chairman from among the three senior committee members of the majority party, and that tenure of committee chairmen would be limited to four terms unless the House, by a two-thirds vote, suspended the rule.

Thus, although the amendments adopted have effected worthwhile and important changes in the Legislative Reorganization Act bill, the failure to abolish, or at least modify, the seniority system demonstrates the need to continue to press for reform, so that the Congress can be a legislative body able to confront, and deal with, the issues and problems of the last third of the 20th century.

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly pleased that the House approved the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. Because of an unexpected delay which occurred just before the vote, I did not have the chance to record my approval. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the measure.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17654, entitled Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

The very title itself bespeaks the purpose of the measure which is to change some of the procedures or ways of legislating in Congress. I am glad that the emphasis is on the word "reorganization" because it carries a more constructive connotation than the word reform. Too frequently, in the early days of debate the press and others referred to this as a reform measure.

The word reform as I understand it means to abandon some evil conduct or to turn over a new leaf. Such a word carries with it the idea that one who reforms must atone for their past errors or do penance for their past wrongs. Now, I know there has been room for improvement in congressional procedures. We are making corrections now. But it should not be argued that all of our procedures in the past have been wrong or in error and that they are all going to be abandoned because that is just not the situation. Most of our procedures have been time-tested and have worked well. They do need amending or improvement. Thus the word reorganization which means to

remodel or make better and to revise, but not to abandon, is the best description of what we are trying to do.

Mr. Chairman, we have been working off and on toward enactment of the reorganization bill for almost so long that the memory of Members runs not to the contrary; we were working on one legislative bill quite some time before the recess. While I have not made an accurate count of legislative days, or portions thereof, I am sure this has been a measure that has taken more of the time of the House of Representatives than many other subject matters in recent years. I am sure we have worked on it more than a dozen days and perhaps some part of 15 legislative days.

While there has been no limitation of debate, so also there was no limitation of space taken to clearly spell out the provisions in the bill, H.R. 17654, which was itself a voluminous document.

Now, in retrospect, after the debate is over and in consideration of the contents of the bill, it becomes somewhat of a task to capsule or recapitulate what could be generally regarded and accepted by most Members as the most beneficial or helpful changes that have been made which will improve the operation of the Congress the most and at the same time improve the image of the Congress in the eyes of the American people.

For my part, the one single accomplishment that overshadows all others is what could be described as the secrecy package. For far too long Members have enjoyed the privilege of hiding their voting record in what has been called a teller count in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. These votes have never been recorded or there has never been any announcement of who voted on either side of the issue. Of course, if a Member wished to announce himself what stand he had taken on the teller count that was his prerogative. But even then he would have to be taken at his word unless he could get another Member to vouch for him because they had walked up the aisle together. While a teller count was in view of those in the gallery, it became almost impossible to know exactly how all of the Members voted as they marched between the tellers. Now this will be changed and these votes will be recorded and publicized.

For my part, this is the greatest accomplishment of this bill. The Congress should not operate in secrecy. If a Member is not willing to account publicly for his stand on every phase of every issue then such a reluctance is indicative of some kind of fear that he entertains that he has taken a course not representative of his people or that he has cast his vote not in the general interest, but instead in a direction that may not be good for either his own district or for the country. If the Congress demands freedom of information from the executive branch then certainly the Congress should be willing to make its entire record available to the people of this country and not limited to just a few rollcall votes that may or may never be taken under present procedures.

It was good to see the change made

which will require all votes in committees be publicized. If a Member is ashamed of his vote in committee or does not want it publicized it may be he is on the defensive and has some reason to apologize for his action or conduct. If a Member is right or believes he is right then he should never be fearful of his vote in the teller live or in committee being publicized for the benefit of his constituents, and even those he does not represent.

Another advance that has been made is that meetings of committees and hearings be open unless there is a valid reason to have it otherwise such as classified information or for security reasons. Then meetings can be closed upon a majority vote of the committee.

Then as a portion of the thread running through all of H.R. 17654 against secrecy and for freedom of information is the requirement of publication in advance of such documents as reports which accompany appropriations bills and also conference reports. Also, as a part of what could be said to be this lifting of the veil of secrecy is the access by the radio and electronic media to committee hearings. Quite wisely the bill provided for written rules to be formulated by each committee. While the bill did not go so far as to permit electronic media to operate in the House galleries during meetings of the House nonetheless it is a step forward to have committee meetings opened to the radio and electronic media. Once again nothing should take place in any committee meetings for which Members should be ashamed. There should be no fear about any matter transacted in committee meetings being made public, if everything is proper and above board.

Mr. Chairman, another significant advance provided for in H.R. 17654 is the whole thrust toward democratization of committee procedures. There is a thread running through this bill that from here on the decisionmaking power will rest with the committee itself rather than with the chairman alone. In other words, the power shall rest with the majority of the committee rather than with only the chairman. This will include such things as decisions over the order of business and the provisions for regular committee meetings which would mean that power over the staff would rest with the majority of the committee rather than the chairman alone. Then, of course, if a meeting were called the chairman could no longer prevent the meeting simply because as head of the committee he could absent himself. Provisions have been made if a chairman is not present the ranking member takes over and the committee meeting proceeds.

As I look about trying to find some of the better things that have been accomplished by this bill I suppose one of the best things in the bill was something over which there was no controversy. I refer to the creation of a Congressional Research Service put in place of the old Library Reference Service. This was essentially an upgrading but it is quite a vast improvement over what we have had in the past. It will mean this re-

search service can, hopefully, evaluate all legislative programs. As an adjunct to this new research service the bill itself provided for joint data processing which, of course, was struck out before final passage. I supported this because at this point we had received no assurance from the other body they would go along and we should continue with data processing on our own until such time as there is an assurance of cooperation from the other body.

I opposed and will continue to oppose the effort to ban all proxies in committee. This is not a matter of secrecy. In fact, it is the very opposite of secrecy. Proxies may be tailor-made, that is, limited as to time and content. The entire business world is carried on by means of principal and agent. The use of proxies is an application of the law of agency. Quite frequently, a Member could find it utterly impossible to be in two committee meetings both of which were conducting important matters at exactly the same time, even though the committee rooms may be located close together. The time could conceivably come, when a Member would have to be present to physically vote in one committee and lose his voice in the other except by means of a proxy. If there has been abuse of proxy it has not been by the committee but by the principal or in this case the Member. If there has been any abuse this has been by the Members themselves who sign a whole pad of proxies in advance and proceed to turn them over to a chairman with no specification as to their use or limitations as to time.

There was created by H.R. 17654 a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations which will provide for a continuous review of the operations of Congress and that means the rules and procedures. This is certainly a salutary provision and could hopefully mean that instead of having a reorganization bill once every 25 years this Committee on Congressional Operations would recommend programs regularly at least every few years.

So far as I am concerned one advance we have made is to convert the pay scales from so-called base pay to gross pay or real dollars. This is the so-called Broyhill amendment which was adopted. To me this makes sense. I have never had any reason to fail to divulge the pay of people on my staff. This is simply another portion of the thread of anti-secrecy that goes all through this bill. If a Member has any reason to hide the pay scale of his staff then such pay may be excessive. Those of us from Missouri have never had any worry or concern over this matter because quite regularly the papers in our State translate the base into real dollars and publicize the salaries of each member of the staff of those Members of Congress from Missouri.

Yet another substantial step forward is the compilation of parliamentary procedures. I must confess that when a point of order has been raised it takes a lot of research to locate the precedents. Precedents are on file in the Parliamentarian's office but not always of easy

access. Now, by the terms of this bill all of us will know what rulings have been in the past. Members will no longer have to second-guess what kind of ruling the Parliamentarian will make or whether the amendment they plan to introduce will or will not be subject to a point of order.

I was glad that the amendment was adopted which will modernize and upgrade our page school including better accommodations for pages. I was also glad galleries will be made more useful to constituents.

It has been a long and tedious debate over the reorganization bill, but at this point it seems all of the effort has been worth the struggle. Of course, only time will tell which provisions will be more helpful and beneficial than others. I still lean toward the view the single or outstanding advance we have made is to the direction of elimination of secrecy.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

The Committee on Rules provided us with a forward looking bill. The procedural changes point us toward modernizing the House so that we can deal more efficiently with our ever-increasing workload.

New developments in information retrieval will provide Congress with an independent means of legislative analysis. Knowledge is power and with that power we can perform our rightful role not only in the development of legislation, but in review of existing programs as well as more efficient constituent services.

Too often, in all three areas—analysis, legislation, and constituent services—we are dependent on executive agencies and departments for information upon which the Constitution requires us to make independent legislative judgments. It is essential that the Congress develop independent facilities for judgment in a most expeditious and timely manner.

Consistent with the development of congressional information retrieval and analysis systems is the expansion of the Legislative Reference Service and the General Accounting Office. Both of these congressional agencies have aided us in the past and should be strengthened.

In supporting this committee bill, however, I am forced to admit that it fails to go far enough in opening the Congress to the full view of the people. We are almost daily attacked for being secretive; our ethics are impugned; we are held up to ridicule and abuse. We are accused of gutting progressive legislation while in the Committee of the Whole and then voting on the record so as to seem to support it.

Because committee votes are not disclosed, we are accused of secretly making unholy alliances and self-serving deals on legislation.

Even within the House itself, many Members complain of authoritarian rules designed to prevent minority expression during debate.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this country talk of losing faith in their institutions. So we have actually come to expect their representatives to be ingenuous.

Many of our young people have "dropped out" because they compare the problems in America with the apparent slow pace of their solution and they have come to mistrust us.

The information explosion of the last 25 years bring far-away events into the living room. People are more aware than ever of what goes on in different parts of the country and the world. The appetite for information has been whetted and people demand to know more about how their Congress operates.

Our constituents have a right to know as much as possible about their Government and the record of those whose salaries they pay. Furthermore, there would be less misunderstanding today about the rightful role of Congress in the legislative process if our procedures were open to public knowledge.

Too much of what we do seems cursory and arbitrary. Too much of our real work is hidden behind closed doors. As a result, too many people look upon our deliberations as obstructionist and feel that our role should be to merely approve or perfect what the Chief Executive proposes. The secrecy which has developed over the years works against and destroy not only our personal credibility with our constituents but our institutional credibility with the people.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to open the doors. It is time to let the sunshine in. It is time to clear away even the semblance of secrecy and let the people know and judge for themselves whether we represent their interests. It is time to restore the faith of all our people and especially regain the trust of our children. And it is time to restore to the Congress its greater rightful role in legislating.

Mr. Chairman, it is for these reasons that I am on record as a sponsor of amendments to record teller votes; to provide for 3-day conference report lay-over; for open committee sessions; for disclosure of record votes in committee; for debate time on motions to recommend; and for guaranteed debate time on amendments. I have also voted to strengthen other parts of this bill as well.

All of these amendments make our procedures more democratic and open the House to public view.

I recognize the problem is amending House procedures. Often amendments intended to make procedures more fair will be turned around in changing circumstances and become undemocratic. These amendments, however, have undergone long study and review and I am confident they will strengthen this great House and the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the Committee on Rules for drafting a progressive reform. That it has been amended beyond their draft is not to their discredit; they have pointed the way and the House has worked its will in a democratic fashion.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, as one who has offered ideas for reform of the legislative branch of our Government, and who has for several Congresses sponsored legislation to improve the workings, streamline the procedures, and enhance the responsiveness of the Congress, I support the Legislative Reorganization

Act of 1970 which the House has been considering for several weeks.

I support this bill, not as a perfect or even as an adequate set of legislative reform—for it is neither perfect nor adequate. Rather I support the bill for the few tiny steps forward it takes toward meaningful legislative reform. For some weeks, I was fearful that we would let the entire 91st Congress slip by without taking any decisive action in the House on congressional reforms. Indeed, it is still possible that no bill will become public law this year. But I am glad to see that the public outcry for a more modern and effective national legislature has not fallen on deaf ears once again, but rather that we have moved forward to provide more democratic voting procedures both within committees and on the floor.

I am particularly pleased that the bill contains a title authorizing the computerization of many functions of the Congress. In an address in New York City earlier this week, before the Computer Audit System symposium, I stated that Congress would continue to lose its co-equal power with the executive branch if it did not equip itself with the computers and adequate staff needed to give our Members the same access to complex data and policy analysis tools which are presently available to Federal agencies.

This bill is a step toward this goal, if only a small one. Hopefully, we will carry this bill into public law and as we implement its modest reforms, they will serve to whet our appetite, and that of the public, for even more modernizations in our legislative process.

I want to congratulate those who have led the fight for this bill for putting aside self-centered motives designed to preserve all of the current powers and prerogatives within Congress, and for emphasizing, instead, the need for reforms that will serve Congress as an institution and the Nation as a whole far better in the long run than we are now equipped to do.

I think many colleagues join me in hoping that this will be the first in a series of increasingly meaningful and bold legislative reorganization acts to emerge from Congress in the coming years.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 17654) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1093, 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?

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Schwengel amendment dealing with proxy voting.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote de-

manded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the so-called Schwengel amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, strike out lines 15 to 24, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Clause 27(e) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'No vote of any member of any committee with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 156, nays 187, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

YEAS—156

Abbitt	Ford, Gerald R.	O'Konski
Adair	Foreman	Passman
Andrews, Ala.	Frey	Pike
Andrews,	Fulton, Pa.	Pirnie
N. Dak.	Gallifanakis	Poff
Ashbrook	Green, Oreg.	Pucinski
Ayres	Griffin	Quie
Bell, Calif.	Gross	Quillen
Bennett	Grover	Rallsback
Bevill	Gude	Rarick
Blester	Haley	Reid, Ill.
Bingham	Hall	Reid, N.Y.
Brinkley	Halpern	Riegle
Broomfield	Hammer-	Robison
Brotzman	schmidt	Roe
Brown, Mich.	Hansen, Idaho	Roth
Brown, Ohio	Harrington	Ryan
Broyhill, N.C.	Harsha	Sandman
Broyhill, Va.	Harvey	Satterfield
Buchanan	Hastings	Schadeberg
Burke, Fla.	Hechler, W. Va.	Scheuer
Burlison, Mo.	Heckler, Mass.	Schmitz
Caffery	Helstoski	Schwengel
Chamberlain	Henderson	Sebellus
Chappell	Hogan	Shriver
Chisholm	Hutchinson	Sikes
Clancy	Jarman	Skubitz
Cleveland	Jonas	Slack
Collins	Karth	Smith, Iowa
Colmer	Kastenmeier	Springer
Conte	Koch	Stafford
Corbett	Kyl	Stanton
Coughlin	Langen	Steiger, Ariz.
Cramer	Latta	Talcott
Crane	Lennon	Taylor
Culver	McClory	Teague, Calif.
Cunningham	McCloskey	Thompson, Ga.
Daniel, Va.	McClure	Thomson, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	McDade	Tiernan
della Garza	McKneally	Vander Jagt
Dellenback	MacGregor	Vanik
Dennis	Mann	Vigorito
Dickinson	Marsh	Waldie
Dorn	Martin	Wampler
Duncan	Mayne	Whalen
Dwyer	Miller, Ohio	Williams
Edwards, Ala.	Minish	Winn
Erlenborn	Minshall	Wylder
Esch	Mizell	Wylie
Eshleman	Mizell	Wyman
Findley	Morse	Zion
Fish	Mosher	Zwach
Flowers	Nichols	

NAYS—187

Abernethy	Boggs	Clausen,
Adams	Boland	Don H.
Addabbo	Bolling	Clay
Albert	Brademas	Cohelan
Anderson,	Brasco	Conable
Calif.	Bray	Conyers
Anderson, Ill.	Brown, Calif.	Daniels, N.J.
Anderson,	Burke, Mass.	Davis, Ga.
Tenn.	Burleson, Tex.	Dent
Annunzio	Burton, Calif.	Diggs
Arends	Byrne, Pa.	Donohue
Ashley	Byrnes, Wis.	Downing
Aspinall	Cabell	Dulski
Betts	Carey	Eckhardt
Biaggi	Carter	Edwards, Calif.
Blanton	Clark	Eilberg

Evans, Colo.	Kyros	Randall
Ewins, Tenn.	Landgrebe	Rees
Fascell	Landrum	Reuss
Feighan	Leggett	Rhodes
Fisher	Lloyd	Roberts
Flood	Long, La.	Rodino
Foley	Long, Md.	Rogers, Fla.
Ford,	Lowenstein	Rooney, N.Y.
William D.	McCarthy	Rooney, Pa.
Fountain	McDonald,	Rosenthal
Fraser	Mich.	Rostenkowski
Frelinghuysen	McEwen	Rousselot
Friedel	Macdonald,	Ruppe
Fulton, Tenn.	Mass.	St Germain
Fuqua	Madden	Scott
Gallagher	Mahon	Shipley
Garmatz	Malliard	Sisk
Gaydos	Mathias	Smith, Calif.
Glaimo	Matsunaga	Snyder
Gibbons	Meeds	Steed
Gilbert	Mikva	Steiger, Wis.
Goldwater	Miller, Calif.	Stevens
Gonzalez	Mills	Stratton
Goodling	Mink	Stubblefield
Gray	Mollohan	Stuckey
Green, Pa.	Monagan	Sullivan
Griffiths	Montgomery	Symington
Gubser	Moorhead	Teague, Tex.
Hagan	Morgan	Thompson, N.J.
Hamilton	Morton	Udall
Hanna	Moss	Ullman
Hansen, Wash.	Murphy, Ill.	Van Deerin
Hathaway	Natcher	Waggonner
Hawkins	Nedzi	Watts
Hays	Nix	Whalley
Hicks	Obey	White
Hollifield	O'Hara	Whitten
Hosmer	Olsen	Wiggins
Howard	O'Neal, Ga.	Wilson, Bob
Jacobs	O'Neill, Mass.	Wilson,
Johnson, Calif.	Ottinger	Charles H.
Johnson, Pa.	Patten	Wolf
Jones, Ala.	Pepper	Wright
Jones, N.C.	Perkins	Wyatt
Jones, Tenn.	Phillbin	Yates
Kazen	Podell	Yatron
Kee	Preyer, N.C.	Young
Keith	Price, Ill.	Zablocki
Kuykendall	Price, Tex.	

NOT VOTING—86

Alexander	Dowdy	Patman
Baring	Edmondson	Pelly
Barrett	Edwards, La.	Pettis
Beall, Md.	Fallon	Pickle
Belcher	Farbstein	Poage
Berry	Flynt	Pollock
Blackburn	Gettys	Powell
Blatnik	Hanley	Pryor, Ark.
Bow	Hébert	Purcell
Brook	Horton	Reifel
Brooks	Hull	Rivers
Burton, Utah	Hungate	Rogers, Colo.
Bush	Hunt	Roudebush
Button	Ichord	Roybal
Camp	King	Ruth
Casey	Kleppe	Saylor
Cederberg	Kluczynski	Scherle
Celler	Lujan	Schneebell
Clawson, Del	Lukens	Smith, N.Y.
Collier	McCulloch	Staggers
Corman	McFall	Stokes
Cowger	McMillan	Taft
Daddario	May	Tunney
Dawson	Melcher	Watson
Delaney	Meskill	Weicker
Denney	Michel	Whitehurst
Derwinski	Murphy, N.Y.	Widnall
Devine	Myers	Wold
Dingell	Nelsen	

So the amendment was rejected. The clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Beall of Maryland.
 Mr. Casey with Mr. Meskill.
 Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Bush.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Denney.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Taft.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Horton.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Berry.
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Devine.
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Widnall.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Stokes.
 Mr. McFall with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Hull with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Hunt.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. Cederberg.
 Mr. Pickle with Mr. Scherle.
 Mr. Handley with Mr. Wold.
 Mr. Melcher with Mr. Schneebell.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Reifel.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Pettis.
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Lukens.
 Mr. Ichord with Mr. Belcher.
 Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Roybal with Mr. King.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Bow.
 Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Myers.
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Button.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Ruth.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Watson.
 Mr. Hungate with Mr. Derwinski.
 Mr. Tunney with Mr. Kleppe.
 Mr. McCulloch with Mr. Camp.
 Mr. Del Clawson with Mr. Whitehurst.
 Mr. Pollock with Mr. Nelsen.
 Mr. Lujan with Mr. Cowger.

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

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Unqualifiedly, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross of Iowa moves to recommit the Bill H.R. 17654 to the Committee on Rules.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 326, nays 19, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 305]

YEAS—326

Abbitt	Bevill	Buchanan
Adair	Biaggi	Burke, Fla.
Adams	Blester	Burke, Mass.
Addabbo	Bingham	Burleson, Tex.
Albert	Blanton	Burlison, Mo.
Anderson,	Boggs	Burton, Calif.
Calif.	Boland	Byrne, Pa.
Anderson, Ill.	Bolling	Byrnes, Wis.
Anderson,	Brademas	Caffery
Tenn.	Brasco	Carey
Andrews,	Bray	Carter
N. Dak.	Brinkley	Chamberlain
Annunzio	Broomfield	Chappell
Arends	Brotzman	Chisholm
Ashley	Brown, Calif.	Clancy
Ayres	Brown, Mich.	Clark
Bell, Calif.	Brown, Ohio	Clausen,
Bennett	Broyhill, N.C.	Don H.
Betts	Broyhill, Va.	Clay

Cleveland Heckler, Mass.
 Colahan Heistoski
 Collins Henderson
 Colmer Hicks
 Conable Hogan
 Conte Hollifield
 Conyers Hosmer
 Corbett Howard
 Coughlin Hutchinson
 Cramer Jacobs
 Crane Jarman
 Culver Johnson, Calif.
 Cunningham Johnson, Pa.
 Daniel, Va. Jonas
 Daniels, N.J. Jones, N.C.
 Davis, Ga. Jones, Tenn.
 Davis, Wis. Karth
 de la Garza Kastenmeier
 Dellenback Kazen
 Dennis Kee
 Dent Keith
 Dickinson Koch
 Diggs Kuykendall
 Donohue Kyl
 Dorn Kyros
 Downing Landrum
 Dulski Langen
 Dwyer Latta
 Eckhardt Leggett
 Edwards, Ala. Lennon
 Edwards, Calif. Lloyd
 Ellberg Long, La.
 Erlenborn Long, Md.
 Esch Lowenstein
 Eshleman McCarthy
 Evans, Colo. McClory
 Ewins, Tenn. McCloskey
 Fascell McClure
 Felghan McDade
 Findley McDonald,
 Fish Mich.
 Fisher McEwen
 Flood McKneally
 Flowers Macdonald,
 Foley Mass.
 Ford, Gerald R. MacGregor
 Ford, William D.
 Foreman Mahon
 Fountain Mailliard
 Fraser Mann
 Frelinghuysen Marsh
 Frey Martin
 Friedel Mathias
 Fulton, Pa. Matsunaga
 Fulton, Tenn. Mayne
 Fuqua Meeds
 Gallfanakis Mikva
 Gallagher Miller, Calif.
 Garmatz Miller, Ohio
 Gaydos Minish
 Glaimo Mink
 Gibbons Minshall
 Gilbert Mize
 Goldwater Mizell
 Gonzalez Mollohan
 Goodling Monagan
 Gray Moorhead
 Green, Oreg. Morgan
 Green, Pa. Morse
 Griffin Morton
 Griffiths Mosher
 Grover Moss
 Gubser Murphy, Ill.
 Gude Natcher
 Hagan Nedzi
 Haley Nichols
 Hall Nix
 Halpern Obey
 Hamilton O'Hara
 Hammer- O'Konski
 schmidt Olsen
 Hanna O'Neal, Ga.
 Hansen, Idaho O'Neill, Mass.
 Hansen, Wash. Ottinger
 Harrington Patten
 Harsha Pepper
 Harvey Perkins
 Hastings Pike
 Hathaway Pirnie
 Hawkins Podell
 Hays Poff
 Heckler, W. Va. Pollock

NAYS—19

Abernethy Jones, Ala.
 Andrews, Ala. Landgrebe
 Ashbrook Michel
 Aspinall Mills
 Cabell Montgomery
 Duncan Passman
 Gross Rarick

Schmitz
 Sikes
 Steed
 Teague, Tex.
 Whitten

Alexander Dingell
 Baring Dowdy
 Barrett Edmondson
 Beall, Md. Edwards, La.
 Belcher Fallon
 Berry Farbstein
 Blackburn Flynt
 Blatnik Gettys
 Bow Hanley
 Brook Hébert
 Brooks Horton
 Burton, Utah Hull
 Bush Hungate
 Button Hunt
 Camp Ichord
 Casey King
 Cederberg Kleppe
 Celler Kluczynski
 Clawson, Del. Lujan
 Collier Lukens
 Corman McCulloch
 Cowger McFall
 Daddario McMillan
 Dawson Melcher
 Delaney Meskill
 Denney Murphy, N.Y.
 Derwinski Nelsen
 Devine Myers

NOT VOTING—84

Patman
 Pelly
 Pettis
 Philbin
 Pickle
 Poage
 Powell
 Pryor, Ark.
 Purcell
 Reifel
 Rivers
 Rogers, Colo.
 Roudebush
 Roybal
 Ruth
 Saylor
 Scherle
 Schneebell
 Staggers
 Stokes
 Stuckey
 Taft
 Tunney
 Watson
 Welcker
 Whitehurst
 Widnall
 Wold

So the bill was passed.
 The clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Beall of Maryland.
 Mr. Casey with Mr. Cederberg.
 Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Bush.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Denney.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Taft.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Horton.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Berry.
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Devine.
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Widnall.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Welcker.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Stokes.
 Mr. McFall with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Hull with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Hunt.
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Cowger.
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.
 Mr. Pickle with Mr. Scherle.
 Mr. Hanley with Mr. Wold.
 Mr. Melcher with Mr. Schneebell.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Reifel.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Pettis.
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Lukens.
 Mr. Ichord with Mr. Belcher.
 Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Roybal with Mr. Derwinski.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Bow.
 Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Button.
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Myers.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Watson.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. King.
 Mr. Hungate with Mr. Ruth.
 Mr. Tunney with Mr. McCulloch.
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Camp.
 Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Nelsen.
 Mr. Lujan with Mr. Kleppe.
 Mr. Whitehurst with Mr. Del Clawson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SISK. 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.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO MAKE APPROPRIATE TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING CHANGES IN H.R. 17654

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of H.R. 17654, the Clerk of the House be permitted to make appropriate technical and conforming changes and adjustments with respect to the table of contents, section numbers and references, section headings, punctuation and grammar, the spelling of words, the numbering of the respective parts of titles, references to parts and titles, the consolidation and relocation of sections and amendments, and other technical and conforming changes and adjustments with respect to the format of H.R. 17654.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 368. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2264) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide authorization for grants for communicable disease control and vaccination assistance," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SAXBE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 3558, AMENDING COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3558) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide continued financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the amendment of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, MACDONALD of Massachusetts, VAN DEERLIN, SPRINGER, and BROYHILL of North Carolina.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker,

I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we will not take up any other business this week. The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

We will have 11 suspensions as follows:

S. 2763, to allow purchase of systems and equipment for passenger motor vehicles over statutory price limitation;

H.R. 14678, penalties for illegal fishing in fishery zone;

S. 3153, conservation of protective coral reefs;

H.R. 18686, to authorize the transfer of Burley tobacco acreage allotments;

H.R. 15911, to increase rates of pension and dependency and indemnity compensation;

H.R. 18448, group mortgage insurance for service-connected paraplegic and quadriplegic veterans;

H.R. 16710, to authorize loans for mobile homes for veterans;

S. 719, to establish a national mining and minerals policy;

H.R. 19007, to designate certain lands as wilderness;

H.R. 12870, to establish the King Range National Conservation Area, Calif., and H.R. 17789, to amend act fixing boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress on the prisoners of war in Southeast Asia, with Colonel—and former Astronaut—Frank Borman speaking.

Also on Tuesday, we will have H.R. 18776, to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich., with an open rule and 2 hours of debate.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, we will have:

A House resolution to cite Arnold S. Johnson for contempt of Congress;

H.R. 17333, Investment Company Amendments Act of 1970, with an open rule and 2 hours of debate; and

H.R. 18583, Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, subject to a rule being granted.

Mr. Speaker, I might add the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules has advised me he hopes to hold a meeting of his committee on Monday on that bill.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNES- DAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF COMMITTEE ON THE JU- DICARY TO SIT DURING GEN- ERAL DEBATE ON SEPTEMBER 21

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on Monday, September 21.

Mr. Speaker, that is the subcommittee dealing with the crime bill.

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

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH AT KAN- SAS STATE UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon the President spoke to a university audience on the campus of Kansas State University. When he had finished his audience of 15,000 students, faculty, and friends of the university rose to give him a 10-minute standing ovation. Their response was eloquent testimony to the fact that Richard Nixon had met the need of the hour for firmness and commonsense within the framework of respect for the law—that necessary respect which Abraham Lincoln called “the religion of liberty.”

It is worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that the violence condemned by the President has not been limited by any means to the campuses. It is spreading in our streets and now in our skies. I say this not out of alarm—for alarmism has never helped to solve the most difficult problems we have faced—but out of quiet conviction that on the question of violence every law-abiding American, of whatever political persuasion, must put his foot down at precisely the line drawn by the President yesterday afternoon. The merit of the Kansas State speech lies in the fact that it focuses unequivocally on this one issue: Are we going to solve our problems through give and take, through due process, through the rule of law—or are we going to surrender to threat and counterthreat, to calculated acts of ter-

rorism, and to the cult of violence which abhors the religion of liberty?

Every American has the right to disagree with the President or any other elected official about how our problems should be solved, and the vitality of our political system is due in large measure to the fact that our citizens over the years have not hesitated to exercise that right. But each of us has an obligation to eschew violence as a means of winning political points, and the person who hesitates to denounce terrorism because he may sympathize with the alienated who resort to it, is as much at fault for the contagion of violence as the committed revolutionary who does not hesitate to destroy himself as he tries to bring down “the system.” It is time for all of us to bring the political game back within bounds, and the President's address yesterday made clear that the ground rules must include a respect for “those decencies, those self-restraints, those patterns of mutual respect for the rights and feelings of others” that must be preserved if freedom itself is to be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, may I commend the President's speech to any of my colleagues who may not have read it.

MIDDLE EAST HIJACKINGS REPRESENT INTERNATIONAL BLACKMAIL

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

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the recent Middle East hijackings represent international blackmail of the worst kind. The lives of scores of innocent people have been put on the auction block by a gang of fanatical outlaws.

The danger in the present wave at skyjackings is that it can easily spread into an infectious disorder all over the world. It is a quick and easy way for any fanatical minority to dramatize its case. It is also the kind of thing that appeals to deranged minds.

We must do all that can be done to deter aerial hijackings. I may feel especially strongly about this since my son was a passenger on the 747 that was hijacked to Cairo and destroyed, and a friend and former resident of my city is still a hostage in Jordan, but I am sure all civilized mankind is outraged and not just relatives of victims. Have we done all that is reasonably possible to do?

There seems to be no one final answer to the problem. Electronic devices are not sufficiently sensitive—but they help and we should increase their use. Sealed or locked pilot cabins are no solution as long as a hijacker can hold a pistol to a stewardess' or a passenger's head. Armed guards are not a final solution, since this is importing an additional risk onto a plane. Armed guards will help prevent hijacking, but the best long range solution is to deter such crimes—by having the hijacker returned promptly to the country of the hijacked plane where he can be quickly and effectively punished. The hijackers must have no hope of finding a safe haven and must know they face swift justice wherever they land.

I have today introduced a bill whose purpose is to accomplish this. It provides that in any case in which an aircraft is hijacked to a foreign country, it shall be unlawful for any air carrier to carry as a passenger any citizen of such foreign country until that country has extradited the hijacker to the flag country of the hijacked aircraft. The President is requested to take the steps necessary to establish this policy on an international basis.

Under this procedure, the citizens of a country will exert pressure on their own government to force that government to return the hijacker, since the citizens will be unable to fly anywhere on any plane until this is done.

Proposals to quarantine any nation which fails to deal effectively with hijackers will be made before the Foreign Affairs Committee next week. My bill may be a practical way to do this.

This is an extraordinary step. It has the disadvantage of punishing the innocent by depriving them of the right to aircraft travel through no fault of their own. But the situation is extraordinary. We are no longer dealing with the demented or the irrational but with purposeful terrorists. Firm steps are necessary.

All of us are sick and tired of violence. It must be stopped.

PERSONAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, it has become my practice at the outset of each general election campaign to submit for the RECORD a full disclosure of my personal financial status. I may regret that these regular listings of my assets consume only a few brief lines of type. I offer them, obviously, in no spirit of flaunting my worth—which, with six children to raise and educate, has never moved far from the brink of insolvency.

Rather, I make these biennial accountings in the belief that the people of my district are entitled to know whether I, as the nominee of my party for a 2-year term in Congress, am free of financial ties which might influence my actions as their representative.

Under California's community property law, my wife and I jointly own a mortgaged residential rental property of about 2½ acres on Poway Road in Poway, Calif.; equity of about \$24,500 in our present residence at 3930 Argyle Terrace NW., in Washington, D.C.; a commercial lot and residential lot in Imperial County, Calif.; 2½ unimproved acres in Mojave County, Ariz.; and 9 undeveloped acres near Hilo, Hawaii.

We own no corporate stocks, and no bonds of any nature. My salary as a Member of Congress represents slightly more than 95 percent of our gross income. Our Internal Revenue Service forms will be made available for scrutiny, if requested, by news media or any other responsible body.

CITIZENSHIP COMMENTARY CEREMONY

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today is Citizenship Day. It was so designated by Congress almost two decades ago to commemorate the signing of the Constitution on September 17, 1787, and in recognition of all persons who, by coming of age or by naturalization, have attained citizenship during the past year.

Unfortunately, relatively little public notice will be taken of this special day. Few Americans are even aware that today is anything except Thursday. Although 3½ million young people have attained the right to vote in the past year, for most of them nothing special will be done today, or any other day, to celebrate and sanctify their attainment of this most precious of all democratic rights.

President Nixon will give a speech, yet few other public officials, religious, civic, or educational leaders, in any part of the Nation will hold any type of ceremony or special observance to recognize the importance of this very special day. Although President Nixon issued a proclamation over 3 months ago asking for such observances to be planned for today, since it is not a holiday, for most Americans it will be business as usual.

This blasé attitude would be unfortunate during normal times. It is tragic during a period of our history when democracy is being challenged by a doubting generation of young people, many of whom have lost faith in democratic institutions which have made this country so unique in all human history, so durable, so strong.

At a time when all too many seem willing to countenance rioting, burning, and some even bombing, it is sad, indeed, that the adult community does not impress upon young people the most powerful and important weapon of social change they can ever receive—the right to vote.

And, in great measure, because the adult community makes no fuss over this newly acquired right of young people who have just become of age, because we rarely publicly reaffirm our own faith in the right to vote, few young people attribute much significance to this newly acquired right and power. The infectious disease of not voting, from which many never recover, takes over. And it takes its heaviest toll among the young, the ignorant, the poor, the disenfranchised.

Is it any wonder?

When a person from a foreign land becomes a naturalized citizen of the United States, there is often a very elaborate and impressive ceremony. He assembles with others to be naturalized in the Federal or State court nearest his home. Relatives and other friends are present. Typically, after an invocation, a color guard presents the flag of the United States. Standing before the flag of his newly adopted nation, the person to be naturalized repeats the oath of

allegiance to the United States and becomes at that moment a citizen. Following this, the new citizen is addressed and welcomed by various community leaders such as the mayor of his city. All present, new and old citizens alike, then sing the national anthem together.

After participating in such an impressive, patriotic event, it is no wonder that new citizens tend to cherish the right to vote and to exercise it at each election.

As a naturalized citizen he has actively chosen to make the United States his new home, to abide by its laws, to defend it if necessary, and to participate in the functioning of its government. For these rights and privileges he has waited for a period of 5 years, studied its history and form of government, and finally taken an oath to defend his new country.

A person who is born in this country usually lives here 21 years before he gains the right to vote. He generally attends 12 years of school in which he spends much of his time, or at least thinks that he does, trying to learn the language, history, and government of our country. At 18 he registers for the draft. Yet when he becomes of age to vote there is no ceremony, no recognition, no event to impress upon him that voting is what democracy is all about.

There should be such a ceremony and it should be on September 17. Becoming 18 in a democracy should be more than the point at which a young man becomes eligible to go to war. Furthermore, I cannot think of a better time to begin planning for such an appropriate ceremony than right now. Next year, we may very well be welcoming over 10½ million young people to the rolls of new voters if the Supreme Court upholds the constitutionality of the 18-year-old vote. In any event it is vitally important that we impress upon all new voters of whatever age the opportunity and the responsibility that are attached to their newly acquired right.

I propose that a citizenship commencement ceremony be held each year on September 17 in Washington, and simultaneously in every city and town in the Nation. To that end, I am introducing a joint resolution today calling upon the President of the United States and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to participate with congressional leaders in a ceremony in Washington, D.C., which shall occur at a joint session of the House of Representatives and the Senate whenever the Congress is sitting on that day. At such a ceremony, selected citizens would be honored, including at least one from each of the 50 States who have achieved within the previous year a status entitling them to vote. This would obviously be the most appropriate forum for the President's traditional Citizenship Day speech, and the Chief Justice should administer a simple, but important, oath of citizenship to the participants. An appropriate certificate would be presented to each.

Such ceremony, coming approximately 6 weeks before the November elections, would remind us all—and especially young people—of the importance of registering so that each will be able to exer-

cise his franchise when election day comes. It will help demonstrate to young people, including the disenchanted and the despairing, the significance and the power of citizenship and hopefully motivate them to use the American system and make it work for them according to the time-honored means which alone form the strength and security of our Nation.

The text of the resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 1374

Concerning a Citizenship Commencement Ceremony for new voters.

Whereas September 17 is designated Citizenship Day nationally and should be a day of celebration in which all individuals are given personal honor, attention and recognition who in the previous 12 months have achieved a status entitling them to the most precious of all rights of citizenship—the right to vote; and

Whereas the appropriate fulfillment of this special day requires the participation of the highest officials of all levels of government; Now

Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that on each September 17 beginning in the year 1971, a Citizenship Commencement Ceremony be held in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, during which:

1. Appropriate remarks will be delivered by the President of the United States.

2. Citizenship Commencement certificates will be presented jointly by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate to selected persons who achieved during the preceding 12 months a status entitling them to vote, such selection to include at least one from each State of the Union;

3. An oath of citizenship will be administered to this selected group by the Chief Justice of the United States.

Be it resolved further, that whenever the Congress is in session on September 17, this ceremony shall occur during a joint meeting of the House of Representatives and the Senate; and

Be it resolved further, that state and local officials be encouraged to hold similar simultaneous ceremonies coordinated to the fullest extent possible with the one in Washington, and that they be encouraged, in addition, to provide for the registration for voting of these citizens as a part of the ceremony.

FREE POLAND GIVES AWARD TO REP. JOHN J. ROONEY

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the free Polish government's highest awards was presented Wednesday, September 16, to our distinguished colleague and my personal friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY).

I had the honor to be present and to take part in the ceremony as Zbigniew Stypulkowski, representative in the United States of the free Polish government in exile, awarded the Officer's Cross of Polonia Restituta to JOHN ROONEY.

There are few persons in public life today who are deserving of this special recognition and JOHN ROONEY is one of them. His efforts on behalf of the people of Poland and our Polish-American citizens amply justify this high honor.

In paying this tribute to our colleague from Brooklyn, we also had the opportunity to once again to remind one and all of the undying spirit of free Poland. Although she stands occupied by the Communists, Poland still strives for freedom—a goal she will one day achieve.

Mr. Stypulkowski knows well of the efforts of free Poland. He was one of the underground leaders in World War II and was imprisoned and tried by the Communists.

Presiding at the ceremony was Col. Casimir Lenard, Washington representative of the Polish-American Congress. Others taking part were: Stefan Korbonowski, former chairman of the Assembly of Captive European Nations; Karol Burke, Anthony Tarnowski, Miss Kristine Malinowska, Ing Jan Miska, and Richard Mossin.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include the text of Mr. Stypulkowski in presenting the award, Congressman ROONEY's response and my own remarks:

REMARKS OF MR. STYPULKOWSKI

Congressman ROONEY: I am instructed by the Polish Supreme Council in London to bestow upon you the Officer's Cross of the Polonia Restituta.

This high distinction has been established after the First World War, when Poland—partitioned between Prussia, Russia and Austria for more than one hundred years—regained its independence and its rightful place among free nations.

Alas, after six years of uninterrupted struggle during the second World War, after losing in it over six million human lives and 40% of its national assets, Poland is again in the bondage of her foes.

Called during that war the "world's inspiration", later she was left at the mercy of Stalin and his henchmen. Twenty five years passed since the war—Poland is still occupied by the Soviet armed forces, the communist system is still being forcibly imposed on her.

The Teheran and Yalta agreements were not only a crime, they were more than that—they were a great blunder. They were made in the name of world peace. It is evident now what kind of a peace has been achieved.

To safeguard it the U.S. has to spend nearly 80 billion dollars a year on armaments, nuclear devices and ABM stands. We look with ever increasing anxiety on what is going on around in the world.

WORLD FUTURE AT STAKE

The center of the gathering storm is in Europe. Let there be no doubt. The just concluded pact between Kosygin and Brandt—with all its implications—proves that Soviet Russia in her offensive mood wants first to solidify her hegemony in Central and Eastern Europe, obtain its confirmation and then to wreck the Western Alliance in Europe. The world's future domination by communism is at stake.

Money, armaments and so called treaties aimed at peace do not suffice to defend the World from communist danger. Such treaties often are not worthy of the paper on which they have been scribbled. Modern wars are laden with the risk of bringing about the extinction of humanity.

The outcome of the present world struggle will be resolved first of all by the spiritual forces—the strength of moral forces. The deadly enemies of these forces are fear, cynicism and hypocrisy with which so many governments and people are inclined to meet every offensive move of the Soviets.

The Poles cannot fight for freedom and their historically justified independence with a shooting war against the Soviets. In the

present circumstances it would be suicidal. They do not advise the Western World—although they are a part of it, to declare a nuclear war against Russia in order to get rid of the vestiges of brutal colonialism in Europe—this colonialism disappeared from other continents and is so detrimental to the just and lasting peace.

POLES REALIZE RESPONSIBILITY

The Poles are fully conscious that the problem of Poland's freedom is primarily their own responsibility. They proved it during a thousand years of history. Thus, they agree entirely with the political doctrine of the President of the United States, which can be summarized in a few words: "He who expects to be helped must first help himself".

Well—in this context the Polish people deserve to have not only the respect and sympathy of the Western World, but also the active assistance of that World. Poland is in the forefront of the struggle for the preservation of the Christian civilization.

Soviet Russia has swallowed this country but is still unable to digest it. The Polish nation with its unbroken moral strength, with its large sphere of influence in the whole region of Eastern Europe, is still a formidable obstacle to the further ambitions of the communist conquerors.

The Polish people badly need this practical assistance from their friends in the Free World. They are pressing for it not from a position of poor relatives but as partners in the common heritage—proud of it and more than the others aware of how much it is in danger.

But even the American administration endowed with far-reaching vision and imbued with best intentions can do little for the Polish cause unless it finds strong, determined support in this respect from the public opinion in this great country. Our common adversaries are watching this determination very carefully and play on its weaknesses.

NEED FOR INFORMED HELP

Therefore, it is so vital to have in the American public life dedicated, well informed, firm and talented supporters of the Polish cause. You, our distinguished Congressman, are one of them. During your long and brilliant political career you watched the events in Poland intensely. You never failed to publicly condemn acts of enslavement and terror in Poland. You never gave approval to the present status quo in Eastern Europe, and—we are sure—you will never give it in the future.

Although, I understand that you are very economy-minded in respect to public funds, you helped appropriate considerable means aimed at helping the Polish people—who live and survive that ordeal.

You were always ready to stretch out a helping hand to the Polish political refugees, many thousands of them are now living in the U.S. In your constituency you managed to establish firm bonds with the Americans of Polish extraction, who reciprocate your services with warm feelings.

Last year you graciously attended the Polish celebration at Monte Cassino in Italy in connection with the 25th anniversary of the historical battle won by the Polish troops. Your presence there, as a distinguished American citizen and statesman, was of symbolic significance and was so well received by my countrymen.

You are continuously proving the exactness of the English saying: "A friend in need is a friend indeed".

This is why—I am so proud and feel so privileged to confer on you—on behalf of the Polish political authorities in the free World—the high decoration of the "Polonia Restituta".

RESPONSE BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN ROONEY

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague, Representative Dulski, officers of Free Poland, my friends: I feel quite inadequate in attempting to tell you how deeply grateful I am to you for the honor you do me today here in Washington. It is always a pleasant experience to have one's efforts recognized, but it is even more pleasant when those who so honor you are longtime personal friends. In this respect I always cherish the small boy's definition of a friend as "a person who knows all about you and loves you just the same."

Some of you who have given such long and dedicated leadership to "Free Poland" are among my closest friends. Many of you know all about me, so it's gratifying you still can show affection for me.

I am deeply impressed with the tributes which have been paid me. I am particularly grateful for the words of my warm friend and colleague, Congressman Dulski.

It is not only a pleasant interlude in these hectic days to visit with you old friends and to meet some new ones, but it is an inspiration to see gathered together again men who have devoted themselves for many years to the betterment of Polish-American benefits and to ultimate re-winning of freedom for the people of Poland.

In my long years in the Congress I have known and worked with countless organizations and individuals. Few such working relationships were as pleasant or as productive as have been those with our fine Polish-American organizations.

The leadership of such organizations as the Polish American Congress has always been most generous with their counsel and support. I have marvelled at the fighting spirit of these leaders. I have been blessed richly by having the opportunity to serve and to be helped by illustrious Polish churchmen.

These courageous "soldiers of the cross" have contributed greatly to the lofty aspirations of the Polish-American organizations and to the unremitting determination of all Polish Americans to restore Polish sovereignty.

Many of you who are in attendance here today have long displayed the same valor and determination which I saw so clearly demonstrated by the magnificent Polish hero, the late General Wladyslaw Anders, with whom I was privileged to confer in Monte Cassino in Italy shortly before his death.

I shall always count as one of my most meaningful associations the privilege of working with your leadership. Your cooperation and your timely support given time after time have given me renewed confidence and increased determination to fight for all legislation which will improve the well-being of all our citizens and which will help us in sharing our blessings of freedom with people of the world to whom these blessings have long been denied.

So it is with deep humility but with genuine pleasure that I accept this honor. I thank all of you who have played a part in considering me worthy of this recognition. Please accept my warmest thanks and my assurances that I shall rededicate my efforts to the achievement of the goals to which we all aspire.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE T. J. DULSKI

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, It gives me real pleasure to share with the leadership of Free Poland in honoring my warm personal friend and colleague, John Rooney.

No man in public life is more deserving to receive the coveted medal of "Polonia Restituta" than the man who so closely identi-

fied himself for more than a quarter of a century with the problems and programs of Polonia world wide.

It is not happenstance that John Rooney is often listed as one of the "Polish" Congressmen. His efforts and his successes in behalf of the people of Poland and our own Polish-American citizens amply justify this designation.

It has been my privilege to work closely with the man you honor today. I know first hand the degree to which he has devoted himself to his constituents of Brooklyn as well as to the people of America.

No man in Congress can boast a better attendance and voting record than John Rooney. Few can equal the dynamic leadership which has distinguished his more than 27 years of service. Few members have served longer or more faithfully on the House committees of which they are members.

As Chairman of one of the extremely important House Appropriations Sub-committees, John Rooney has established a brilliant reputation for handling the appropriations for such key departments as State and Justice.

Many of us, who are indebted to John Rooney for his wise counsel and willing cooperation, look with what is tantamount to awe at the imposing number of major legislative achievements accomplished during the last 25 years for which John Rooney merits a great deal of credit.

The laws which he sponsored and for which he fought cover most of the broad humanitarian gains which the American people enjoy today. Gains such as broadened social security and medicare benefits, improved immigration laws, civil rights legislation and anti-crime measures are but a few of the legislative achievements of our friend, John J. Rooney.

Perhaps it is because of his own background of being born of immigrant parents and growing up in Brooklyn among the families of the foreign-born that John Rooney has so long been a champion of our "new Americans" and a loyal supporter of our fine nationality groups, that he has won the deep respect and admiration of these groups and organizations.

We of Polish extraction feel a particularly close bond with John Rooney because of his efforts. Polish veterans who fought both Hitler and Stalin were permitted to enter this country as immigrants. He waged a long and successful battle to assure that thousands of our Polish friends and neighbors displaced from their homelands and living in filth and squalor in refugee camps were given a safe haven here and elsewhere in the free world.

John Rooney has been the recipient of many honors from numerous governments and organizations. In recent days he has been honored by his own government in being named as a Regent of the Smithsonian Institution. The honor which you bestow upon him today is a fine example of the recognition which his Polish-American friends have given him time after time.

The people in Poland know and admire John Rooney not only because of his visits to Poland and the material assistance he has given them in the form of hospitals and school feeding programs but for his forthright stand in condemning the Soviet grab of Poland and in seeking to redress the wrongs suffered by the people of Poland.

I commend the leadership of Free Poland for their decision to honor Congressman John J. Rooney. I congratulate you, John, in receiving this significant award, which you have surely earned.

I look forward personally to many more years of working with you in the Congress and most particularly in working together with the fine people who honor you today.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION HAS GIVEN MORE AID TO ISRAEL THAN PREDECESSORS

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, between August 31 and September 4, I was in Israel. During that time I had a number of talks with a number of Israeli leaders. One of these interviews was with the Deputy Prime Minister of Education and Culture, Yigal Allon.

During the past 20 months, I have repeatedly called for increased military aid to Israel. My recent personal fact-finding tour to that country reinforced my belief in the importance of a strong and viable State of Israel in the Middle East to the United States.

On the eve of meetings between Israel's Prime Minister, Golda Meir and President Nixon, I believe a transcript of at least a portion of my interview with Mr. Allon would be of interest to my colleagues.

Question. HAMILTON FISH, Jr.: First of all, it is my understanding the Russians are flying operational missions over Egypt. I have also heard that there has actually been combat flights against Israeli pilots. I have also heard that the number of Russian and Egyptian pilots now outweigh the number of Israeli pilots. In the United States we hear that the policy of our country is to maintain a balance and to see that it does not tip against Israel. If this is true, and if air power is a key here, it would seem to me the point could be reached where the numerical superiority of Russian and Egyptian pilots and aircraft could change this balance . . .

Answer. YIGEL ALLON: Yes. But we have the advantage of not seeking expansion. We don't have to bother about controlling Egypt. For us it is enough if we are capable of controlling our own skies. Therefore the supply of arms must be a little more generous.

I must say, that the Nixon administration is doing a lot—more than any other administration before. Johnson's promise to supply us with Phantoms was fulfilled by Nixon, including the Sky Hawks and some other weapons.

Yet the United States is weighing this balance with milligrams, not even kilograms. As if it can be so weighed. So be a little more generous and open-hearted. Supply a little more. Let the Israelis have the necessary weapons in plenty. We shall pay for them—if not in cash then in 10 years, in 5 years, and sometimes in cash. But I must do justice to the Nixon administration. They gave much more than any other administration before, which we appreciate.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I express the feeling of all my colleagues when I state that I hope the present meeting between President Nixon and Mrs. Meir heals the apparent breach which has developed between our two countries since the start of the standstill cease-fire. From meetings with constituents in my district, I have become aware that a credibility gap has occurred. Mr. Allon has clearly stated that the Nixon administration has done far more than any previous administration in assistance to Israel. I hope from the current meetings will come both military and economic credits for Israel, and that the traditional warm and

friendly relationship between our two countries will again become clear and unquestioned.

THE ADMINISTRATION MUST RESPOND TO ISRAEL'S PREMIER

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Premier Golda Meir of Israel has arrived in the United States. Tomorrow she will meet with the President. Certainly, the urgency of this meeting is apparent. The cease-fire violations by the Egyptians and the Soviets have gravely imperiled the tenuous hopes for peace in the Mideast. The despicable acts of the Palestinian guerrillas in hijacking planes flying in international commerce and their holding of hostages show the nature of those dedicated to the destruction of Israel.

Various reports have indicated that the administration is contemplating a large economic aid package for Israel, and I urge the administration to meet Israel's needs. It is essential that actual extension of such aid be one of the outcomes of the meeting between Premier Meir and President Nixon tomorrow.

In addition, the President must state in the strongest terms the U.S. condemnation of the cease-fire violations, and the U.S. firm support for Israel. While the administration's desire to effect a state of peace in the Mideast is commendable, the cease-fire, which has so much been the initiative of the administration, has been working to the very severe detriment of Israel, skewing the balance of power and, thereby, imperiling her very survival.

The administration must make clear that it has no intention that this balance be upset—whether through Israel suffering combat losses, or through the invidious violations of a paper cease-fire. One way to do so is to provide Israel with the sophisticated weaponry necessary to counteract the SAM-2 and SAM-3 missiles which have been placed within the cease-fire zone in violation of the cease-fire by the Egyptians and the Soviets. Another way is to exercise through diplomatic channels the firmest of positions, leaving no doubt or question that the United States is committed to the survival of Israel in strength and prosperity.

WHERE IS THE ADVICE FROM CONGRESS IN THIS CRITICAL HOUR?

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months many of our most respected colleagues in the Congress who serve in the other body have debated the prerogatives of that body and its Committee on Foreign Relations with regard to the making of America's foreign policy. They feel they

should advise and consent to the actions of the President.

Well, now is the time.

The critical situation in the nation of Jordan presents extremely difficult and delicate choices to those who shape the foreign policy of the United States. The very lives of Americans in Jordan may be endangered as I speak. Some of these are businessmen and tourists who are in Jordan willingly dealing with the established Government and businesses there. Others are the Americans among the hostages being held by the Arab guerrilla forces after the guerrillas hijacked and destroyed the airplanes on which these innocent people were flying.

So, in this civil war or revolution Americans are under the control and protection of both sides—the established government of King Hussein and the guerrilla rebels trying to destroy that government.

What should America do?

Where is the advice from the Congress in this critical hour? Why is it not forthcoming in the same clear, righteous, and stentorian tones with which we will be told—some months from now—what should or should not have been done?

Is it possible that those who would want to advise are too busy now with legislative matters put off while they debated resolutions on Cambodia and Vietnam after the fact? Or is it because of the campaign year that such advice is slow? Could it be that the members of that committee which feels its prerogatives particularly keenly cannot come to agreement on what should or should not be done? Or is it that they feel that they just do not know enough of the facts on which to take action? Surely their chairman will have an opinion, at least.

Lest any of my colleagues feel it is rude for me to press for this advice without offering my own, let me make my view clear. I feel King Hussein has been one of the few voices of reason in the Arab world in recent years and that his positions of moderate reasonableness must be maintained if lasting peace is ever to be found in the Middle East. The United States should do all possible to see that this exceptional man stays in power in Jordan and remains a position of leadership among Arabs—but we should not commit American men to the area or our Nation to war there.

However, my view is limited by my own limited knowledge of the intricate situation in this involved and complex part of the world. And so I shall place my faith in the President of the United States and his knowledgeable advisers to do the wise and right thing. And I shall pray that it will prove to be the best course of action—even where all the choices may be bad.

That is the best advice and consent I can offer.

NATIONAL COMMITMENT TO DESTROY MANKIND'S MOST MONSTROUS ENEMY: CANCER

(Mr. GALLAGHER asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 84 Members of this House joined me in proposing a national commitment to destroy mankind's most monstrous enemy: cancer.

On that date, we introduced House Resolution 1086, to provide for a 10-year national commitment to cure and control cancer in this decade. Our bill authorizes appropriations of no less than \$6.5 billion over the next 10 fiscal years to achieve that goal.

Also, on that date, over 600 prominent American cancer specialists and researchers publicly endorsed House Resolution 1086, and expressed their conviction that cancer could be cured if it were enacted. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 20268-20273.

But since that date, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1086 has remained stalled in committee, with no action scheduled or planned.

Also, since that date, more than 82,000 Americans have died of cancer, while countless others have contracted that killer disease.

The paradox is as striking as it is tragic.

For since we know that cancer can be cured, there is simply no excuse for permitting so many people to die such horrible deaths from this nightmarish affliction for lack of sufficient research funds.

There is no excuse for permitting this lack of funds to stand as the only formidable obstacle between cancer and cure.

And each day that we permit this paradox to exist, the same, terrible questions arise: How many more men in the prime of their lives—such as the late Vince Lombardi—will continue to be struck down by malignancy for our failure to cure cancer?

How many more families will be saddled with the overwhelming economic burdens of paying treatment costs for children or spouses or parents afflicted with cancer, for our failure to appropriate sufficient research funds?

These questions gnaw at our sensibilities, and tear at our consciences.

It is time that we provided a definitive answer.

For it is within our power to eliminate the scourge of malignancy by providing the necessary weapons to those dedicated scientists and physicians who now fight on the frontlines against cancer.

We can give them the powerful weapons they need to win the war which they fight so well today.

I believe that House Resolution 1086 fulfills this function, and that it should be acted upon without further delay.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am today filing a discharge petition to bring House Resolution 1086 to the floor for an immediate vote.

And I strongly urge all of my colleagues to sign this petition.

The issue of cancer is one which does not require extensive debate.

We, as all other people, are not immune to this disease.

We, as all other people, know its random terror and its mortal attack.

And it is up to us to act. For in the case of cancer, none serve who only stand and wait.

The thousands of letters reaching this body since the introduction of House Resolution 1086 attest to the fact that the American people will not permit this Congress to wait any longer.

It is time that we undertook a firm, meaningful, and adequately funded national commitment to life, a national commitment to erase cancer, and the fear of cancer, from all of our lives.

I ask the support of this body on the discharge petition for House Resolution 1086.

Thank you.

SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I know I have discussed the situation in the Middle East many times in this Chamber, but I must do so again today. Tomorrow, Mrs. Meir will be meeting with the President to discuss the crisis there, and that meeting ought not occur without some indication of the feelings of millions of Americans. I believe I am voicing some of those feelings today.

Foremost on our minds are the lives and well-being of those innocent people who have been made hostages by Arab terrorists—57 men and women—39 of them American citizens—are still in the hands of the air bandits, and one wants to avoid any public posturing that might add to the difficulty of obtaining their safe return. But surely the United States should make it clear that unless the hostages are released quickly and unharmed, all U.S. aid to refugee camps now under the control of Arab terrorist organizations will be stopped. We contribute more than two-thirds of the funds for the maintenance of these camps, and the plight of all refugees must be the concern of those who are more fortunate. But we cannot continue to finance sanctuaries—much less training grounds—for those who would blackmail the civilized world by kidnaping hundreds of travelers and then detaining some of them after a selection process that appears to have peculiarly sinister overtones. Furthermore, the U.S. Government will have to launch, and organize support for, an air boycott of all states that refuse to punish or extradite hijackers.

But our concern over the horror of the hijackings must not make us forget or fall silent about the larger problem presented by the flamboyant disregard of the terms of the cease-fire by the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic. America has a special responsibility to see that violations of the cease-fire agreement are rectified—we had so much to do with negotiating it in the first place. We simply strengthen the hands of those in the Arab States and the Soviet Union

who want another war when we allow good faith on the part of Israel to become a device for weakening her military position and threatening her very existence. So our interests as well as Israel's—and the interests of world peace generally—make it imperative that we not tolerate violations of a cease-fire we had so much to do with bringing about. We become patsies, not statesmen, when we allow our desire for peace to be used as a device for potential aggressors to gain advantages they could not otherwise gain over their potential victims.

For that reason, if for no other, we must support the demand of the Israeli Government for a return to the status quo ante as a precondition for the beginning of the negotiations. If the U.S.S.R. and the United Arab Republic refuse this demand, we must make available to Israel immediately whatever weaponry she requires to restore the military balance that has been undercut by the Soviet-Egyptian violations of the cease-fire.

I include in the RECORD at this point an editorial that appeared in the distinguished newspaper *Newsday* and the text of a statement placed in the *New York Times* of Thursday, September 17, by the Zionist Organization of America.

I hope the President takes note of the recommendations encompassed in these statements, and that he understands how many Americans agree that these measures are essential if there is to be any hope for lasting peace in the Middle East.

ISRAEL'S COMPLAINT

We'd give a lot to be in on the little chat that Golda Meir, the Israeli prime minister, and President Nixon plan to have at the White House tomorrow. For when the President looks across the table he's not going to behold a woman in love with the administration's Middle East policy. Not by any means. The complaints Mrs. Meir is likely to tick off to the President range from the administration's willingness to bargain for a "deal" with the Palestinian kidnapers to its inability to persuade the Russians and the Egyptians to keep their half of the bargain that was the American peace initiative. What Mrs. Meir's list of grievances is likely to add up to is a grave crisis in Israeli-American relations. It could not come at a worse time.

Even as Mr. Nixon and Mrs. Meir talk, the Middle East situation deteriorates. One Jordanian government crumbled yesterday, and the Palestinian commandos who are holding onto some 54 hostages would like nothing more than to see this new, Army-controlled government fall once again. We're afraid to contemplate what would happen if the hostages—at least 34 are Americans—are caught in the middle of a shoot-out in Amman. And, to make matters worse, Egypt just the other day moved extremely sophisticated, Russian manned SAM-3 missiles into the so-called "standstill" zone around the Suez Canal. Since the cease-fire Egypt's violations had been limited to introducing the more primitive SAM-2. This is a clear indication, in case there was any doubt, that that Kremlin condones if not encourages the Egyptian violations.

This is why Friday's meeting, if it produces nothing else must at least result in a closer working relationship between Washington and Jerusalem than so far has been evidenced. For the first principle of any American policy in the Middle East must be support for Israel. In confused times like

these it would be wise to reaffirm that cardinal fact. Indeed the success of any further American peace initiative in the Middle East—and we hope that the administration tries again—depends in no little measure on Israel's enemies knowing exactly on whose side the Americans would stand should the crunch ever come.

UNAVOIDABLE CONFRONTATION WITH THE TRUTH

Americans want peace in the Middle East. Americans accept our government's conclusion that a massive movement of missiles into the prohibited cease-fire zones by Egypt, aided and abetted by the Soviet Union, violated the newly agreed-upon military standstill agreement, thereby impairing the balance of power which the United States has pledged to maintain.

Americans are satisfied with the representations to Congress by our Department of State that military grants and economic aid are needed to enable Israel to maintain the status quo of the cease-fire lines.

It is appropriate for the United States to begin to treat Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East, as a de facto ally for the safeguarding of American interests.

Americans recognize that Israel took the risk of making substantial concessions regarding the conduct of peace negotiations in response to the urgings and recommendations of our Department of State.

Americans appreciate the contrast between our government's sincere initiative for Peace in the Middle East and the Soviet Union's military support and political advocacy of the extreme demands of the Arabs upon Israel.

Americans deplore that Soviet-controlled Egypt and terrorist-occupied Jordan lack genuine capacity to negotiate for peace.

Soviet military officers command Egyptian units. The Soviets control Egyptian ports and airfields. They man Nasser's missiles and supply trained jet crews. Jordan is occupied by bands of marauders who roam the country at will, paralyze Hussein's government, raid Israel and terrorize international airlines and their passengers. Arab governments have shown neither the willingness nor power to control Arab terrorist groups.

Americans will disassociate themselves from pressures upon Israel to negotiate for peace at any price.

Americans know that only the courage of confrontation with the truth today can prevent confrontation with disaster tomorrow.

Americans know that Israel has been and will remain the southern anchor for NATO. Israel can be counted on to help the Free World maintain the freedom of the Mediterranean. Israel is the last barrier against complete Soviet domination of the gateway to Asia and Africa.

We submit that wide dissemination of these views will strengthen the hands of our government to proceed on a realistic basis to safeguard American interests and achieve a genuine peace in the Middle East.

WYDLER ASKS HELP FOR CONSUMERS TO OBTAIN AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF BEEF

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, it appears that pressure brought to bear by a special interest lobby successfully aborted efforts of a congressional subcommittee to make public its investigative findings and recommendations on the increasing

retail price of beef. Such a turn of events raises a serious question as to which should come first—public or private interests.

Complaints from consumers over the unusually high and sudden price increase for beef, which began in early January 1969, were the basis for an investigation into the possible causes for such retail price hikes by the Special Studies Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. The investigation was conducted for several months and public hearings were held at my urging on October 7, 8, and 9, 1969.

The resulting 28-page report was critical of procedures used by both the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture and of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor in determining beef consumption and domestic beef needs. But the report did not find the efforts of these two departments at the base of the price increases.

Instead, the report generally concluded that the problem of supply and demand and an inadequate system of import quotas not geared to consumer demands were primarily responsible for the inflated prices of beef.

Two recommendations were made in the draft report of the subcommittee: First, that import quotas be determined on the basis of domestic need—perhaps established on the basis of the difference between domestic production and demand, and second, that an 18-member congressional commission be established for a 2-year period to study the entire beef industry—production, processing and distributing cycles—to make recommendations to assure that an adequate supply of beef would be continually available to the American consumer "at reasonable prices."

It was felt that assurance of a constant supply of beef would help to prevent a wild fluctuation in prices resulting from fluctuations in supply.

As the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, I felt that consumer interests had to be heard and considered as the subcommittee conducted its investigation. Unfortunately, consumer interests were subverted by a powerful special interest lobby, namely the American National Cattlemen's Association—ANCA—which lobbied and pressured against adoption of the final report—and succeeded.

Although the ANCA was violently opposed to any import quota increases, it should be made clear that the committee report made no recommendations to abolish import controls. On the contrary, the committee was deeply conscious of the problem of imports and their effect on the American economy. What the beef producers decried in the import recommendation was the simple suggestion that the meat import quota formula have a component connecting it to demand as well as production—so that the modest manufactured beef imports could be adjusted depending on consumer demand as well as producer supply. This

would currently amount, at most, to only one-tenth of the current quota amount. I believe that to inflate this suggestion into a proposal to abolish restrictions on imports is pure sensationalism.

On the question of a study commission, it is difficult to determine what the lobbyists found objectionable. Why should not the problem of rising beef prices be studied by competent experts? That is, unless there is something to hide.

A few years ago the National Commission on Food Marketing was set up to study and submit recommendations on many aspects of the American food supply problem. But this commission did not cover the area of beef supplies in any depth.

Would it not be beneficial, therefore, to consumers as well as to producers, processors, and retailers to have a similar body look into their problems and make recommendations for improvements?

The beef producer is interested, of course, in higher market prices which in turn will raise overall profit margins and dollar returns for his efforts.

Testimony from the meat producers revealed that the yearly increases in beef demand is about 3 percent—a figure which accounts for a 1-percent increase in population and a 2-percent increase in demand. According to industry spokesmen it is this 3-percent figure which is used by the producers in planning for production increases on a yearly basis.

If demand and supply are maintained at a constant level from year to year, prices should remain stable or increase only with the general nationwide inflationary trend.

What is most disturbing, however, is that the price of beef took a tremendous leap in the early months of 1969, over a very short period of time, far outstripping a significantly lower increase in prices resulting from inflation. Why?

This question was pursued by the subcommittee especially since an allegation had been made that the market development committee of the National Cattlemen's Association had attempted to create a supply lag in 1967 to artificially increase the price of live beef sold by the farmer and beef producer.

ANCA spokesmen told the subcommittee that in 1967 their market development committee had recommended to the industry, in general and on a voluntary basis, that it reduce the beef supply by 5 percent—that is 5 percent less tonnage of beef available for marketing—in order "for us to move into a net profit position" and "get ourselves in balance with effective demand."

I still find it difficult to rationalize how such an action as this jibes or blends itself with a "free market" concept of operation when producers can agree together to reduce production, lessen supply and in effect force an increase in prices which will be passed on to them. This is hardly what I would call a free market. And I, for one, would prefer Government control rather than industry control if we are not to have a truly free market.

I find this whole matter especially difficult to comprehend because it was the beef producers who, during the hearings, so ardently defended the free market concept of operation which allows the law of supply and demand to take its normal course.

Would not such an action by the market development committee be considered in most circles an illegal act to openly restrain trade?

Our committee was not the first to make this observation, and I was interested to learn that the same question had been raised several years earlier.

In 1967 the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice was requested to investigate an allegation that the American National Cattlemen's Association was promoting a plan to increase beef prices through a reduction in size of cattle herds—in other words to cut back production or "hold production constant" to use ANCA's own terms. The net effect would be a growing demand and a strict supply resulting in higher prices. The Department of Justice determined that no price fixing effort was being attempted in this case by the American National Cattlemen's Association, mainly because it only recommended such actions. I, for one, am still not convinced that such activity is proper or should be allowed to continue.

Furthermore, based on comments during the course of the hearings, I am convinced that the action in 1967 may well have been one of the prime factors causing the tremendous and sharp price hike in 1969.

Regardless of what action was taken in 1967 one must still wish to ask if any sector of the meat industry is profiteering from price increases.

Representatives of the beef industry—the producers and growers—ardently maintained that they were not engaged in a profitable business under current market conditions. And that, despite price increases, profits were not finding their way down to the producer. It is logical then to ask where the consumer's beef dollar is going as prices increase.

Three days of intensive questioning failed, in my opinion, to provide me with a satisfactory answer to just who gets what portion of the average housewife's beef dollar.

If we can believe the statistics of "expert witnesses" that the cattlemen receive 60 cents of the meat dollar, that the processor—slaughterhouse and packer—get 10 cents and that the retailer gets between 24 and 25 cents we are still left with an unaccounted 5 to 6 cents which, as evidenced by the price situation, is certainly not being passed back to the consumer.

Testimony offered later in the hearings stated that the producer was actually getting the unaccounted for 5 to 6 cents from "offals"—hides, fats, leftovers. Another witness claimed, however, that it was the processor who profited from the leftovers. Just who is getting the missing 5 cents may still be a mystery—but it is no mystery that the consumer and housewife is not.

If offals are worth 5 cents of the beef dollar, where are they being used? I am shocked to even consider the possibility that offals, which I believe make up the missing 5 cents of the beef dollar, are being used in processed meats. If this indeed is the case, which many sources have indicated to me it is, it is no wonder that the beef producers are fighting lean beef imports because such imports would be substituted for offals in processed meat production and, therefore, destroy a market for what might otherwise be waste products. The report was voted on affirmatively with my support in the subcommittee.

Objections to the report began, interestingly enough, before the report was to have been made public.

The draft report was supposed to be a confidential and internal working paper subject to changes and revision before possible passage and public release. Industry representatives obtained a copy of the report and began their attack, however, before the final review and analysis of the report was made by the full committee.

The American Farm Bureau Federation even sent a telegram to my office on April 8, 1970, the day before committee consideration of the report, which began "we have hurriedly analysed the Special Studies Subcommittee Report." How did the American Farm Bureau Federation get a copy of the report? It is amusing to me that they attempted to advise a Member of Congress on a confidential report which they should not have had access to at that stage in the committee's work.

Why was it that those opposed to the contents and recommendations of the report and only those opposed conducted an intensive lobby effort? No consumer interests had copies of the report or lobbied in favor of approval. Therefore, it is now time for all Americans to have access to the significant portions of the report, and I intend to take such action.

The lobby efforts of the American National Cattlemen's Association did result in the killing of recommendations for impartial and objective measures which are vitally needed to help correct some of the inequities responsible for the rising retail price of beef.

There is no doubt that this report was also rejected because the ANCA is opposed to any imports of foreign beef. They do not even want the matter discussed.

As many Americans who have followed this issue in the press, I too, wonder whether it was a committee of the Congress or the American National Cattlemen's Association which made the decision for the general public that beef supplies and beef prices were not to be investigated further and that the recommendations of the subcommittee were not to be made public.

The concentrated negative effort of the ANCA to defeat this report is, to me, convincing by itself that the congressional initiative in this area was necessary, timely, and in the interest of the American consumer.

Consumers have the right to expect

government agencies to see to it that the supply of beef reaching the American market is of the proper quality and quantity to satisfy the public's demand.

The public also has the right to expect that the supply of beef will be consistent throughout the year to assure retail price stability. But most importantly, the public has the right to demand that the Congress makes its decisions in this area independent from the lobby efforts of either domestic producers or importers of foreign beef whose aim may be to manipulate the retail beef market at the cost of the consumer's food dollar.

Questions will now be left unanswered because no study of the general problem will be made. The question of imports, who gets what portion of the consumer's beef dollar, or whether the 1967 action—recommendation—by the ANCA was responsible for price increases, and how to better equip our Federal departments with procedures to more accurately predict both production and demand, all these questions require answers if the American housewife and American consumer in general is to have an adequate supply of quality beef in the 1970's—at reasonable prices.

I strongly support the measures outlined in the report of the special studies subcommittee. And in the interest of consumer protection as well as in the interest of seeing an unbiased and objective study of this very complex subject undertaken, I intend to make every effort to encourage reconsideration of this subject by the committee even if this requires redrafting the body of the report so as to gain approval of a majority of the committee members.

The following findings and recommendations were contained in the report. They had my support and approval and I feel it my duty to make them a matter of public record.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The Federal Government, by purchases for the military, VA hospitals, Public Health Service hospitals, Bureau of Prisons facilities, and Agricultural Department school lunch and donation programs absorbs approximately 5 percent of the country's beef supply. As the country's largest beef purchaser, increases in the retail price of beef, such as occurred in the second quarter of calendar 1969, adds an extra burden to the Federal budget.

2. The upsurge of 10 cents per pound in the second quarter of 1969 represented a cost of approximately \$25 million in increased prices to the Government or about 28 million pounds less beef that it could purchase than before that price rise.

3. The Department of Agriculture, which issues through its Economic Research Service forecasts as to beef supply and prices, did not forecast any such price rise on either the farm, wholesale or retail level nor any reduction in supply.

4. The Department of Agriculture determines the farm-retail spread by establishing a composite retail price for choice beef, and wholesale and farm values, by weight price and product equivalents and deducting by-product values. The complexity of its procedures and formulae, and its varying assumptions, make it almost impossible to ascertain whether its determinations are reasonably accurate.

5. The method (changed since the hear-

ings) and statistics used by the Department of Agriculture to determine the composite retail price of beef, may well still be open to attack for not taking into account the higher cost of primal and subprimal cuts to the retailer for use in "special" sales.

6. The Department of Labor, through its Bureau of Labor Statistics, collects retail prices of various beef cuts, but admits that the prices it reports do not necessarily reflect the effect of special sales of beef, nor has it established the difference in the quality of beef at regular and sales prices, although it believes such difference exists.

7. The automatic operation of the Meat Import Quota Act of 1964 has been prevented by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State by means of so-called "voluntary" agreements to restrict beef imports.

8. The Department of Agriculture believes that there is no short-term beef shortage, notwithstanding that its estimates of beef production for 1969 and 1970, together with imports, show that the beef supply will not increase at the generally accepted minimal rate of 3 percent per annum needed to keep pace with increased consumer demand.

9. The sharp rise in the retail price of beef, more than 10 cents a pound, in the second quarter of 1969, cannot be justified by the slight drop in production of 2.5 percent during that period, since previous drops in production have not produced such a result.

10. None of the explanations advanced before or during the hearings justify the extent of the retail price rise and the continuation of retail prices at high levels.

11. The projections given to the committee by the Department of Agriculture and the American Meat Institute lead to the conclusion that the United States will encounter a beef shortage of some magnitude and sharply rising beef prices between now and the end of 1975, even if imports are increased. The Meat Import Quota Act, which requires a quota based only on domestic production will accentuate this adverse picture for the consumer.

12. Restrictions on meat imports are not needed at present to protect the domestic beef producers because the forecast is that the supply of beef, including available imports for the next 6 years, will be less than sufficient to meet demand in this country. This is especially true as to lean beef used for hamburger and processed meats, for which imported beef is used.

13. To determine whether consumers will have, in the 1970's, an adequate supply at reasonable prices of beef and other red meats,² supplemented by imports as needed, requires the establishment of a statutory commission for this purpose, in view of the complex issues and the various departments involved.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In view of the need for more lean beef, the appropriate committee of the Congress should give immediate consideration to the amendment of the Meat Import Quota Act of 1964 to provide for adjusting the annual import quota on the basis of changes in consumer demand as well as in production.

2. Congress should establish a commission to determine the adequacy of the meat supply for American consumers at reasonable

¹ A primal cut is the first breakdown of the carcass into parts, such as the chuck, sirloin, round, flank, etc. A subprimal cut is the breakdown of a primal cut, such as eye of the round, round steak, standing rump, etc. from the round. Food For Us All, 1969 Agriculture Yearbook, p. 96.

² Red meats, according to the Department of Agriculture, are beef, veal, pork, lamb, and mutton. Livestock Slaughter, October 1969, p. 2.

prices with a reasonable return to producers, packers and distributors. This commission's mandate should include formulating procedures which will produce better and more relevant statistics for making meaningful determinations and forecasts as to consumer demand for, production and imports of, and prices for beef. This should include estimating the share of the retail price going to each major subdivision of the above three segments of the industry, the costs incurred and the profits realized by each. The commission should determine whether an adequate meat supply requires imports, and, if so, how this need should be determined for each class of meat. Its recommendation to Congress should specify that provisions of law, if any, are needed to control such imports to assure a stable market at reasonable prices.

CHAOS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, while most of the Nation has been closely following the escapades of air hijackers, campus dissidents, and revolutionary types in Latin America and the Middle East, a much more costly revolution in terms of the future of this Nation has been going on in the South.

At the sacrifice of a standard of quality education, thousands of young southern schoolchildren are being subjugated to the most disheartening, frustrating, and irrational scheme ever perpetrated in the history of education in this Nation. At the whim and complacent conniving of a handful of Federal court judges and a star-studded cast of HEW and Justice Department bureaucrats, these children are being forced to board buses or any number of other travel conveyances in order to attend schools miles from their neighborhoods. They are being forced to do this to comply with what the courts and bureaucrats have decided is the necessary and proper method of arriving at a standard of racial balance within the public school system.

This is poppycock. This is about as realistic a method of letting our schoolchildren obtain a quality education as trying to keep a snowball frozen down in you know where. This is all contrary to sections 401 and 407 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. As we are all well aware by this time, those two vital sections of the 1964 act specifically prohibited the assignment and busing of pupils for the purpose of overcoming racial imbalance.

Well, 6 years have passed since that Civil Rights Act became the law of the land, and yet these Federal court judges and HEW and Justice Department bureaucrats still have not tuned in on the right wavelength.

On October 12, 1970, many Members of Congress, and I will be among them, will appear before the Supreme Court to intervene in the now famous Charlotte-Mecklenburg school case. This case has been incorporated with the critical Mobile County school case and several other similar cases which will ultimately decide the legality of pupil assignment and busing to overcome racial imbalance in public schools throughout the Nation.

On Tuesday of this week, I joined with nearly 70 other House Members from 19 States across the Nation in support of the amicus curiae brief of our colleague from Florida (Mr. CRAMER) which has been filed in the Supreme Court in this matter.

The logic of our intervention in this case is simple. It is a strictly non-sectional, nonpartisan move to clearly point out to the Supreme Court the undisputed intention of Congress when it adopted sections 401 and 407 of the Civil Rights Act. It should have been clear all these years, but the bureaucrats and the lower Federal courts have completely ignored this clear intent.

The emphasis of this matter is far divorced from the confines of a civil rights controversy. The very survival of our cherished system of neighborhood schools is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, there is still time for others to join in support of the Cramer brief. I urge all Members to do so.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. U.S. factories produce a flow of goods almost equal in size to the combined output of the Soviet Union and Western Europe.

AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF IN CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG CASE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, our able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER), the author of the antiassignment amendment to the 1964 Civil Rights Act, has prepared a legal brief of monumental significance in the annals of American jurisprudence. This amicus curiae brief has been filed by him with the consent of the parties in the case of James E. Swann, et al. against Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, et al., which as we all know is a case that will no doubt result in a Supreme Court ruling on the legality of pupil assignment and bussing to overcome racial imbalance.

As a friend and admirer of the gentleman from Florida, I am proud that he called upon me to send a letter to our colleagues in an effort to obtain their support for the brief. He intends to petition the Supreme Court to accept an amended brief containing the list of colleagues who also want to join as amicus curiae in the case.

The purpose of the brief is to acquaint the U.S. Supreme Court with the legislative history of sections 401 and 407 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Our colleagues who are now signatories to the brief are partners in an historic and precedent-setting event which repre-

sents one of the last hopes the American people have to save quality public education in this country, and I am hopeful that, in the next few days, more of our colleagues will swell the ranks of supporters which as of now number 74.

The balance of powers among the branches of our Federal Government, as prescribed by our Constitution, exists as a defense of our liberty. For too long, Congress has stood by while the Federal courts have assaulted that balance of power. The U.S. Supreme Court in case after case has extended its powers at the expense of the power of Congress and the people. Congress has enacted legislation, all too often dissipated by Federal court rulings. It is time, using the Charlotte-Mecklenburg case as the vehicle, to insure that the will and directives of Congress and the people are carried out and not contravened.

The Members of Congress acting as friends of the court, or amicus curiae, can communicate to the Supreme Court exactly what the Congress meant by sections 401 and 407 of the 1964 act. By taking this action, we will take a long step toward restoring much-needed balance to our governmental system and we will carry out our responsibility to the people to see that what they will through acts of Congress becomes and remains the law of the land. The mere fact that so many Members of Congress are not willing to confront the Court and explain in no uncertain terms what we have enacted into law is an indication that people everywhere are concerned. I dare say that just 5 years ago only a handful of Members would have been willing to join such a brief, and now we have over 70 and the list grows daily.

Mr. Speaker, the bussing of innocent children to facilitate the whim and fancy of misguided Federal bureaucrats and Federal judges is unjust, immoral, and illegal. Parents, whether they be black or white, are at wits end to stop this horrible exercise in tyranny by the Federal Government and the courts. This matter transcends racial differences and political geography. The parent and schoolchild in California are just as distressed over this matter as those in Charlotte, N.C., and they are looking to this Congress to do something. We must not fail them. Never have the stakes been higher. It boils down to whether we are to have free, stable, and quality public education or complete anarchy in our schools.

I earnestly hope that our colleagues will see the utmost necessity of this attempt to enforce our prerogatives and that they will join the gentleman from Florida in this amicus curiae brief.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHMITZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, every year, in accordance with Public Law 915, the President proclaims September 17 to September 23 as Constitution Week. This is the 183d anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United

States of America at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, in 1787.

The Daughters of the American Revolution have urged that the opening of Constitution Week be commemorated by a reading of the Preamble of the Constitution of the United States and the Preamble to the Bill of Rights on the floor of both Houses of Congress, and I am happy to take this opportunity to do so.

The Preamble to the Constitution of the United States reads:

We, the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

The Preamble of the Bill of Rights is not as well known as the Preamble to the Constitution, but deserves to be. It reads as follows:

The conventions of a number of the States having at the time of their adopting of the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best insure the beneficent ends of its institution.

THE COMING DESTRUCTION OF ISRAEL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if it were not for Israel, the entire Arabian Peninsula might have been forced into the Soviet sphere during the past decade. The oil of the Persian Gulf, on which Europe and Japan depend, would today be in Russian hands—to be used as a powerful geopolitical weapon. It is Israel that makes possible the continued independence of the Christian community of Lebanon.

Israel is a wedge that keeps a Russian-dominated Egypt from invading the Arabian Peninsula. This, above all, is the reason why Russia wants Israel weakened, reduced, or preferably destroyed. It was the Soviet Union that, for months before the 6-day war, urged Nasser to mass an invasion force against the Negev. The purpose was to break through Israel and give Egypt a short land route into Saudi Arabia. For several years Egypt had been seeking a military foothold on Saudi Arabia's other flank, through Yemen, logistically a far more difficult operation.

"The Coming Destruction of Israel," by Myron S. Kaufmann, a book just published as a Signet Broadside, discusses these matters. It sets forth concisely the imminent Soviet threat not only to Israel's existence, but to the whole Middle East and the world balance of power.

I commend the book to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress. It will be controversial. The author has strong views, which not everyone may agree with. Nevertheless, I believe this book presents many challenging ideas. It may

contribute to a greater understanding of the forces at work in the Middle East. It suggests horrifying possibilities. Certainly, Mr. Kaufmann has a message which should arouse urgent attention to the need to insure Israel's survival.

"The Coming Destruction of Israel" points out that Russia today again seeks the very same breakthrough into the Arabian Peninsula, either cheaply by diplomatic means, or by military force, or by a combination of diplomacy followed by force. The book asserts that, if the Soviet Union succeeds in rolling back Israel, the very next move will be a phony civil war in Saudi Arabia. Egypt will intervene, while Russia warns the United States to keep out.

As for Christian Lebanon, the book points out that the totalitarian regime in Syria has long wished to wipe her off the map and reduce the Christians to an impoverished minority—but a warning from Israel has already served to prevent this.

The book is extremely current. It notes that today, unlike the situation in 1967, Israel is confronted by the Soviet Air Force itself. Russia has readied an overwhelming military force, with all the equipment for a canal crossing, with all the equipment for breaking Israel's air cover, and with underground hangars to prevent the kind of victory that saved Israel three years ago. Further, it states that the Soviet Union's violations of the terms of the new cease-fire has made a shambles of the good name of the United States. They threaten to do much worse.

"The Coming Destruction of Israel" emphasizes that the water of the Suez Canal is the best natural defensive line between Israel and Egypt, from the point of view of either side, just as the Jordan River is the best defensive line between Israel and Jordan. It says that nothing could be more foolhardy than for the United States to repeat the mistake of 1957 and force Israel back, thereby opening the road to a Russian beachhead.

It is obviously true that the Sinai and the Negev are the shortest, quickest, handiest route from Egypt to Saudi Arabia. If it were not for Israel, that route would long since be wide open—to the Soviet Union.

I strongly agree with its statement that, in Israel, we have an ally which can stand off the Soviet Union in the Middle East, provided that we supply her with weapons and diplomatic support.

"The Coming Destruction of Israel" brings the alternatives into clear focus. It analyzes the nature of Israeli and Arab claims in the area, and the true situation of the refugees. I believe it should be of great interest to both Members of Congress and the Administration who are concerned with these vital foreign policy issues.

SCRAP STEEL AND IRON

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIPLEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, for several months a serious shortage of steel scrap has existed in this country. Several rep-

resentatives from various steel companies have met with officials of the Department of Commerce in order to try to work out a solution to this problem, however, no action has yet been taken by the Department.

For the past year the United States has been using and exporting much more scrap steel and iron than is being generated in this country. Scrap prices this year are 60 to 70 percent higher than they have been for the past several years and exports of scrap increased 40 percent in 1969 over 1968. It is possible that if this situation continues, small steel companies, steel casting shops, and iron foundries, caught with a full backlog of normally priced orders, face the very real possibility of going out of business.

It is the opinion of the representatives who have been meeting with the Department of Commerce that the time has come to place a restraint on the export of steel scrap, since the exportation of the scrap can result in shortages causing the shutdown of operations and the subsequent loss of jobs.

Under the Export Administration Act of 1969, the Secretary of Commerce has the right to impose export controls on a commodity to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the serious inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand.

The Department of Commerce has been studying this problem for several months, but in the meantime the situation is growing more critical. I would urge the Department to give full consideration to this matter and act as quickly as possible.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Nixon spoke at Kansas State University on the subject of campus unrest. He sounded a note that finds a responsive chord in every thoughtful American today. He stated that although we welcome the free expression of ideas both on the campus and throughout our Nation, there is no room for violence and intolerance on our campuses. President Nixon made it clear that no responsible American condones in any way the wanton and tragic bombing of the University of Wisconsin Research Center. The response of practically all of the students at Kansas State to President Nixon's address was overwhelmingly favorable.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon spoke for me when he voiced this view. It has become increasingly clear that a small minority have lost sight of the purpose of education in their attack on our institutions of higher learning. I have long believed that every young man or woman who wishes to obtain a college education should be able to do so. But higher education is a privilege and not a right. For those who are fortunate enough to attend college it is a tragedy

when their education is disrupted by the few. Students can and should work for legitimate changes in college curricula so that education meets current rather than outdated needs. But these efforts toward change must be channeled through peaceful and legitimate processes—not through crowd coercion or by force. There is always room for dissent, peaceful dissent. There is no room for senseless violence or manipulation of the many by the few.

Although I am a Democrat I want to make it clear that I fully share the theme expressed by President Nixon yesterday at Kansas State University. The issue that he spoke of transcends partisan boundaries. His approach merits the support of Americans from both parties. He has mine.

CITIZENSHIP DAY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today, all over the Nation, we mark the occasion of Citizenship Day, 1970. Our Federal Constitution was approved by the Convention on this date 183 years ago. It is fitting that we pause each year to reflect on the meaning of good citizenship and count our blessings on being Americans in these days of global strife.

Today is also an occasion for us to rededicate ourselves to the historic principles of our Nation—justice for all citizens; loyalty to fundamental democratic beliefs; tolerance for the points of view of others; respect for the law, and full participation in the affairs of our Government. These are principles that good citizens should live and practice each day of the year. They have helped to make America great. We must increasingly rely on them if we are to meet the great challenges of the 1970's at home and abroad.

One way in which Americans can clearly demonstrate their support of these basic principles is to register and vote in each election. Many thousands of residents of the Fourth Congressional District who are eligible to participate in our electoral processes have not taken the trouble to register. Final date to register for the important November election is Thursday, September 24.

Voter participation in off-year elections—nonpresidential years—in the Fourth District has been woefully poor. Statistics show that in the 1966 off-year election, only 60.9 percent of the registered voters in Mercer County went to the polls, compared with 85.6 percent who voted in the 1968 presidential election and 69.4 percent who voted last year in the election for Governor, assemblymen, and other local offices. The figures for Hunterdon County were 68.4 percent in 1966, as compared with 88.7 percent in the 1968 presidential election and 75.3 percent in the 1969 gubernatorial election. Statistics for Warren and Sussex Counties show a similar pattern of lower voter participation in the off-year elections in 1966 and 1969.

Apathy among voters—for whatever the reason—is a deadly disease that threatens the body politic. It deprives our district, State, and Nation of the type of clear public expression of views on vital issues that is essential for our democratic form of government to exist.

Let us all pledge ourselves on this Citizenship Day, 1970, to live each day to carry out the basic American principles of good citizenship, brotherhood, and justice to our fellow men. To be a good American is to be an aware, participating citizen.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

PRISONERS OF KAUNDA THE LIBERATOR

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the great liberator of Africa, President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia has shattered his image. Recent events more clearly prove him to be just another power seeking dictator operating a fifth-rate police state.

Last week during Kaunda's so-called nonaligned countries summit conference at Lusaka, at least nine newspaper men were arrested at midnight, thrown in prison, and deported from the country for reasons that their presence was "inimical to the public interest." Interestingly enough, each of the banished newsmen claims to not only been invited to the conference but were given visas and proper documents processed by Zambian immigration officials for their entry.

But, the most repressive revelation was yet to come. When the newsmen were imprisoned, like so many common criminals, they discovered in their midst some other 20 prisoners who also questioned Kaunda as being any liberator. These other prisoners were black Africans from Kenya, Malawi, Rhodesia, South Africa, and Somalia, who had been detained in prison without trial for periods ranging from 4 months to 2½ years. Most indicated that they had never been informed of the nature of charges against them and had no idea of why they were being held.

This is strange behavior, indeed, for the great Kaunda, ruler of Zambia, a country to which both the United States and England have given substantial financial assistance as well as moral and political support against Rhodesia and South Africa under the guise of obeying the United Nations' unilateral economic declaration of war. For interestingly enough, among newsmen so mishandled were an American and an Englishman.

It would be misleading to resolve that Kaunda's action in expelling the newsmen was simply because of his fear that they might truthfully report what they saw or heard in Zambia. After all, he had given these men a real news story; that is, the prisoners of Kaunda, rotting in a dingy prison at Lusaka without the benefit of the protection of individual liberties which are taken for granted in all civilized countries.

But then, after all, this is the mentality

of Kaunda the liberator who would squander \$14 million to build a hall for his royal guests in a country whose gross national product is only \$1 billion.

This is why emerging countries never seem to emerge.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that several newsclippings follow:

[From the Rhodesia Herald, Sept. 10, 1970]

JOURNALISTS SEE KAUNDA'S CAPTIVES

PRISONERS OF KAUNDA

(By Edwin Linington, of Iana, who was one of the journalists detained in Lusaka)

The conference of the non-aligned nations now meeting in Lusaka is much occupied by the question of freedom in South Africa and Rhodesia, but there is a group of about 20 men in Lusaka's remand prison who would like their position aired.

They are Africans from Rhodesia, South Africa, Kenya, Malawi and even Somalia who have been detained there without trial for periods ranging from four months to 2½ years.

Most of them say they have no idea why they are there—other than that the Immigration Department has alleged some unspecified vague infringement of the immigration laws.

They pleaded with me and other journalists detained there yesterday to try to help them.

"We are going mad," one said as they gathered around us in the large communal cell we were sharing last night.

CAUGHT UP

"All we want to do is go home. How can they keep us here without charge, without trial, for as long as two years? If they don't want us they can send us away instead of keeping us here," said one young Rhodesian who has been there for more than four months now.

His story is one of an individual being caught up in administrative machinery. He was granted a trade union scholarship to go to Britain for study, and the Rhodesian Government gave permission and granted a passport.

However, he found he could not get beyond Blantyre with the documents he had and could not get a British passport from the British High Commission in Malawi. He then decided to go to Lusaka to approach the British High Commission there. The Zambian immigration officers arrested him on arrival and he has been in the remand prison since.

AIR TICKET

Equally mysterious is the case of a young Somali who had been working on the railways in Zambia. At the end of his contract he bought an air ticket to Rome, booked his seat on a plane and was preparing to leave when he was arrested and put in the remand prison on an allegation of being a prohibited immigrant. He has been there for more than four months.

A Bulawayo schoolteacher, Mr. Misheck Mpofo, has been there for eight months. He entered Zambia to visit his young brother on fully valid travel documents which were accepted by the immigration officers. But he was detained "at the President's pleasure," because he had once been in the Rhodesian Army.

"But I left the Army in 1959 after Malaya, and now I am a schoolteacher," Mr. Mpofo told me.

PROTEST

I played four games of chess with a young South African who said he had arrived without documents but had never been accepted as a refugee. A charge of illegal possession of a firearm had been made but never put before a court.

Yesterday the "PI" men, as they are known

in prison, staged a protest to the senior prison officer, appealing to him to bring the immigration authorities to see them.

An immigration officer who was escorting a journalist into the prison at the time was surrounded by "Pis," who told him to tell his senior officers of their wish to go home.

One man suggested that the immigration officer should not leave until the senior officials came, but warders soon quietened the prisoners.

18 HOURS IN GAOL

INSIDE STORY OF LUSAKA DETENTION

The Zambian police came knocking on the door at 1 a.m. "Get dressed, pack your bags and come with us," they said. "You are being deported."

That, writes Edwin Linington, of Iana, was my first taste of the non-aligned summit fever that has turned the minds of Zambians. It ended 18 hours later when I and seven other journalists who had been detained, were released from Lusaka's remand prison on Tuesday night—wary, filthy and devoutly wishing to get out of Zambia as soon as duty and transport would allow.

The arrests of journalists started on Monday evening—the eve of the conference opening. The first man picked up was taken in at about 8 p.m. But news of this did not get out until about 11.30 p.m., when the second man was arrested in the vast new Mulungushi conference hall.

Another, who was summoned by public address system, saw what was happening and quietly slipped away and escaped detention.

The police then went to Africa House at the University, picking up first The Times Southern Africa man from Cape Town, Mr. Dan van der Vat, then myself.

As we were sitting in the police vehicle Mr. Hans Reinhardt, German Press Agency man from Johannesburg, was brought along to join us.

He was taken back to his room to collect his bags, and later, we heard the police summoning an ambulance by radio—Mr. Reinhardt had had a heart attack on the steps of Africa House.

The police continued their search for Pressmen on their list, and Mr. Ron McDonnell, Visnews cameraman from Salisbury, joined us. We were then taken to the central police station, and searched before being put into the remand prison.

There we found the first two detained men—Mr. Anthony White of Reuters and Mr. Kenneth Whiting of Associated Press, both stationed in Johannesburg.

They were lying in prison blankets on the cement floor of a cell about 15 ft. by 10 ft. with five other men.

CONSULAR HELP

"Look out, the blankets are lousy," we were warned as we entered. The time was then about 5.30 a.m., most of the night having been occupied in waiting about at the police station and in the prison guard room, where our money, watches, belts and ties were taken from us.

First an American and later a British official called. We said we had had no breakfast other than a mug of cocoa served in a tin mug that had been badly washed.

The result was that chocolate, sandwiches, fruit and milk arrived for us. Complaints about the state of the blankets resulted in the consular officers gaining for us brand new prison blankets.

The prison warders, all Zambians, did their best to settle us into their overcrowded gaol, treating us courteously and allowing us to eat in private. But the prison is small, antiquated and extremely dirty and uncomfortable.

WELCOME TO ZAMBIA

By Tuesday night our strength—as arrested Pressmen—had risen to eight, whose

nationalities included British, American, Rhodesian, Italian and South African.

One man had come from Nairobi, but all the others had come from South Africa or Rhodesia.

We had all arrived with proper documents and were processed by Zambian immigration officials. We were all there legally and, as far as we knew, the "Welcome to Zambia" notices in our rooms at the university were genuinely meant.

But we had all been detained in prison on warrants from the Immigration Department which alleged that we were suspected of being prohibited immigrants.

The one common factor seemed to be that we came from south of the Zambezi River, but if they had not wanted us there for the conference, they need not have admitted us in the first place—in my case only eight hours before my arrest.

MINISTER UPSET

But the journalists who were there last week recalled two occasions when Press arrangements had been criticized—once to an Information Department official and once to Mr. Sikota Wina, the Minister of Information.

The Minister had reacted strongly to the criticism and accused one man of bringing to Zambia from South Africa his attitude of "racial superiority" and of talking down to Zambians.

A senior Foreign Office official told several of the detained newsmen after their release that he was very sorry about their arrest.

The official said that President Kaunda was displeased when he heard of the round-up and ordered it to stop. A statement vaguely accusing three unnamed journalists of having abused Zambia's hospitality in an unspecified way, was issued as an excuse for the action.

In the event, three Press men were served with deportation orders, as their continued stay in Zambia was considered "inimical to the public interest".

[From the Rhodesia Herald, Sept. 10, 1970]

LUSAKA: U.K. PRESS REACTS SHARPLY

Leading British newspapers reacted sharply today to the detention of journalists at the summit conference of non-aligned nations in Lusaka.

In an editorial headed "Lusaka's bad start", The Times commented: "The sin of the group was that they were based in South Africa or Rhodesia, and this outweighed the fact that they had earlier applied for, and had been given, valid visas to attend and report the conference."

"This action is silly and self-contradictory. Mr. van de Vat, a staff correspondent of The Times and one of those detained, was born in Holland and brought up in Britain. He is a British subject. Until he went there as a correspondent last year he had never visited South Africa."

"There is no professional reason why he, or the others concerned, should not report the conference equally objectively wherever their points of departure may be."

"But perhaps objective reporting is not what is expected of them or any other correspondents present."

"A conference of this sort is for many of those present primarily an occasion for propaganda, and putting journalists in gaol makes more obvious propaganda than letting them report debates."

The Guardian said that if the reason for the detention of the reporters was that they were all based in South Africa or Rhodesia, it was not a good one.

The Guardian went on: "It may have been annoying for Zambia that reporters based in South Africa had come up to cover the conference."

"But Zambia ought in all honesty to admit that these same reporters were one of its own sources of news about South Africa, since no Zambian reporters are allowed in."

"Zambia should not at one and the same time accept their usefulness in South Africa and then deny them access. A country is rarely wise to ban journalists. Zambia was hitting the wrong target."

"As it is, the amount of international coverage of the conference in the World Press has been desperately meagre."

"NONSENSE"

The Daily Telegraph, in an editorial headed "non-aligned nonsense," said: "Petty vindictiveness of this kind, far from influencing Western Governments and public opinion against the white regimes in Southern Africa, will only make them the more inclined to disregard the complaints of Zambia and her associates."

"Another result will be to raise for the third time the hitherto unanswered question of what these 'non-aligned' jamborees are supposed to achieve."

In its main editorial headed "exercise in futility," the Daily Express said: "That this should happen in Zambia—a country with which Britain, at great cost, has cooperated in imposing sanctions against Rhodesia—will strengthen the critics of official British policy in Southern Africa."

"The British Government can make a swift start in changing this by scrapping the Beira patrol—the Royal Navy's blockade of Mozambique to prevent oil supplies reaching Rhodesia."

"Lifting this unnecessary burden from the Royal Navy would be a good start to a complete rethink of Britain's policy towards Southern Africa."

KAUNDA'S ACTIONS DISTURBING

The actions of Zambia's President Kenneth Kaunda in his apparent bid for Pan-African leadership are being observed here with growing misgiving by officials and others who have until lately been voluble in their admiration for him.

Inevitably, President Kaunda's growing preoccupation with foreign affairs has called to mind the history of former President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana after he assumed the mantle of the "Liberator of Africa."

State Department officials decline to comment either on the meeting in Lusaka of the "non-aligned" heads of State or on the arrest of journalists who went to cover the event.

ACTUALLY INVITED

In private, however, some officials concede that events in Zambia are "disquieting". It was noted that the first newspaperman arrested and deported was Stanley Meisler of the Los Angeles Times, who did not come from the south but from Nairobi, and who was actually invited to the conference.

Also mentioned is the cost of the conference. The New York Times, one of Dr. Kaunda's more constant champions, has reported that Zambia "which has a gross national product of about U.S.\$1,000m. and is hard pressed for funds," spent U.S.\$14m to build the hall and other facilities.

The tone of the report, with its implied criticism, caused raised eyebrows here among diplomats accustomed to the newspaper's usual sympathy for Zambia.

ZAMBIA WILL TAKE A LONG TIME TO LIVE DOWN PRESS FIASCO

(From Our Africa News Service)

It will take a long time before Zambia lives down the fiasco of the newsmen here to cover the conference of non-aligned States, who were detained by immigration authorities.

Thinking Zambians themselves are shaking their heads over an affair which, in the Western Press, eclipsed the sought-after news on the deliberations of leaders and

leading lights of about 50 "third world" nations.

But the purge of the media men was not accidental. It was being carefully planned behind closed doors in the Immigration Department last week, after the first of the South African-based correspondents and film men arrived.

It started, in fact, after one Johannesburg-based reporter strode around the Secretariat here where photographs for accreditation cards were being issued, muttering anti-Zambian slogans.

It gathered strength after the same man was involved in an altercation with the Information Minister, Mr. Sikota Wina, on Saturday night at a Press reception.

But the person concerned remains in Zambia to cover the conference.

Those detained for a night on Monday, and who were picked up left, right and centre by Immigration were all—with the exception of an international wire service correspondent from Nairobi—from South Africa or Rhodesia, even though they were attached to American, British and international media.

One of those detained was a Rhodesian African, Justin Nyoka, from Salisbury, who is covering the conference for the World Council of Churches among other organizations.

Today, the affair is the subject of nervous laughter in the top floor bar of the plush conference hall. For the three journalists who have been given 48 hours to leave the country it is no laughing matter. "We are completely baffled by it," one of them said. "Obviously some names have been mixed up."

The three who are to fly to Johannesburg are Mr. Ken Whiting, an American with Associated Press, Mr. Mike Keats, an Australian with United Press International and Mr. Ernest Christie, a South African of Christie Films. All live in Johannesburg.

Two other journalists—one from Nairobi, John Platter (UPI), and one from the South African Press Association, Mr. Edwin Linington—have had their accreditations seized from them.

The detention of newsmen (the Government said in an official statement there were 16, but it actually seems there were nine), has been regarded by foreign Pressmen and delegates to the conference as a major blunder.

[The Rhodesia Herald, Sept. 10, 1970]

JOURNALISTS UNAWARE OF REASON FOR DETENTION (Herald Reporter)

Journalists who arrived in Salisbury yesterday evening after their release from the Lusaka Remand Prison insisted that they knew of no reason for their detention and were completely unaware of any incident which could have given rise to the allegation of "misconduct".

Among them was Mr. Anthony White, a Reuters representative based in Johannesburg, who was the first foreign journalist "detained for questioning" by Zambia police at about 8 p.m. on Monday. He remained in a remand cell for 22 hours.

His personal belongings were thoroughly searched before he was escorted to prison where he said he was well treated.

He said he had not the slightest idea why he and other foreign journalists had been "picked up."

As far as he knew only eight journalists had been detained and not 16 as reported earlier. All had been released and he believed that accreditation to the summit conference of non-aligned States had restored to all but three.

Mr. White travelled from Lusaka by car with Mr. Ron McDonell, of Visnews, Salisbury, and Mr. Edward Linington, South African Press Association, Johannesburg.

SEARCH

Mr. McDonell's prison spell was shorter—he was not called upon until 1:30 a.m. on Tuesday. A thorough search of his photographic equipment followed.

He, too, had no idea of the reason for the detentions, and no idea of what could have been construed as misconduct. There had been nothing unpleasant about the treatment apart from the detention.

The general impression was that everybody concerned was from South Africa or Rhodesia but then it was realized that one journalist, Mr. John Platter, accredited to UPI, was from Nairobi.

Then Mr. McDonell thought there must have been a bomb scare because of the particular attention paid to his baggage. He dropped the idea when he realized that the search was for documents.

RESTORED

His accreditation to the conference was also restored but he decided it was expedient to leave Zambia on the ground that what had happened once could well happen again.

Both he and Mr. White agreed that there had been some criticism of the facilities to cover the summit conference but none could be described as "misconduct".

All eight correspondents were detained at intervals during Monday night and the early hours of Tuesday morning. They were all placed in the same cell, were provided with three blankets each but had to sleep on the floor because there were no beds.

Food was provided.

CHANCE FOR RHODESIA TO BENEFIT

If Zambia wants to keep certain reporters out of the country she is perfectly entitled to forbid them entry. She might be foolish in barring perfectly respectable men representing perfectly respectable newspapers or news agencies—we think she would be—but she would not expose herself to ridicule.

But when she issues visas to individual reporters and lets them in without any fuss, and then at dead of night rounds them up and gaols them like common pickpockets, she does make herself ridiculous.

When it turns out that one of the arrested men was specially invited to come down from Nairobi to report the conference of the "nonaligned" Heads of State, the situation becomes more than merely ridiculous.

And when it is shown that the arrested men's crimes—so serious that the authorities could not delay whisking them off to prison—were being based in South Africa or Rhodesia; or associating with journalists based in those countries; or—horror of horrors!—criticizing the arrangements made for reporting the conference; then one begins to doubt the sanity of the people responsible.

Those thoughts and more will have undoubtedly crossed the minds of the reporters concerned; and of their employers; and of their home Governments.

How can a responsible Government respect a country that behaves so illogically, so irresponsibly, so vindictively, with such crass stupidity? It cannot. Out of imagined self-interest it can continue to act as if it does, but is far less likely to go overboard in her support.

Zambia's actions will not mean that the West will stop courting her and the other Governments represented at Lusaka, will not mean a drift into support for the "white camp" in Africa. But it will mean the dropping of a few more scales from the West's official eye.

Rhodesia can take advantage of Zambia's immaturity by opening her doors wider to foreign journalists, and letting the world know they are open.

The Times of London, for instance, has told its readers that it doubts if the Lusaka delegates want objective reporting; they

want propaganda. Let there be no doubt that objective reporting is just what Rhodesia does want. The contrast between the two attitudes cannot fail to be noted by the impartial.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 13, 1970]

THE "NONALIGNED" AT LUSAKA

The first question a disinterested observer might raise about the summit conference of "nonaligned" nations just concluded in Zambia is: What do they mean by nonalignment? On their performance at Lusaka it is clearer than ever that they do not mean to signify a neutral or even-handed stand on some of the world's most complicated problems.

As expected, the "nonaligned" leaders lined up decisively with the Arab side in the Middle East conflict. Their resolutions contained no censure of Palestinian guerrillas for hijacking aircraft and holding innocent humans as hostages; but they demanded the removal of Israel troops from occupied Arab territory and United Nations action against Israel for "obstructing" Middle East peace negotiations.

Their approach to the South African problem was equally one-sided. They condemned Britain for its intention to resume arms sales to South Africa but deleted a specific censure of France for selling arms to Pretoria for years in violation of United Nations resolutions. This represented a successful lobbying effort by France's "independent" African colonies.

Evidently it did no violence to the conference's "nonaligned" principles to give the floor and its greatest ovation to the Foreign Minister of the Vietcong regime in South Vietnam. Though calling for withdrawal of "all foreign forces" from South Vietnam, one resolution blamed the American armed forces exclusively for the suffering and deaths in that country. There was no resolution condemning the Soviet Army's occupation of Czechoslovakia.

President Kaunda, the conference host, implored the departing "soldiers of non-alignment" to fight for freedom and justice, but his Government had done violence to both by arresting sixteen reporters for Western news organizations because some of them were based in South African and Rhodesia.

When the first of these meetings was held in Yugoslavia in 1961, it seemed to make sense to bring nonaligned leaders together for common objectives, including efforts to ease relations between the power blocs led by the United States and Russia. Today it is no longer clear what nonalignment really means, if anything, or what shared goals the self-styled "nonaligned" can best pursue collectively.

[From Newsweek, Sept. 21, 1970]

AFRICA: THE BEST OF EVERYTHING

As the first Black African nation to play host to a nonaligned summit meeting, Zambia had spared no expense to turn its small, dusty capital of Lusaka into a conference site fit to accommodate the high and mighty. For seventeen frantic weeks, Zambians uncrated expensive imported goods, including everything from a new Italian telephone-exchange system to more than 40 tons of sophisticated communications gear from Holland. And to top everything off, a Yugoslav-Zambian consortium rushed to completion a 1,500-seat, pagoda-shaped conference hall, complete with wood paneling and mustard-colored carpeting. For Zambia's President Kenneth Kaunda, the estimated \$20 million his country spent preparing to entertain the Third World conclave seemed worth every penny. Indeed, when Kaunda was presented with the golden keys to the conference hall just a few days before the summit opened,

he gasped: "It's better than the U.N. General Assembly Hall."

Unfortunately, however, when the kings, presidents and prime ministers representing 54 nonaligned nations finally got together last week, the standard of rhetoric did not match the impressive surroundings. For three days, the delegates, led by President Josip Broz Tito of Yugoslavia, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi of India and Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, left no cliché unspoken as they hammered away at the issue of the Vietnam war, South Africa apartheid and the failure of the developed world to improve the lot of poor nations.

Perhaps even more disappointing than the stale oratory was the host country's attitude toward visiting newsmen. For although the summit had been billed as a conference that would make a tough, vigorous attack on racism and imperialism, few observers expected that the offensive would take the form of a roundup of Western reporters. Yet without warning, security police arrested one black and seven white journalists (including a West German correspondent who suffered a heart attack when awakened by police) and hustled them off for an overnight stay in Lusaka's grim Remand Prison. At first, a Zambian official claimed the newsmen had been "drunken" and had offended the Zambian people. Later, however, the government said that the journalists had been arrested because "the monopoly press of the West decided to send to the Lusaka summit their reporters based in South Africa . . . like waving a red flag to a bull, this was tantamount to deliberate provocation."

DISSENTERS

But if there was confusion surrounding events outside the conference hall, most observers seemed equally perplexed by the results of the summit itself. In his final address to the conference, Kaunda, who had broken into tears during an earlier speech, fervently declared: "Today marks the end of an era of uncertainty about the future and direction of the nonaligned movement. Our deliberations have revealed an unquestionable identity of views about the fundamental purpose of our various nations and of the nonaligned movement in particular." Yet at the close of the meeting, the texts of the resolutions—the very heart of the conference's work—were not ready for publication. And committee sources revealed that practically none of the resolutions had been properly approved. "The scene in the committee rooms was chaotic," said one delegate. "Our objections were brushed aside and we were told that we could record them later." In fact, dissenters were told to circulate their objections in writing to all 54 delegations—which suggested that the achievements of the Lusaka summit would not be known for several weeks—or, perhaps, that there were none.

MALI'S 10TH INDEPENDENCE DAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1970

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Diggs) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Mali celebrates its 10th Anniversary of Independence on September 22. On behalf of the subcommittee on Africa I am pleased to extend to Lt. Moussa Traore, Chief of State and President of the Military Committee of National Liberation, and to the people of Mali congratulations and every best wish for the future.

Until 1960 Mali was part of the large colonial territory of French West Africa. Prior to the arrival of the French in

the 1880's Mali had a long and interesting history. Historians will recall the grandeur of the ancient Kingdom of Mali, which reached its height in the 14th century with the conquest of the fabled city of Timbuktu. Today Mali is a progressive West African nation whose primary concern is national development, in which we have been privileged to assist. On November 19, 1968, the former regime of Modibo Keita was overthrown in a bloodless coup led by the Military Committee of National Liberation. The military committee has announced its intention to return Mali to constitutional civilian rule as the pressing problems of national development are solved. We are confident of Mali's future and of the continued close friendship between our two countries.

DON BERNARDO DE GALVEZ DAY

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the bicentennial of the American Revolution, there has been a spirited and refreshing increase in interest in the great events of the Revolution. This includes emphasis on many events during that epochal conflict which heretofore have received comparatively little attention and are little known. One in particular which should be better known is the contributions of Don Bernardo de Galvez, a great Spanish general who fought against the British in Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama. Although students and historians of the American Revolution are aware of the victorious role of the youthful Galvez in capturing Mobile, Baton Rouge, Natchez, and Manchac from the British, it is not generally known that his smashing victory at the Battle of Pensacola has long been considered by many qualified authorities to be the most brilliantly executed battle of the Revolution.

In recognizing the critical role of Spain and her distinguished son, General Galvez, in the American Revolution, the Honorable Bryant Liggett, mayor of the city of Pensacola, has proclaimed September 26, 1970, as Don Bernardo de Galvez Day in Pensacola. In addition, similar proclamations for Galvez Day has been issued in the cities of Mobile and New Orleans for September 26, and in Baton Rouge for September 21. I am very pleased indeed that these cities are taking note of this important part of their history and that of our Nation.

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much lately from the prophets of doom who predict a dreadful decline for America much like the decline and fall of Rome.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is time for those of us who have faith in America to go from the negative to the positive.

We are living in an exciting time that is the birth of a new era of greatness for America.

Mr. Speaker, I call to my colleagues' attention the following excellent article about "What's Right With America" by the Honorable H. Ross Perot.

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

(By H. ROSS PEROT)

In spite of the cacophonous criticism of the "system" these days, you don't really have to look far for examples of what's right with America. The opportunity that makes careers such as H. Ross Perot's possible is one of them, obviously.

A Texarkana, Tex., cotton broker's son whose first experience as a businessman involved breaking horses at \$1 a head (at age seven), Ross Perot founded Electronic Data Systems Corp. in Dallas with \$1,000 of his savings in 1962. EDS profits have doubled every year since then, and his net worth today (he's just turned 40) is in the many millions, even after a stock price nose dive.

Mr. Perot, an energetic, articulate philanthropist who preaches that more Americans must become involved in public affairs, has been particularly concerned about freeing, or at least helping, U.S. prisoners in North Viet Nam. At one point he offered, in vain, to ransom them. At Christmastime he tried to bring supplies to them, but got no closer than Laos. To show sincerity, at Eastertime he visited POW camps in South Viet Nam and tried to pass on to Hanoi information about the well-being of its captured men. He was rebuffed again, but he's still trying to help our POW's.

When Nation's Business asked Mr. Perot to write for it on the theme headlined here, he took pencil in hand while on a business trip, and produced this article.

The greatest thing about America is that its people are free.

The concept of freedom has a new, special meaning for me, after having visited refugee camps in Laos. Like most Americans, I just assumed freedom was my birthright and did not think much about it until I talked with the refugees in Laos and saw the awful sacrifices these primitive, illiterate, tribal people were willing to make to be free—to protect their families and keep them together.

I asked every refugee I talked with, "Why did you flee the North Vietnamese?" I had read that the refugees were fleeing the bombing. I was unable to find a single refugee who was doing so.

The refugees in Laos flee the North Vietnamese to keep them from impressing the boys and men as slaves to carry goods down the Ho Chi Minh Trail. They flee to keep them from sending the girls and women to North Viet Nam into other forms of slavery. Freedom assumes a new dimension when you learn of the absolute brutality of North Viet Nam in dealing with these people.

The next time you read about the North Vietnamese taking another village in Laos or pursuing refugee groups through the jungles, realize that they are simply capturing slaves. As you sit comfortably in your home, surrounded by your family, try to picture yourself and your family fleeing through dense jungle, trying to run ahead of the North Vietnamese, knowing that if you are overtaken your family will be broken up, put into bondage and lost.

That does not happen in America, but it is happening every day throughout the world in cultures where human life is subjugated to national goals.

The American society's concept of concern for others is another thing that is right about America.

"THE BEAUTIFUL AMERICANS"

One of my finest experiences has been meeting the "Beautiful Americans" scattered

all over the world who have dedicated their lives to helping people less fortunate than we are.

Some of these people are missionaries in the classic sense. Others are carrying out missions of medicine, education, agriculture and construction, just to name a few. I wish every American could get to know these people as I have, and could actually watch them working to help others. What other society has ever produced selfless people in such great numbers?

What other government or culture would want to—or could—produce men willing to fly, day after day, into North Vietnamese antiaircraft fire, to drop rice—not bombs—to Laotians fleeing the North Vietnamese?

Only America produces men like that. These pilots who risk their lives daily to bring food to helpless people are missionaries of the air, willing to face death to keep life and freedom alive among people who can offer them nothing in return.

What other nation in the history of man has produced men willing to fly through North Vietnamese gunfire, land on dirt strips and absorb gunfire while on the ground, to pick up plane-loads of Laotian refugees about to be captured by North Viet Nam—to rescue them from slavery? This is happening every day in Laos.

Cynics might ask, "What is in it for us?" The answer—nothing but preserving the lives and freedom of a very primitive people. Our country produces men and women who will risk and give their lives to help others. What other nation can claim that?

When my group went to Southeast Asia in an effort to aid American prisoners in North Viet Nam, the most difficult thing for the North Vietnamese to understand in dealing with us was that any private citizen could be free to do the things we were doing. Having the freedom to do such things was far more impressive to them than having the economic resources.

The paramount importance of the individual, the uniqueness and preciousness of each life in our country, is a great American strength. The North Vietnamese just cannot understand why anyone, particularly a capitalist, would be concerned about "just 1,500 men"—a phrase they use repeatedly when referring to the prisoners. I have tried to convince them that, in our country, the entire nation can become concerned over one person in need.

They just cannot accept this, because in North Viet Nam people are merely instruments to further national policy. The individual is subordinated to the national goals of North Viet Nam—he is a tool to be used by the state.

The North Vietnamese see our country as "inherently weak," because the people select the leaders, and the leaders are the servants, not the masters, of the people. North Viet Nam feels that having the people determine the future is a great weakness. I feel that this is one of our greatest strengths.

It is great to live in a country where the government can be changed by its people to adapt to changing conditions. It is difficult for the North Vietnamese, or any other closed society, even to comprehend that concept.

Speaking of closed societies, after having seen them, I have an even deeper appreciation for our open society. The North Vietnamese do not understand the concept of public opinion, since there is no public opinion in North Viet Nam—only the official position. Dissent is not tolerated. There are no demonstrations in North Viet Nam.

An exchange of differing views, and respect for another's position on an issue, are basic to our society. I was amazed to learn that the North Vietnamese could not argue. They would take the official position but become ineffective when asked, "What is your reasoning behind this position?" There was no reasoning. It was policy—not to be questioned

or debated, just carried out. Contrast that to our society.

PRACTICAL DREAMERS

It is great to bring up a family in a nation where each person decides what type of work he will do, where he will live and what his goals are. In our country, one person can move mountains. We have a nation that provides a climate that produces practical dreamers—men and women who have great dreams and the desires, discipline, capacity and freedom to make these dreams materialize.

Compare that to societies that are indoctrinating children instead of educating them. The children are trained to be loyal to the state—not the family. The child's life is planned for him by the state. The child may want to be a composer, but the state needs scientists, so he becomes a scientist.

This is a more subtle form of slavery than that imposed on the Laotians, but nevertheless, it is slavery.

Take a minute; think about your children. Would you want some bureaucrat, armed with aptitude tests and national manpower quotas, determining your child's fate? That is another thing that is right with America.

You have probably noticed I have not mentioned that we provide our people with a standard of living that is unique in the world, and in the history of man. I have not pointed out that persons living in poverty in this country would be upper-middle-class in most of the world. I have not boasted about our highways, schools, medicine, industry and technological prowess.

I have confined myself to the real American Dream, the one the Pilgrims had—the dream of freedom.

TRUE RICHES

When we boast that America is the richest nation on earth, we should only be boasting of our true riches—our freedom, our people and our concern for others.

In this article, I have limited my examples to personal experiences of recent months. If I were to include all the pertinent examples from just my personal experiences, this article would become an encyclopedia. The neighbors, friends, teachers, children's organization leaders, Sunday school teachers, businessmen, policemen, firemen, military and religious leaders and elected officials who touch our lives and build our nation are intertwined in a magnificent web that represents the strongest society ever devised by man. It is bound together with powerful glue—concern for one another and a dedication to building an even better nation and world.

I would like to describe my own American Dream to you. I dream of an America that has a strong family unit and deep religious conviction in each home. I dream of an America made up of families who have a great sense of destiny for their nation, and a deep, unabashed love for it. I dream of these families developing great men and women, who will have the wisdom to manage our vast resources and technology, and direct them toward the best interests of our nation and the world.

These families will produce leaders who are honest, intelligent, disciplined and concerned enough to melt away the problems facing us today. They will keep us free.

I plan to spend the rest of my life as a private citizen and a practical dreamer, working to make that dream materialize. Only in America could a private citizen have such a dream, and the freedom to direct his energies toward it.

EACH GENERATION'S CHALLENGE

The challenge for each generation is to preserve and enhance our great freedoms, passing them on to the next generation, stronger and better, never forgetting that they are precious and fragile, and require continuing care by each of us.

This article is a love story—the story of one man's deep love for his country, and his dreams for its future. I hope you share my dreams for this great country.

The key to our future is for millions of private citizens, like you and me, to start once again to act like proud part owners of our country.

We will not always agree, and that is not important. We will be involved in doing everything we can to see that the things we feel need to be done are done. We can be the generation that made the real American Dream come true. We can deliver the constitutional guarantees to our people—to our children.

Let's stop talking, accusing and fretting. Let's get to work!

"RETURN TO SCHOOL" PROGRAM

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Tommy Shulman, editor of the popular and educational column—Carter Guidance—which is published in the Record American and Sunday Advertiser in Boston, Mass., arranged in cooperation with the Boston Public Schools, representatives of industry and Raymond's Department Store to conduct a week long "Return to School" program—August 31 through September 4. The event took place on the second floor of Raymond's Store.

Six Boston school guidance counselors under the direction of Maurice J. Downey, director of guidance, Boston Public Schools conducted meetings with students and parents to help prepare them for their school programs. Parents and students who were shopping for school days found this program convenient and helpful.

A special section was arranged in the store for private meetings with school guidance counselors and dropouts.

Demonstrations, slides, brochures, and entertainment were featured on the program. Shulman's columns in the Boston Record American and Sunday Advertiser invited students to attend and also announced the program of events.

Students were invited to write an essay telling the career they selected and the reason. A board of educators selected the best written essay and the writer will be presented a complete set of Encyclopaedia Britannica at school assembly.

The attached letters and messages, which I include in my remarks, certify the success of the program.

The following guidance counselors of the Boston Public Schools participated with Mr. Downey:

Caesar J. Tarallo, Roslindale High; William P. Gilligan, assistant director of guidance; Thomas J. McGrimley, Hyde Park High; Joan Eldridge, William Barton Rogers School; Elton Avery, J. E. Burke School, Roxbury.

Among the participants representing industry: New England Telephone; Trans World Airlines, Hilton International Hotels; Massachusetts Restaurant Association; WBZ Radio; WNAC Television; Massachusetts Medical So-

ciety; Boston Police Department Safety Squad; U.S. Weather Bureau, Logan International Airport; N. E. Aquarium; Scholarship Department, Massachusetts Department of Education; Wilfred Academy of Hairdressing; Vocational Education and Physical Education, Boston Public Schools; Massachusetts Port Authority and Interactive Learning.

A double spread layout of pictures and stories recording the events of the week was featured in the Record American dated Saturday, September 5, 1970. Shulman's column of September 7 featured a plea for dropouts to return to school telling them the new opportunities available and telling them who to see for help.

I include in my remarks, tearsheets from the Record American-Sunday Advertiser dated September 5, and 7, and August 30.

It is Mr. Shulman's hope with which I agree, that other cities in our country will conduct similar programs preparing students for school and also saving dropouts from leaving school and help them continue school and get the most important diploma.

This program has been a notable success in Boston. It is a most constructive one that other cities throughout the country might well consider and follow.

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
September 10, 1970.

Mr. HAROLD G. KERN,
Publisher, Boston Record-American,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. KERN: My sincere appreciation to the Record-American for the very active role it has played in supporting the Boston Public School's Return-to-School Program. More than two thousand school dropouts have been assisted by the Return-to-School Program since its inception.

The Record-American has contributed significantly to the success of Return-to-School Week through its news columns and especially through the efforts of Mr. Thomas Shulman and his helpful column.

Once again, my gratitude to you and the staff of the Record-American for assisting the Boston Schools in this important work.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. OHRENBERGER,
Superintendent of Public Schools.

BOSTON, MASS.

THOMAS SHULMAN,
Career Guidance Editor,
Record American.

Congratulations and thanks to you and the Boston Record American Sunday Advertiser for cooperating in our successful career guidance clinic at Raymonds. We topped last year's attendance. As a result, thousands of pupils will return to school better prepared for their studies and hundreds of dropouts will continue their education. This clinic was another public service participated in by your fine newspapers. Again, thanks and congratulations.

MAURICE J. DOWNEY,
Director of Guidance.

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Boston, Mass., September 10, 1970.

DEAR MR. SHULMAN: What a thorough organizational and informational job you have done!

Your writing pulls the tedious details of notifying, counseling, and re-enrolling youth right back into your reader's stream of living—and carries along.

I wish we had you on our regular staff.
JOSEPH LEE,
Chairman of School Committee.

[From the Record American, Sept. 7, 1970]

DROPOUTS: FINISH SCHOOLING

(By Tommy Shulman)

Last week, I had the opportunity to speak with potential drop-outs and parents. It was interesting to learn why they left school before receiving that all-important high school diploma.

Some told me that they lost time because of illness and couldn't catch up; others claimed school had no interest for them and they were bored. A few said that there was a lack of communication between student and teacher. Slow readers blamed their handicap as responsible for failing in school.

Behavior problems, money problems and drugs were other reasons given for leaving school.

I also learned that the highest dropout period takes place in the 9th and 10th grades, a time when most students turn 16.

We watched with great interest as children discussed their school problems with guidance counselors at our Career Guidance Clinic conducted last week at Raymonds.

Although each case differed, the staff of Boston Public Schools guidance counselors gave careful consideration and treated each child with patience and understanding. They were told about the many new and exciting and interesting courses which are now available; the new school work study programs and occupational on-the-job training programs; part time employment after school; organizations offering remedial courses; cooperative courses; youth opportunity centers and others.

It was my pleasure to see the students walk out of their meetings with guidance counselors much happier than they came in. I know that these boys and girls were no longer dropouts—they were going back to complete their education and get that important diploma.

Yet, it is a fact, that our guidance clinic did not reach all dropouts. That's the reason for this column. We'd like to see all dropouts drop in at school Wednesday! Hence the reason for this column—to make a last minute urgent plea for all students to go back to school.

One of the first questions an employer asks a jobseeker: "Have you got a high school diploma?" Competition in the job market is keen. Guidance counselors find it difficult to help students who leave school during their high school years.

The Boston area is rich with educational opportunities with day or evening classes.

We urge you to take inventory of yourself, determine what type of a job you would like to do—then prepare yourself for it—and go after it!

The United States Dept. of Labor tells us that high school graduates average about \$2000 more per year than non-graduates. College grads make \$2000 more than that.

We strongly urge that you make an early appointment with your school guidance counselor and talk your problems over with him or her. He will tell you what is best for you and if you need special help, he will arrange it.

Remember: There are few problems facing a dropout which cannot be solved. But you have to make the first move.

For your own success in life and for your parents happiness, take advantage of a good education. It will prepare you for your life's work and will be a stepping stone for a successful profitable future. You can reach for your star—if you want to—the choice is yours.

Here are some people who you may phone for advice and help:

Maurice J. Downey, Director of Guidance,
Boston Public Schools, 45 Myrtle Street, Boston 742-7400.

Victor B. Stevens, Jr., Guidance Supervisor,
Mas. Dept. of Education, 182 Tremont Street,
Boston 727-5750.

Education is an investment in your future. The more you invest—the more dividends you reap. A good education is "Earning Power".

You want to do yourself a favor? Go back to school!

CLINIC AT RAYMOND'S VARIED

(By Tommy Shulman)

Four Boston Public Schools Guidance Counselors will be at the Record American-Sunday Advertiser Career Guidance Clinic on the second floor of Raymond's Store, Washington St., Boston, all this week from 2 to 5 p.m. for the purpose of guiding and advising students who are preparing for their school programs.

The are: Maurice J. Downey, director of Guidance, Boston Public Schools; William P. Gilligan, assistant director, Guidance Dept.; Thomas J. McGrimley, guidance counselor, Hyde Park High, and Caesar J. Tarallo, guidance counselor, Roslindale High School.

Students and parents who wish to consult with the educators will enjoy the privacy of a special section of the clinic. Free brochures and career material will be distributed.

Here are some of the highlights of the week's activities:

Students (boys and girls) will be invited to submit essays telling the career they selected and the reason. Best one chosen by a board of educators will receive a complete set of Encyclopedia Britannica.

A boy 12 to 17½ will have an opportunity to register and receive a brochure pertaining to our Junior Diplomat Around The World Adventure Tour via TWA and enjoying the luxuries of Hilton International hotels.

Students may submit questions pertaining to college placement into an "Interactive Learning" computer; Mass. Port Authority will display educational photos of Logan International Airport and an architect's model of Mass. Port's new containerized terminal at Castle Island, South Boston; Mrs. Clinton Bagenstose, president of the Mass. Medical Society will present a film description of Blood Function.

Charles Archambault of the U.S. Weather Bureau will discuss weather forecasting and displays and free material; Boston's M-1 Safety Policeman will present a school safety program; Mass. Dept. of Education Scholarship Division will tell about scholarships available and how to get them.

Also Miss Lynn Zimmerman, N. E. Aquarium; Charles Towell, Trans World Airlines; Bart Whalen and Herman Wells of the FAA will discuss air traffic control and other subjects; Sandra Talanian, John Hancock Insurance Co.; New England Telephone Co., Edward J. King, John Halloran and Thomas Kuhn, Massport; Jeff Keating, vocation director, V. McCabe, physical education director, Boston Public Schools; and James Schmidt, editorial art director, Record American-Sunday Advertiser.

Entertainment will be furnished by: Larry Glick, WBZ Radio; Clive Baldwin, popular recording artist; Bob Munstead, ventriloquist; Mt. Carmel Choir of East Boston; Pianist William Smiddy and organist Bob Baratta; Matilde Giannotti, soloist and radio broadcasting—Newsboys Radio Show.

Remember the place: Raymond's 2nd floor; all this week from 2 to 5 p.m. except Saturday. Everybody is welcome.

RA-A SPONSORS WEEK-LONG GUIDANCE CLINIC

Thousands of students will go back to school on Wednesday better prepared for studies—and hundreds of dropouts will finish their education and receive that most important high school diploma—all because they took time out to visit the Boston Record American-Sunday Advertiser's third annual Career Guidance Seminar this week at Raymond's Department Store, Washington St., Boston.

Gov. Sargeant proclaimed the week as

"Career Guidance Week" and praised these newspapers, Boston Public Schools and Raymond's for the public service performed for the youth of our community.

Maurice J. Downey, Director of Guidance, Boston Public Schools, and his staff of Guidance Counselors—Caesar J. Tarallo, Roslindale High; Thomas G. McGrimley, Hyde Park High; Mrs. Joan Eldridge, William B. Rogers School, Jamaica Plain and William P. Gilligan, Asst. Director of Guidance, were on hand all week to discuss with students and parents problems and programs pertaining to schools.

Special private consultations were held with school dropouts and potential dropouts.

Industry was represented by the following who discussed their careers and distributed free pamphlets: Massport, New England Telephone, Mass. Medical Society, Mass Dept. of Education Scholarship Dept., U.S. Weather Bureau, N. E. Aquarium, Federal Aviation Administration, John Hancock Insurance Co., Wilfred Academy Hairdressing School, Vocational Education and Physical Education Depts., Boston Public Schools, and Interactive Learning (college placements), M-1 Safety Squad, Boston Police Dept. and Record American-Sunday Advertiser represented by Artist James Schmidt.

Entertainment was furnished by Larry Glick, WBZ; Clive Baldwin, recording star; Lynda Day, ABC-TV star; Bob Munstet, ventriloquist; Mt. Carmel Choir; Organist Bob Barratta, and Pianist William Smiddy.

Students were invited to write essays telling the career they selected and the reason. The winner will receive a complete set of Encyclopaedia Britannica.

The Boston Public Schools, Raymond's and Industry made the clinic possible by their participation in another community youth-building program arranged by these newspapers.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S ADDRESS AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President addressed the students of Kansas State University. What he had to say about the "crisis of the spirit" that troubles many of our great institutions of higher learning in America is meaningful for all of us. The President's comments on dissent and violence deserve wide dissemination. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to insert the President's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point. The speech follows:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, MANHATTAN, KANS.

At this great university, in this distinguished company, I cannot help thinking about the twists of fate—and of how we learn from them.

I think of the fans of Wildcat football here today who have known what it is to lose—and then who have known what it is to win.

I think back to 1936, when Governor Landon—who already knew what it was to win—learned what it was like to lose.

And I think too of some of the moments in my own career: as a football player who spent most of his time on the bench; as a candidate who knew the thrill, the great satisfaction, of winning—and then as a candidate who learned what it meant to lose.

Having won some and lost some, I know—as you know—that winning is a lot more fun.

But I also know that defeat or adversity can react on a person in different ways.

He can give up; he can complain about "a world he never made;" or he can search the lessons of defeat and find the inspiration for another try, or a new career, or a richer understanding of the world and of life itself.

When Alf Landon lost his race to Franklin Roosevelt, he was not a man to waste his life in brooding over might-have-beens. In the 34 years since then, the world has been transformed. Enriched by his experience, Alf Landon has continued to grow with it—until now he is one of the great elder statesmen of America, a man whose wisdom and common sense, and whose outspoken concern for the welfare of this nation, have inspired and aided generations that have come after.

Or take Kansas State and its football team.

Just three years ago the Wildcats had a dismal seven-year record of eight wins and sixty losses. But there was a dogged spirit here, a determination, a readiness to learn new ways—and when Vince Gibson came to the campus it was that spirit, that determination, that "Purple Pride" that he helped translate into the Purple Power of today.

As for myself, I doubt that I would be President today if I had not learned from the lessons of defeat in 1960 and 1962—and I hope that I can be a better President because of those lessons.

I cite these not only to suggest that we here today have something in common—but also because this pattern of playing by the rules, of losing some and winning some, of accepting the verdict and having another chance, is fundamental to the whole structure on which our liberty rests.

There are those who protest that if the verdict of democracy goes against them democracy itself is at fault—who say that if they don't get their own way, the answer is to burn a bus or bomb a building.

Yet we can maintain a free society only if we recognize that in a free society no one can win all the time; no one can have his own way all the time; and no one is right all the time. Whether in a campaign or a football game, or in debate on the great issues of the day, the answer to "losing one" is not a rush to the barricades but a study of why, and then a careful rebuilding—or perhaps a careful re-examination of whether the other fellow may have been right after all.

When Palestinian guerrillas hijacked four airliners in flight, they brought to 250 the number of aircraft seized since the skyjacking era began in 1961. And as they held their hundreds of passengers hostage under threat of murder, they sent shock-waves of alarm around the world at the spreading disease of violence and terror and its use as a political tactic.

That same cancerous disease has been spreading here in the United States.

We saw it three weeks ago in the vicious bombing at the University of Wisconsin, in which one man lost his life, four were injured and years of painstaking research by a score of others destroyed.

We have seen it in other bombings and burnings on our campuses, and in our cities; in the wanton shootings of policemen; in the attacks on school buses; in the destruction of offices, the seizure and harassment of college officials, the use of force and coercion to bar students and teachers from classrooms and even to close down whole campuses.

Consider just a few items in the news:

—A courtroom spectator pulls out a gun, halts the trial, gives arms to the defendants, takes the judge and four other hostages, moves to a waiting getaway van—and in the gunfight that follows four die, including the judge.

—A man walks into the guardhouse of a city park and pumps five bullets into a police sergeant sitting quietly at his desk.

—A Nobel Prize winner working on a cancer cure returns to the cages of his experimental rats and mice to find them vandalized, with some of the animals running loose, some thrown out of the window into the sea, and hundreds missing.

—A police patrolman responds to an anonymous emergency call that reported a woman screaming, arrives at the address, finds the house deserted but a suitcase left behind; as he bends over to examine the suitcase it explodes, blowing off his head and wounding seven others.

These acts of viciousness all took place in the United States—and all within the past five weeks.

America at its best has stood steadfastly for the rule of law among nations. But we cannot stand successfully for the rule of law abroad unless we respect the rule of law at home. A nation that condones blackmail and terror at home can hardly stand as the example in putting an end to international piracies or tensions that could explode into war.

The time has come for us to recognize that violence and terror has no place in a free society, whoever the perpetrators and whatever their purported cause. In a system that provides the means for peaceful change, no cause justifies violence in the name of change.

Those who bomb universities, who ambush policemen, who hijack airplanes and hold their passengers hostage, all share in common not only a contempt for human life but also a contempt for those elemental decencies on which a free society rests—and they deserve the contempt of every American who values those decencies.

Those decencies, those self-restraints, those patterns of mutual respect for the rights and the feelings of one another, are what we must preserve if freedom itself is to be preserved.

There always have been those among us who chose violence or intimidation to get what they wanted. Their existence is not new. What is new is their numbers, and the extent of the passive acquiescence, or even fawning approval, that in some fashionable circles has become the mark of being "with it."

Commenting on the bombing three weeks ago at the University of Wisconsin, the Wisconsin State Journal recently said:

"It isn't just the radicals who set the bomb in a lighted, occupied building who are guilty. The blood is on the hands of anyone who has encouraged them, anyone who has talked recklessly of 'revolution,' anyone who has chided with mild disparagement the violence of extremists while hinting that the cause is right all the same."

And I would add that what corrodes a society even more deeply than violence itself is the acceptance of violence, the condoning of terror, the excusing of inhuman acts in a misguided effort to accommodate the community's standards to those of the violent few.

For when this happens, the community sacrifices more than its calm, and more even than its safety. It loses its integrity and corrupts its soul.

Nowhere should the rule of reason be more respected, or more jealously guarded, than in the halls of our great universities.

Yet, as we know, at some of our great universities small bands of destructionists have been allowed to impose their own rule of arbitrary force.

Because of this, we face the greatest crisis in the history of American education today.

In times past we have faced shortages of classrooms, shortages of teachers, shortages that could always be made up by appropriations of money.

These material shortages are nothing compared to the crisis of the spirit which rocks hundreds of campuses across the country

today. And because of this, to put it bluntly, today higher education in America risks losing that essential support it has had since the beginning of this country—the support of the American people.

America has been rightly proud in the past of its enormous strides in higher education. The number of students in college today has doubled in the past decade. But at a time when the quantity of education is going dramatically up its quality is massively threatened by assaults which terrorize faculty, students and university and college administrators alike.

It is time for responsible university and college administrators, faculty and student leaders to stand up and be counted. Only they can save higher education in America. It cannot be saved by government. To attempt to blame government for all the woes of the universities is to seek an excuse, not a reason, for their troubles. If the war were ended today, if the environment were cleaned up tomorrow morning and all the other problems for which government has the responsibility were solved tomorrow afternoon—the moral and spiritual crisis in the universities would still exist.

The destructive activists at our colleges and universities are a small minority. But their voices have been allowed to drown out the responsible majority. As a result, there is a growing, dangerous attitude among millions of people that all youth are like those few who appear night after night on the television screen shouting obscenities, making threats or engaging in destructive and illegal acts.

One of the greatest disservices the disrupters have done, in fact, is precisely this: to reflect unfairly on those millions of students who do go to college for an education, who do study, who do respect the rules and who go on to make constructive contributions to peaceful change and progress in this country.

I would not for one moment call for a dull, passive conformity on the part of our university and college students, or for an acceptance of the world as it is. The great strength of this nation is that our young people, in generation after generation, give the nation new ideas, new directions, new energy. I do not call for a conformity in which the young simply ape the old or in which we freeze the faults that we have. We must be honest enough to find what is right and to change what is wrong. But at the same time we must take an uncompromising stand against those who reject the rules of civilized conduct and of respect for others—those who would destroy what is right in our society and whose actions would do nothing to right what is wrong.

Automatic conformity with the older generation is wrong. At the same time, it is just as wrong to fall into a slavish conformity with those who falsely claim to be the leaders of the new generation, out of fear that it would be unpopular—or considered square—not to follow their lead. It would be a tragedy for our young generation simply to parrot the policies of the past. It would be just as great a tragedy for the new generation to become simply parrots for the slogans of protest, uniformly chanting the same few phrases—often with the same four-letter words.

Let us take one example that deeply troubles many of our young people today: the war in Vietnam.

Many of the slogans simply say we should end the war.

We are ending the war. The great question is how we end it, and what kind of peace we achieve.

A "peace now" that led only to a bigger and more terrible war later would be peace at too great a price.

As we look back over the 20th Century, we see that not yet in this century has Amer-

ica been able to enjoy a full generation of peace.

The whole thrust, the whole purpose, of this Administration's foreign policy—whether in Vietnam or the Middle East, or in Europe, or in relations with the developing countries or the Communist powers—is to meet our responsibilities in such a way that at last we can have what we have not had in this century: a full generation of peace.

That is why, in Vietnam, we are carrying out a plan that will end the war, and that will do it in a way that contributes to a just and a lasting peace in Vietnam and in the world.

There are those who say that this is the worst of times to be alive.

But we in America have a great deal to be proud of—and a great deal to be hopeful about.

If we open our eyes, if we look at all that for the first time in the whole history of man is becoming possible here in America, what do we see?

—We see a natural environment that has been damaged by the careless misuses of technology, true; but we also see that the same technology gives us the ability to clean up that environment and restore the clean water, the clean air, the open spaces, that are our rightful heritage.

—We see a nation now rich enough so that everyone willing and able to work can earn a decent living, and so that we can care for those who are not able to do so.

—We see a nation that now has the capacity to make enormous strides in these years just ahead in health care, in education, in the creative use of our increasing leisure time.

—We see a nation poised to progress more in the next five years, in a material sense, than it did in fifty only a short time ago.

—We see that because of our wealth, because of our freedom, because of our "system," we can go on to develop those great qualities of the spirit that only decades ago were still buried by the weight of drudgery—and that we can do this not just for an elite, not just for the few, but for the many.

The question is: How shall we use our great opportunity?

Shall we toss it away in mindless disruption and terror? Shall we let it wither away in despair? Or shall we so prepare ourselves, and so conduct ourselves, that this will be looked back upon as the beginning of the brightest chapter ever in the unfolding of the American dream?

Making its promise real requires an atmosphere of reason, of tolerance, of common courtesy—with that basic regard for the rights and feelings of others that is the mark of a civilized society.

It requires that the members of the academic community rise firmly in defense of the free pursuit of truth—that they defend it as zealously today against threats from within as they have at other times against threats from without.

It requires that the idealism of the young—and indeed, the idealism of all ages—be focused on what can be done within the framework of a free society, recognizing that its structure of rights and responsibilities is complex and fragile and as precious as freedom itself.

The true idealist pursues what his heart says is right in a way that his head says will work. But the final test of his idealism lies in the respect he shows for the rights of others.

Despite all the difficulties, all the divisions, all the troubles that we have had, we can look to the future with pride and with confidence.

As I speak on the campus of this great university, I recall one of the great sons of Kansas, Dwight David Eisenhower. And I recall the eloquent address he delivered in

London's historic Guildhall in 1945, at a ceremony in his honor after he had led the allied forces to victory in Europe.

On that day, to the huge assemblage that had gathered in his honor, made up of the officialdom of all Britain, he said: "I come from the heart of America."

Now, 25 years later, as I speak in the heart of America, I can truly say to you here today that you are the heart of America—and the heart of America is strong. It is sound. It is good. It will give us—you will give us—the sound and responsible leadership that the great promise of America calls for—and in doing so you will give my generation what it most fervently hopes for: the knowledge that your generation will see that promise fulfilled.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the double privilege of being very proud of my President and of my alma mater.

The President's speech at Kansas State University yesterday will surely stand as one of the high marks of the Nixon Presidency. In the fact of persistent, loud heckling from a very small but determined band of student protesters, the President refused to be shouted down and went on to deliver one of the most reasoned and inspired speeches given during his term of office. I was there and I was never more impressed with his calm and courage.

The President put it to the students straight when he said:

If the war were ended today, if the environment were cleaned up tomorrow morning and all the other problems for which government has the responsibility were solved tomorrow afternoon—the normal and spiritual crisis in the universities would still exist.

This country has recently been treated to a spectacular show put on by a commission which purports to examine the underlying causes for campus unrest. This investigation was conducted with great fanfare as the radical, dissident minority of students unleashed their inflammatory rhetoric in testimony before the commission. Rhetoric which was promptly and duly reported—with equal fanfares—in the Nation's media.

Now we are anxiously awaiting the report of this commission, and I fervently hope that the members of this investigating body recognize the truth in the President's words yesterday. The students at Kansas State University did—when the President told them the truth, they gave him a standing ovation in return. And so did I.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, there was a portion of the President's speech yesterday at Kansas State University which especially bears repeating in the Congress:

To put it bluntly, today higher education in America risks losing that essential support it has had since the beginning of this country—the support of the American people.

America has been rightly proud in the past of its enormous strides in higher education. The number of students in college today has doubled in the past decade. But at a time when the quantity of education is going dramatically up its quality is massively threatened by assaults which terrorize faculty, students and university and college administrators alike.

It is time for responsible university and college administrators, faculty and student

leaders to stand up and be counted. Only they can save higher education in America. It cannot be saved by government. To attempt to blame government for all the woes of the universities is to seek an excuse, not a reason, for their troubles.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has stated the situation correctly. There is a crisis in higher education and our universities are in danger of losing the support of the American people. The President cannot resolve this crisis, neither can the Congress resolve it. Government can help but by far the larger burden rests upon the academic community. As the President said, it is time for responsible academic leaders—students, faculty, and administrators—to stand up and be counted.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the address of the President of the United States at Kansas State University yesterday, following the text of the President's remarks which I inserted in the RECORD at an earlier time.

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

There was no objection.

DESEGREGATION OF SCHOOLS

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am troubled by some counterproductive claims that have come from the National Education Association concerning the desegregation of our schools.

Objective observers of the administration's work for school desegregation must feel forced to take issue with NEA's undercutting of desegregation efforts.

NEA has misleadingly claimed that its organization has received thousands of complaints of teacher firings—failing to mention that those complaints date back so far as the middle 1950's.

NEA officers have alleged that Federal court orders have been violated, yet the organization has failed to offer details of violations to the Department of Justice.

This past weekend an NEA southeast regional director was quoted by UPI as charging that the National Education Association officials were attempting to monitor school desegregation because of the Nixon administration's "failure to take those steps necessary to insure the peaceful and orderly desegregation of public schools."

This charge of failure, if quoted accurately, and coming after 3 full weeks of orderly and peaceful school openings, is scarcely worthy of a high official of the National Education Association.

To anyone, who is watching closely, the Nixon administration is conducting an impressive, watchful effort. Every time a problem occurs in a judicial district, the U.S. attorney and Department of Justice lawyers seem to be present on the scene

to give aid and assistance to school officials, parents, teachers, and judges.

While I do not have intimate knowledge of administration plans and efforts for school desegregation, I want to commend the early results. Whatever it is you are doing, keep it up because it seems obviously successful.

Accordingly I do not have personal knowledge of the plans and strategies of my friends in the National Education Association, but I fear the results. Whatever it is you are doing, I urge that NEA time and talent be redirected to the searching problems of education.

Working at odds we can deliver neither racial harmony nor quality education. Working in concert and mutual support, we might finally achieve both the desegregation and the education for which the Nixon administration as well as the education profession is very earnestly striving.

PUBLIC CONCERN ABOUT WORLD'S ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

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

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years, we have witnessed a great upsurge of public concern about the state of the world's environmental health. The pollution crisis has been with us for a long time, but we are just now aroused enough to take the substantial steps necessary to restore our physical world to a cleaner condition. In meeting the challenges of pollution, Congress and the States have enacted new environmental quality standards, and there are constant demands for more stringent requirements. Basically, the response of government to the environmental crisis has been to pass new laws limiting the amount of polluting material that can be discharged into our air and water.

It has become readily apparent that attacking the problem through environmental quality standards alone is simply not enough. We pat ourselves on the back for passing "tough" environmental protection laws, then sit and watch while they remain largely unenforced. Often what happens is that the people who are doing the polluting—the industries, manufacturers, and individual citizens—would like to do something to reduce their own pollution, but they are faced with substantial economic barriers. We have allowed the environment to deteriorate to the point where the costs of cure now far exceed the costs of prevention that we would have incurred had we begun action earlier. These costs are sometimes so prohibitive that a small businessman simply cannot afford to install pollution control devices without risking financial bankruptcy. In part, this condition arises because American consumers are sometimes not as willing to pay for pollution abatement through higher prices for goods and services as they are to demand legislation that restricts or eliminates pollution. What we must realize is that the fight to save the environment is going to be a costly one and that unless we begin now to spend

what is necessary we will lose far more in economic and human costs.

Individual businesses are reluctant to commit funds for voluntary pollution abatement because they simply are not sure that the public really wants pollution-free products enough to pay the higher prices necessary to give businesses a sufficient return on their investment. The laws of economics thus can be at odds with the laws of Government. We can pass all the stringent pollution control legislation we want, but unless we are prepared to commit the necessary financial resources, those laws will be meaningless. I believe that the American people are in fact ready to pay what is needed, but that realization of this fact may take some time. Presently we are in a state of mild recession and understandably businesses are especially reluctant to make capital investments that are, from their viewpoint, of questionable profitability. Moreover, because of the simultaneous inflation in the money market, businesses are faced with exorbitant interest costs whenever they need new capital. Putting all this together, it is apparent that a major obstacle to rapid installation of pollution control devices in American industry is a reluctance and inability on the part of manufacturers themselves to make the necessary capital investments. The problem is particularly serious for the small businessman who does not have the substantial resources of the corporate giants and simply cannot afford risky investments.

To meet part of this problem I am today introducing, together with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE), a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide disaster loan assistance to any small business that is required to install pollution control devices to meet applicable national, State, or local environmental quality standards. This bill would make available Federal loans at interest rates considerably below rates now available from commercial lending institutions. Small businesses could obtain loans for periods up to 30 years at "current money" interest rates, defined as the average interest rate on outstanding governmental obligations. Thus, in effect, the Federal Government would be using its borrowing power to raise money which it would in turn loan to businesses. As a result, small businesses that ordinarily pay around 10 percent in interest on loans could obtain funds at around 5.125 percent under current conditions. Since the interest rate charged by the Government is the same rate at which it borrows the money, there would be no increased tax burden on the taxpayer. The overall effect of these low interest rates would be to allow businessmen to make the necessary investments in pollution-free machinery now, while postponing the necessity of immediately raising prices to reflect these higher operational costs. These costs can be gradually phased in, and will hopefully coincide with consumers' growing awareness and willingness to absorb most of the costs for protecting our environment.

The bill is designed to provide funds under the disaster loan provisions of the Small Business Act. At the present time

the Bureau of the Budget has placed an administrative freeze on all loans under the Small Business Act except the disaster loans. Last year Congress amended the disaster loan provisions to permit loans to the coal mining industry to aid them in meeting the safety requirements of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. In so acting Congress recognized that we faced "disaster conditions" in the coal industry. Our failure to act in the past had resulted in a crisis condition. Tough new standards were needed, but the economically depressed coal industry simply could not meet these standards without some Federal assistance. Low interest loans under the Small Business Act was one such form of assistance. Exactly the same conditions exist with regard to pollution control in many small businesses. We now realize that we face an immediate crisis and imminent disaster. There is ample precedent for meeting the environmental crisis as we did in the coal safety crisis—by providing disaster loan assistance to businesses forced to make capital investments to meet new governmental standards.

Obviously the legislation we introduce today will not meet all the problems of the environmental crisis. Much more is needed than just Federal loan assistance. But this legislation is very important. American business is resourceful and capable. Given the necessary incentives and resources, it can and will move to meet the pollution crisis. This bill can be a significant step in the direction of governmental cooperation with the private sector in jointly solving a problem of the first magnitude. We commend this legislation to the attention of the Congress and urge its rapid consideration and approval.

REGARDING MERCURY POISONING

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, man's unthinking and growing abuse of the natural environment is a mounting tragedy. The latest chapter in this unfortunate saga concerns mercury poisoning which poses an immediate and deadly threat to human and animal life.

In previous statements here I have attempted to describe the urgency of the situation by, among other things, relating the facts of a recent mercury poisoning tragedy in Texas that put two children in a coma and left their older sister blinded and paralyzed; noting that fish and water in 14 States are contaminated by mercury; and by pointing out that mercury residues can persist up to 100 years in polluted lakes. On August 20 the Washington Post reported that mercury in dangerous amounts has been found in wild ducks in North Dakota and in Detroit, and recent testimony before a subcommittee of the other body indicates that the average person's intake of mercury is 10 times as high as it was 35 years ago.

It seems incredible to me that, knowing the seriousness of the problem, the Government agencies responsible for protecting the quality of our soil, water-

ways, and the air are not vigorously carrying out their responsibilities to prevent any further contamination of the food chain.

An excellent editorial underscoring the urgency for enforcing existing laws to prevent future mercury poisoning appeared in the July 30 edition of the Redding Pilot, and I am including the article, written by Mr. Steve Harris, editor, for the benefit of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

EVEN VERMONT

When was the last time you ate fish? Last night? Last Friday? Last month? How did it taste?

It takes within two to four hours for a large fish to transform inorganic mercury once in the blood stream into organ methylmercury, making consumption of the fish a health hazard.

But that's okay in America because we'd rather take the risk of suffering brain damage or even of dying if it is profitable or pleasurable. That's why most of us keep on smoking, disregarding that annoying cough or slight chest pain. Like the man says on television: "Come to where the pleasure is, come to Marlboro Country."

That's also why Vermont's Gov. Deane Davis, running for a second term, is supporting a move to relax the stringent regulations of his state's tough new environmental-control law so a New York City paper-processing company will settle on the shores of the Hoosic River in Pownal.

The heck with the rivers, the heck with the mercury-poisoned fish and the heck with the people who fish the rivers and eat the fish. The Spruce Tissue Company is coming to Vermont to build a \$7.2 million plant and that means more tax money for the state.

State Rep. Luther F. Hackett, a Republican, and State Sen. Leo O'Brien, Jr., a Democrat, both from South Burlington and both friends in the political off-season, were the prime movers in getting the environmental-control law passed in the last session of the Vermont legislature.

But what good is this law or any environmental-control law in the country when men like Gov. Davis will not support it when he has a chance to make money for his state?

It was only last year, testifying before a hearing of the subcommittee on economic development of the U.S. Committee on Public Works in Boston, that Gov. Davis said "We are fast losing control of our environment in New England and disaster will surely result unless programs for environmental control are soon implemented."

Now, with all the lakes and streams in Vermont reported by the state's Fish and Game Commissioner Edward Kehoe to contain mercury, Gov. Davis is willing to risk disaster for a \$7.2 million paper processing plant.

Maybe it will take an epidemic of mercury poisoning sweeping across America before we wake up and realize that bringing in more tax revenue isn't worth the price of somebody's life.

PROPOSALS TO END HIJACKING

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we all welcome the fact that the majority of the hostages taken and held by the Palestinian terrorist hijackers have been released. However, we must bear in mind that about 50 innocent people, including a number of American citizens, are still being held. It is essential that the civilized world take every possible step to

secure their safe release and to make sure that these acts of piracy are brought to an end.

There are a number of steps that can and should be taken to stop hijacking. The framework of international law must be strengthened and both multilateral and bilateral treaties must be sought to assure that countries will not give asylum to hijackers and will extradite them as criminals to the countries where the offenses occurred. In the Middle East, as I have previously indicated to this House, I agree with the proposal that there should be a boycott by all the airlines of those countries that encourage hijacking by not taking any steps against the hijackers. At the present time the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, of which I have the honor to be a member, is holding hearings to consider what steps can be taken along these lines.

All this is important for the future. Unfortunately, however, none of these measures is likely to help to secure the release of the hostages by the Palestinian terrorists. Pressure on the Government of Jordan is useless, since clearly that Government would release the hostages if it could, but does not have the power to do so.

I am not suggesting that the demands of the terrorists—assuming those demands have been made clear—should be met. To take this step would only be to encourage further outrages and further threats to the lives of innocent people.

Nor am I suggesting that there should be international military action in an attempt to recover the hostages. Even if this were practicable, it would greatly endanger the lives of the hostages themselves.

Some way must be found, however, to make the Palestinian terrorists realize that they have made international outlaws of themselves and that someday, somehow, they will be adequately punished for their crimes.

One immediate step that could be taken, it seems to me, is for this Government and the other governments involved to seek to cut off, at least temporarily, the flow of funds to the Palestinian terrorists which makes it possible for them to carry on their despicable activities.

The Palestinian terrorists are today receiving financial assistance from oil-rich Arab States. Yet all the Arab States, including the most radical, have condemned the hijacking. Why, then, should the Arab States which are supplying funds to the Palestinian terrorists not agree to suspend any further financial assistance until the hostages have been released?

Another possible approach for the U.S. Government—not inconsistent with the foregoing—would be for the President to announce that, first, the American people are angered and revolted by the acts of the hijackers and their terrorist backers; second, the U.S. Government is determined to show that such crimes will not be allowed to further the cause of the Palestinian irredentists; and, third, in order to demonstrate that the hijacking will only produce the contrary of what the Palestinians want, the U.S. Government is announcing additional

support for the State of Israel in the form of economic aid and the provision of additional supersonic jets for Israel's defense.

I am today making these suggestions to the President and the Secretary of State in the hope that they will be pursued.

Whether or not these are the best ways in which to proceed, it is unthinkable that the U.S. Government should stand idly by while these horrible acts of international barbarism continue and while some 50 hostages and their relatives continue to suffer.

CITIZENSHIP DAY AND CONSTITUTION WEEK—SEPTEMBER 17 TO 23

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

Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the observance of Citizenship Day and the first day of Constitution Week.

Largely due to the stimulation of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and other interested organizations which for many years supported the movement to establish a specific day for recognition of U.S. citizenship, Congress passed two joint resolutions authorizing the President to issue annual proclamations for the observance of Citizenship Day and Constitution Week. The Immigration and Naturalization Service, through yearly bulletins provides valuable advice to communities desiring to hold special ceremonies honoring new U.S. citizens and commemorating the historic signing of our Constitution.

My own State of Connecticut is fortunate to have Mr. James E. Smith as District Director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in Hartford. Mr. Smith, an able and dedicated public servant, actively works for the proper observance of Citizenship Day and Constitution Week in Connecticut so that the two historic events receive the recognition they deserve.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL LAND USE POLICY

(Mr. TAFT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TAFT, Mr. Speaker, in a country so rich in natural resources, our greatest fundamental resource is probably our land. Not only does it provide us with the food necessary to survival but much of the material needed to clothe and shelter us, as well as the meadows and wooded areas, the lowlands and the rocky crags so essential for human recreation and a favorable balance of nature.

Those among us who were reared close to the land or who continue to provide the Nation's needs from it know the value of each parcel of land all too well. Yet the numbers of such people decrease as the dynamic agricultural revolution frees more and more men to produce other goods and services. There is an increasing danger that those who do not appreciate the proper value of our land will misuse it.

Too often, rich productive agricultural land is paved over in an unthinking, unplanned accommodation to suburban sprawl. Farmers, in that case, may have to move into less productive locations where the cost of creating meals for their fellow Americans must necessarily increase.

This need not happen. As America grows, there is plenty of room for both farmer and city dweller.

The dangers that face us if we take an unenlightened path in the development of our land and the necessity for a national land-use policy are spelled out quite clearly in a recent speech by U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin. I commend it to my colleagues as a thoughtful treatise on one of the most critical issues of our times.

Secretary Hardin's September 12 address at the National Plowing Contest matches in Versailles, Ohio, follows:

It is a great privilege to take part in this program. All of us here know and love this land—these fertile acres that stretch across America's heartland.

I recall driving through this area many times, in past years, from my home in eastern Indiana. The changes are spectacular. Back in the '20's when I first made this trip, Ohio's population was only half what it is today.

This has been an interesting day for me. On landing at Dayton we were met by Congressman Bob Taft, who has been one of my helpful advisors in Washington. En route here Bob and I talked about the spectacular changes that have taken place in agriculture in recent years, and the progress here in Ohio.

The Congressman and I also discussed President Nixon's address to the Jaycees in St. Louis, in which he emphasized that people ought to think and talk more about the good things in America. Looking out the car window as we drove along, we were certainly impressed by the good things we could see along the way—the good things of agriculture, especially here in Darke County.

I am pleased to be here in the district so well represented in Washington by Congressman McCulloch; I am pleased indeed to share the platform today with your outstanding candidate for governor, Roger Cloud, and to hear his comments.

The National Plowing Matches are part of an agricultural tradition that goes back 300 years in Europe and a century or more in this country and Canada—events identified with recognizing the importance of land to mankind.

Your contests and exhibits highlight the farm revolution that has made American agriculture the best in the world. This is an appropriate occasion to give special thought to what will be happening to the Nation's land and the development of policies for the use of that land and their relationship to the quality of our total environment. First, however, let me touch on matters of immediate concern—the corn situation and farm legislation.

The latest estimate of this year's corn crop is contained in the September 1 crop report which became available after the market closed yesterday afternoon. The 1970 harvest is now expected to total about 4.4 billion bushels, down 290 million bushels from the 4.7 billion estimate of a month ago. This compares with last year's crop of 4.6 billion bushels.

The drop in the prospects over the past month amounts to about 6 percent, due partly to adverse weather but mostly to corn leaf blight.

This is the first time that a disease has struck this Nation's corn crop in anything like these proportions. Because of this and

because no one knows the extent to which it will recur next year, it has to be regarded seriously. But we are not faced with a crisis as was feared by some spokesmen earlier.

Actually, this year's estimated crop has been exceeded only twice in the past. Furthermore, total carryover stocks of corn and other grains amount to about 2 and a half billion bushels, which is more than ample to take care of domestic feeding requirements through the 1971 harvest and still permit sizable increases in export sales.

In the meantime we are working closely with the seed companies in an effort to maximize supplies of blight-resistant seed for planting next year. Fortunately some stocks are on hand and some more can be produced in warm climates during the winter months.

The amount of international concern with our corn crop has, I think, surprised everyone. We have had urgent requests for information from almost every part of the world—from Japan, from the Southwest Pacific, from several of the Latin American countries, and from most of the European countries.

In fact, the German Minister of Agriculture who has been in Washington this week asked as he left that a copy of yesterday's crop report be cabled to him immediately. Corn definitely has become an international commodity, reflecting the rising levels of living around the world—which in turn is reflected in an expanded demand for animal products and, therefore, more feed grain.

With regard to legislation, the House of Representatives approved the Agricultural Act of 1970, a carefully structured proposal reflecting months of intensive, bipartisan effort. It is now in the hands of the Senate and is scheduled for a Senate vote next Tuesday. It is our strong hope that the new law will closely resemble the measure passed by the House.

The House Bill provides leverage for expanding exports; it removes penalties for over-planting and abolishes marketing quotas; it will set a course for agriculture more firmly in the direction of crop specialization, making best use of land and water resources, and gearing production to changing markets.

If approved in a form similar to the House version, I sincerely believe the new farm law will enhance the economic position of farmers and serve the long-term best interests of all consumers and taxpayers as we move into the decade of the 1970's.

As I've worked with the members of Congress during the past many months, I have become more and more aware of the need for greater public understanding of both the problems and the contributions of American agriculture.

For example, there have been loud complaints about food prices. Yet food prices haven't gone up as much as other items in the cost of living index. They haven't gone up as much as incomes, and the average American consumer in 1970 can buy his family's food supply with the smallest percent of his income in the history of this or any country.

To the extent that this results from increased efficiency in agriculture we can take great pride. And this has occurred. On the other hand, some of our low food prices are due to inadequate returns to farm producers—and this is a matter that should not be tolerated. This is really what the new farm legislation is all about.

The corn blight alarm brought home for millions of Americans the importance of support programs and commodity credit operations. When a great, basic commodity seems threatened, the public has reason to feel reassured in that the ancient Biblical lesson of saving during good years against scarcity in poor years is a concept that still has merit. It underlies the whole partnership structure of programs of the Federal

Government, the States and farmers to assure continuing agricultural abundance.

Indeed, the essential significance of America's farm revolution lies in the fact that natural resources, public funds, scientific research, modern technology and improved management are welded into a versatile, ever-more powerful agricultural capability.

By producing more with fewer people, the American farmer has made it possible for more people to be employed in producing other goods we all want. This has happened to a greater extent here than anywhere.

No less significant is the freedom won by the man with the plow in liberating land, by producing more on fewer acres. If our output had not steadily increased over the past 50 years, we would need all our present acreage plus additional land equal to the area of all the States east of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio River in order to meet today's food needs.

This aspect of farm progress—the saving of land—has immense implications for the future. Today we still have more farm land than we need. In fact, this year we are holding about 50 million acres of cropland out of use.

This picture seems likely to change, however. Each year our expanding cities eat up more farm land. Still more goes into highways, airports and recreational facilities. And the trend will be stepped up as the new national growth policy takes form, and we begin to see a redistribution of the population and the emergency of hundreds of new growth centers throughout the Nation's great heartland.

Now is the time, while we still have some elbow room, to take a hard and critical look at our land and how we want to use it.

President Nixon recognizes this. He said in a message to Congress last month that "... Society as a whole has a legitimate interest in planning proper land use."

His message accompanied the first report of the Council on Environmental Quality, which asserted that misuse of land is "the most out-of-hand and irreversible" of all environmental problems.

How land can be put to best use for the greatest number of people is a matter that could be, in a very real sense, a key to America's future. It involves such vital issues as: adequate supplies of pure water, continuing abundance of farm products, living and working space for a growing population, protection of species and ecological systems, development of increased transportation facilities such as the many airports that will be needed in years to come, location of industrial and power plants, and the creation of safer, pleasanter environments for recreation and cultural purposes.

Solutions proposed for such problems will inevitably hinge, in many instances, on land utilization. Pressures will be brought to force greater amounts of land into non-agricultural uses. We know this because it is happening now, all the time.

A typical situation that quite often comes up may be seen in the need of a new airport or new manufacturing facility to be built, and the engineers decide the site they want is right in the middle of prime farm land. People can legitimately ask why the choice of a site in marginal land will not serve the purpose just as well.

The area of America's usable land is fixed, by and large. How land is to be apportioned for various purposes will have to be governed sooner or later, by sensible, carefully thought out guidelines. In developing a guidance policy, the Department of Agriculture and numerous other agencies of government at Federal, State and local levels will have important contributions to make.

Since most of the land involved is privately owned, many of the decisions for formulating and carrying out national land use policy will be made by landowners in terms of personal gain—hopefully in the best traditions of enlightened self-interest. Persons

like yourselves who are engaged in agriculture will be in a position to take a leading part in this decision making.

In the judgment of competent authorities, the United States has the land, and the ability, to satisfy the food requirements of a population perhaps double the size of today's provided we plan the use of land wisely.

A crucial question arises, however, and policy makers must keep it constantly in mind: It is this: In planning for greater economic, urban and industrial growth, how do we preserve our better farm lands for future needs and at the same time assure adequate land areas for other open space uses?

As answers to this question are sought, it will be helpful for people in agriculture to take a new look at their own real estate—to evaluate land not only for its productive capacity but also for its location and use potentials.

In many situations it will be highly advantageous for landowners and policy makers alike to consider the multiple uses to which given areas can be put.

Recent years have made it increasingly apparent, for example, that agricultural bounty and environmental quality can and should go together. Thousands on thousands of farmers are proving every day that the best conservation practices are synonymous with the best agricultural methods. The new farm bill, by the way, gives important support in that direction.

All together, these represent experience, "know how," leadership, facts, and organization—all necessary ingredients in further developing and carrying out a coordinated and innovative program of land use.

An outstanding example of USDA's capabilities may be found in some of the magnificent work of the Soil Conservation Service, which has been concerned with environmental improvement for 40 years. There is more to the environmental problem than smog and water pollution. In small watershed projects alone, SCS has prevented \$180 million in property damage from flooding. They have kept millions of tons of sediment out of streams, brought new municipal water supplies to many communities and created increased values in new recreational opportunities.

Successful land use policy will foster a climate conducive to the best agricultural practices by those who choose to farm. Good technology and good land are essential to achieving adequate farm income.

In the development of land use policy, many differing aims and different interests will have to be reconciled. As the President has said, "I believe that the problems of urbanization, of resources management, and of land and water use generally, can only be met by comprehensive approaches which take into account the widest range of social, economic and ecological concerns."

Already, a good start has been made. The Department of Agriculture has long had a leading role in the national land policy area, a tradition reflected in the Department's many rural development programs—experience in conservation, in the use of credit, and in planning.

The millions of acres of National Forests and Grasslands are important assets. So, likewise, are the cooperative programs that are under way with State departments of agriculture, experiment stations, land grant educational institutions and other universities, and the State extension services. There are the ASC county committees and more than 3,000 local conservation districts; and hundreds of thousands of farmers cooperating under voluntary agreements.

The best efforts of everybody concerned will be needed to assure that America's land and natural resources are properly developed to produce ample food and serve the space requirements of a growing population and economy.

This is the challenge that can be foreseen in President Nixon's words when he said: "I believe we must work toward the development of a National Land Use Policy to be carried out by an effective partnership of Federal, State and local governments together and, where appropriate, with new regional arrangements."

I am confident that those who are the providers of plenty from America's farms, groves, forests and ranches will rise to the challenge—and to the opportunities—presented by the President. In the final analysis, individual and community action by people dedicated to America's great heritage will achieve these new steps of progress in building the better Nation we want for our posterity.

May the day come when grateful citizens, enjoying the benefits of farsighted national land use policy, once again will say: "The man with the plow did it!"

A BILL TO MAKE ASSAULTS ON POLICEMEN, JUDGES, AND FIREMEN A FEDERAL CRIME

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER) in the introduction of legislation intended to make it a Federal crime to assault a policeman, judge, or fireman.

The recent attempted "shoot-out" at the Marin County Civic Center in California, in which a respected judge was slain, is graphic evidence of the need for this legislation.

This tragic incident is only one example of a long series of brutal and unprovoked assaults that this Nation has witnessed against law enforcement personnel, firemen, and court officials in recent months. Evidence clearly proves that these attacks have been deliberately perpetrated by so-called radical revolutionaries and were conceived by vicious minds attempting to destroy our society and its established institutions.

As I have stated before:

America is in a state of anarchy and the bomb, the torch and the gun have become the debating tools of these "Radical Revolutionaries"!

Our bill will make it a Federal crime to assault, injure, or kill any State or local law enforcement officer or judicial official because of his official position, and would also cover firemen during the performance of their duties. As we are all aware, there have been numerous instances when unprotected firemen were fired upon by hiding snipers while fighting to protect lives and property.

An example of exactly what is happening in this country today was reported by the San Francisco Examiner just this past weekend and I would like to include the article at this point in the RECORD.

GUERRILLAS' WAR AGAINST POLICE

New York City Mayor John V. Lindsay, who is very good at blurring political and social realities, recently took to the tube to proclaim there is no proof of an organized subversive plot to attack policemen.

This may have reassured some of his glib and fearful listeners, but it was pure nonsense—all the same—as he surely should have known.

His attention is hereby called to a report by the old House Committee on Un-Ameri-

can Activities. It is dated May 6, 1968; bears the Government Printing Office number 87-359, and is entitled, "Guerrilla Warfare Advocates in the United States."

In this disturbing summary of hearings before the committee, whose report should be read by all our mayors, there is compiled a devil's long index of groups that are united in a thoroughly documented common aim—the disruption and overthrow of our social system.

Eventual out and out armed urban warfare with the forces of government is the last step of their detailed blueprint for insurrection activities. The first steps include campus violence, then bombing of public buildings, then attacks on policemen, and then sabotage of public facilities such as transportation.

To date the blueprint is being followed exactly, step by step, and the police attack stage clearly seems now to have been reached. A national survey by the United Press International shows that over 1000 policemen have been shot, stabbed or otherwise wounded in deliberate assaults this year—16 of them fatally.

These figures already are double those of 1969 and four times those of 1968. Furthermore, in an eight-month period which has had upwards of 2000 terror bombings, the police attacks have greatly accelerated in the last three months. In the last weekend of August alone, 13 policemen were shot without warning or provocation.

We spotlight these facts here because the public should know the facts, however unpleasant. An enlightened public is the strongest bulwark of our republic. And one of its continuing weaknesses is the public official who tries to obscure grim realities by refusing to face them, or by trying to obscure them with a wash of soft soap.

It is incumbent on the Congress, in my judgment, to make it crystal clear that this is a critical national problem that must be met with the full and potent force of the law. By the simple expedient of making these attacks a crime under Federal statutes, it will permit the FBI and other Federal officials to cooperate with local officials in the investigation of such crimes.

Vigilante-type retaliation is not the answer to the problem, but, when due process of law fails to quell these attacks, then people invariably turn to self-imposed repression or attempt to take the law into their own hands.

If we are to avoid this type of confrontation, new laws with real teeth in them, such as the one we have introduced today, are desperately needed.

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW IN GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the text of an address by the Vice President of the United States last night in Grand Rapids, Mich., at which I had the honor of presenting him to an enthusiastic audience of Michigan Republicans.

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

There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT THE MICHIGAN REPUBLICAN DINNER, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., SEPTEMBER 16, 1970

I am glad to be back in Grand Rapids, where you gave the Nixon-Agnew ticket such a warm and friendly reception in 1968.

And I can think of no more appropriate place to visit in this first full week of the 1970 campaign than the home district of a future Speaker of the House of Representatives—Jerry Ford.

Make no mistake about it, Ladies and Gentlemen, that is the primary goal of this national campaign—to give President Nixon a Congress ready and able to work with him in carrying out the mandate you gave him.

And no one would appreciate that more than Jerry Ford. Jerry has the experience, the drive, and the legislative savvy to do the job. All he needs are the horses—good, strong steady Republican horses.

I have seen him in leadership meetings with the President of the United States. I have seen him called upon for advice in critical situations. And I have heard him deliver his judgment coolly, sensibly and persuasively.

If you could see him in action behind the scenes, where the pressure of national affairs separates the men from the boys, you would know why I am traveling all around this nation in this campaign: to get more all-Americans like Jerry Ford to support the President in Congress in the years ahead.

Important to the success of any State campaign is the man at the head of the ticket. You are fortunate, here in Michigan, to have a man with the ability and solid experience of Governor Bill Milliken.

Of course, you are all aware that Michigan is the land of leadership. When the chips are down, we know we can turn to a freshman Senator whose talent and brainpower have catapulted him to one of the most responsible leadership positions in American government—I refer, of course, to Bob Griffin.

Bob would be the first to admit that the Senate offers plenty of room for improvement.

There is something to be said about President Theodore Roosevelt's remark: "When they call the roll in the Senate, the Senators do not know whether to answer 'present' or 'not guilty.'" These days, though, Teddy's remarks would be considered "polarizing."

Michigan has a splendid opportunity this year to help us reverse the political balance of the Senate—to break the grip of a little band of unwilling men who are holding back the will of the people. You have a first-class candidate to do this in Lenore Romney.

I have known Lenore since she was Michigan's First Lady. She is profoundly concerned with the well-being of people. She is totally dedicated to public service. And if anybody is tempted to underestimate the power of a woman, let them talk to Senator Margaret Chase Smith—and Senator-to-be Lenore Romney.

You won't find Lenore Romney, for example, exculpating draft dodgers . . . voting against crime control . . . cooing with political doves who seek to sabotage our effort to secure an honorable peace in Southeast Asia . . . you won't find Lenore Romney voting for wild spending that drives up the cost of living . . . or saying that marijuana should be legalized.

It's incredible, really, that the opposition party of this State would formally embrace resolutions favoring a unilateral pullout of all of our forces from South Vietnam by Christmas of 1970—thereby accepting an American defeat.

It is hard to believe that the platform of the Democratic Party of this State urges the granting of amnesty to draft evaders who are in prison or who have fled to Canada. In effect, they vote no confidence in our men who are doing their duty, and put their blessing on those who shirked their duty.

Any political leadership that far out of touch with the people is not worthy of holding elective office—State or national.

This idea of welcoming home the run-

aways did not originate here in Michigan. On February 25, 1969, Senator Edward Kennedy proposed a commission to explore the granting amnesty to draft evaders. This Senator, who today finds it popular to rail against the "campus commandos," last year pointed out that—and I quote: "Many times in our history we have, as a nation, been magnanimous enough to grant amnesty."

Rest assured, my friends, that there will be no amnesty for draft dodgers. There are great choices in life. Millions of young Americans chose the path of courage, and more than 40,000 of them died for their decision. The few hundred slackers who chose another path are just going to have to live with the consequences of their decision.

I make that point tonight, Ladies and Gentlemen, to illustrate a larger choice that faces our entire society.

There is a segment of our society that embraces amnesty as a way of life. This segment is represented far beyond its number in the United States Senate.

When a decision is required to keep America strong enough to encourage a peaceful world order, a little band of Senators can be counted upon to come down on the side of weakness.

When a decision is needed to restrain federal spending to hold down the cost of living, this same little band of unwilling men is sure to decide against the President and against the interest of all the people.

When a decision is needed to crack down on lawlessness, to sweep the dope peddlers and thugs off the streets of America, this little band of men says no.

This little band of radical-liberals has long marched behind banners that say "police brutality" and "repression"—at a time when innocent human beings are being brutalized by crime, and the civil rights of millions are being repressed by fear of senseless violence.

This little band of men is guided by a policy of calculated weakness. They vote to weaken our defenses; they vote to weaken our moral fiber; they vote to weaken the forces of law. They were raised on a book by Dr. Spock, and a paralyzing permissive philosophy pervades every policy they espouse.

These are not evil men. They are not disloyal men, or unpatriotic men. And, with the exception of election time, when they trim their beliefs to appear to be more in accord with the will of the people, these are not insincere men. They deeply believe that permissiveness at home and isolation abroad would be the best course for our country.

But because these men are so wrong about America, they are doing great wrong to America. And that is why they must be driven from their positions of power.

You might wonder why, in a democratic society, this little band of unwilling men is so confident that it can get away with frustrating the will of the great majority of Americans.

I think I know the reason. They believe they will automatically be returned to power every six years by a force more powerful than any other force in politics—the force of habit.

They believe that the American working man, who supported them years ago, will go down the line, in F.D.R.'s phrase "again and again and again."

Well, this year the apostles of the old political order are due for a rude awakening. The working people of America will no longer be taken for granted.

I am convinced that George Meany is absolutely right when he says that the American working man is the captive of no party. More and more, the American working man is turning away from the people who have sold out his interests; more and more, he is turning to candidates who understand his needs and respect his views.

Never forget this: the only kind of govern-

ment that works is the kind that respects people who work.

This is the man who has built America—with his heart and his mind and his hands. He is proud of his country. He properly resents seeing it run down by people who have never had to work as hard as he does.

He and his sons have served proudly in our armed services. Many of them have fought, and some have died in Vietnam. He does not appreciate the suggestion by some Senators that this sacrifice be thrown away. He respects the flag.

This forgotten American has strong family ties and keeps faith with his religion. He is fed up with the tired rationales and the general permissiveness that have brought rioting in the streets and on the campuses. He is fed up with watching college buildings destroyed in the name of academic freedom—especially when the wanton destruction drives up the tuition he must scrape to pay.

He does not enjoy being called a bigot for wanting his children to go to a public school in their own neighborhood.

For too long, this American has been forgotten—but on this election day the forgotten American won't forget.

I speak of the backbone of America—the working man, earning between \$5,000 and \$15,000 a year, supporting his family with no hand-outs from Uncle Sam. He has to fight and scrimp to make ends meet; often, he moonlights at a second job, or his wife works to supplement the family income. His real wages didn't go up one thin dime in the second half of the Sixties, thanks to higher taxes and inflation, the legacy of his former political friends.

The President has acted responsibly and effectively to curb the runaway inflation which was brought on by \$57 billion in consecutive budget deficits in the spending spree of the Sixties. We have strong evidence now that he is succeeding, and that we are now on the road toward full employment with reasonable price stability.

Lenore Romney's opponent and some of the other kneejerk spenders in Congress have constantly contributed to this problem. They are still trying to pile on more spending than the country can afford. Mrs. Romney's opponent alone has sponsored bills that would add \$17 billion to the national debt.

Crime is another matter of prime concern to the working man where this Administration is moving aggressively, but has been hamstrung by Congress. The President has sent fourteen crime bills to Capitol Hill, thirteen of them last year. Only one has come back for his signature—the District of Columbia Crime Act which should produce dramatic results on a local scale, and serve as a model for similar local legislation across the nation.

Despite this "ho-hum" attitude in Congress, the national crime rate was curbed last year through strong administrative efforts and better local law enforcement. The FBI report issued last month for 1969 showed that the increase in serious crimes nationwide slowed down last year—for the first time in five years. And in cities over 250,000 the increase in serious crimes was cut in half. That's not enough—but that's progress.

I am sure Lenore Romney will continue reminding Michigan audiences that her opponent was one of only four Senators who voted in 1968 against the Omnibus Crime Bill. This legislation needed to fight crime was passed despite the opposition of this Senator from Michigan, and it brought \$1.6 million to Michigan last year for improved law enforcement.

Our Administration has also undertaken a host of other programs of great importance to the working man.

We asked for nearly \$3 billion for manpower programs to provide skill training and em-

ployability development to well over one million unemployed or underemployed workers.

We installed forty-six computer job banks to serve metropolitan areas in thirty-three states. These help job seekers to find out quickly what jobs are available throughout an entire metropolitan area.

Our Department of Labor has undertaken strong efforts on behalf of minority-group workers.

Income tax relief will be granted to lower income groups under the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

Well over a million heads of families who work full time but whose annual income is less than the poverty level—the so-called working poor—will qualify for assistance under the Family Assistance Act.

Improved health and safety standards for workers are now before Congress.

The Administration has proposed equal opportunities in higher education for children in families below the \$10,000-a-year level—to be achieved through a combination of grants and loans. For the first time in our history, no qualified student would be denied higher education because his family could not afford it.

We have succeeded in providing unemployment insurance protection for almost five million additional workers.

Improved retirement benefits were included in the Social Security Bill signed recently by the President.

These are all long strides forward for the American working man and woman, taken at the initiative of President Nixon and, in most cases, pushed through a reluctant Congress.

But let us not delude ourselves, as our opponents do, into thinking that there is a monolithic bloc of votes that can be labeled "The American Worker."

And let us not delude ourselves, as our opponents do, into thinking that any group of individuals votes strictly on the basis of group self-interest.

When political pundits look at the working man, they say with their usual absolute certainty that the Republican appeal is on the social issues, while the Democratic appeal is on the economic issues. I submit that today's conventional wisdom will turn out to be tomorrow's mistake.

I believe that we have a powerful case to make on that "gut issue" called "The Pocket-book Issue."

That case is based on one single unpleasant fact that everybody hates to face. Let me give it to you without the frills: The only time the Democrat leaders have been able to bring about full employment is during a war or during preparations for a war.

I'm sorry if that hard fact upsets the squeamish, but it happens to be true. And once you have said it out loud the first time, it becomes easier to say again: "The only time the Democrat leaders have been able to bring about full employment is during a war or during preparations for a war."

Therefore, to use a phrase of Dickens, they brought about "the best of times and the worst of times"—both at the same time. That is not an economic record that merits pride.

This Administration, on the other hand, offers the American working man something new and different—prosperity in peacetime, and without a runaway inflation.

Right now, today, we can point to an economy that is headed upward while a war is heading downward. We're not talking "pie in the sky." We're talking about solid, measurable progress toward a goal that the opposition never was able to achieve.

Just the other day, a survey of almost two hundred leading economists showed an overwhelming agreement with our policies. Production is on the rise, and that will surely mean more jobs. And since it will take place in peacetime, that will mean less

inflation and more real take-home pay for more workers.

We do not belong on the defensive when it comes to jobs and real prosperity for the working man. Just the opposite—the record of 1970 offers greater economic hope than the average family has ever had before.

Remember this: the hardest times are the war times. The American people are ready to trade a helmet in for a hard hat any day. One great difference between this Administration and previous Administrations is this: We put the interests of all the people ahead of any special interest.

We don't say, "Stick with us, and you'll get a better deal than your neighbor." Instead, we say, "Think as Americans first, and then as American workers, or American employers, or American veterans or housewives or suburbanites or whatever."

If there is a "new politics" abroad in our land, that is it. The old way of assembling majorities by appealing to people by ethnic group or social class or region is doomed to defeat.

Ours is a more inspiring message. We say, "Whoever you are, whatever you do, wherever you live—think of yourself first as an American, and support what is best for the whole country."

Idealistic? Maybe. But there is a streak of idealism that is part of the American character, and it has not been preempted by highbrows or longhairs.

The American worker doesn't need politicians to tell him that unemployment is higher now than it was when we were spending ten billion dollars more to support a wider war. He knows it, and we know it.

But he also knows that something had to be done to restrain a runaway inflation that snatched away his pay increase. He knows that the big spending that sounds so good to specific groups on the receiving end has to come from somewhere—and it's the worker who pays, in higher taxes and higher prices.

Most important of all the American worker knows that what is best for the whole nation is best for every single American in it.

And now, at long last, we have a President in Washington with the courage to do what is best for all the people.

The forgotten American is forgotten no more.

We remember who pays the taxes. We remember who has had to fight the wars. We remember who makes the automobiles, build the plants, and makes this country run.

And by our action to end this war with honor; by our action to slam the brakes on the cost of living; by our action to crack down on the racketeers and thugs who prey on honest people; by these actions on behalf of all the people, I believe we have earned the strong support of the working people of America.

One important way to improve the quality of life is to enhance the dignity of work. To do this, we must show a new and decent respect for the decent people who respect the law, respect the flag, respect their neighbors, and have earned respect for themselves.

Let me say it again—the forgotten American is forgotten no more. And as long as he joins in sending Senators and Representatives to Washington like Jerry Ford and Lenore Romney, who will stand shoulder to shoulder with the President of the United States, he will never be forgotten again.

JUVENILE JUSTICE INSTITUTE AND TRAINING CENTER ACT OF 1970

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced the Juvenile Justice Institute and Training Center Act of 1970, H.R. 19327.

Cosponsoring this bill with me are Messrs. NIX, WALDIE, ADAMS, BIAGGI, BROWN of California, DADDARIO, HATHAWAY, KEE, KYROS, LEGGETT, MURPHY of New York, OTTINGER, ROSENTHAL, GILBERT, GARMATZ, BINGHAM, HALPERN, HARRINGTON, MATSUNAGA, SYMINGTON, FRASER, EILBERG, TUNNEY, WILLIAM D. FORD, WOLFF, ROONEY of Pennsylvania, GUDE, ANDERSON of Tennessee, KOCH, FARBSTEIN, GALIFIANAKIS, ECKHARDT, BRADEMANS, McCARTHY, and FRIEDEL.

My cosponsors and I feel that this bill is of prime importance when confronted with the terrifying statistics attesting to the increase of juvenile crime and delinquency.

Over a year ago, the House Select Committee on Crime received the shocking testimony that the 15- to 17-age group, representing less than 6 percent of the population of the United States, accounts for almost 13 percent of all arrests. This represents the highest arrest rate of any age group. In that age group from 1960 to 1967, crime increased 59 percent, while the amount of people in the group increased only 22 percent.

The Juvenile Justice Institute and Training Center would serve needed functions in the juvenile justice area. At present, there are 11 Federal agencies dealing with juvenile justice; however, there is no central research facility coordinating and listing all data in the area. The Institute would perform that function.

The Institute, further, would commission original, independent research into various aspects of juvenile justice. In addition, the Institute would each year report to the President and to the Congress on all activities of the Institute, discuss various areas of the juvenile justice system wherein changes are needed, and propose legislation to effect those changes.

The Institute would prepare a series of Minimum Standards of Juvenile Justice and a Model Juvenile Justice Code. Both of these would serve as models for local jurisdictions.

Experts will be made available by the Institute to assist State and local communities in improving procedures and operating methods.

Long- and medium-term training courses will be made available to personnel in all aspects of juvenile justice. This would include police, judges, probation officers, and corrections personnel. The new techniques learned would then be available to local jurisdictions to help them upgrade their fight against the rise in youth crime.

Finally, grants would be made by the Institute to various programs with a history of successful experimentation in the past. Such programs would include home substitutes; diversion of juveniles from the judicial process; community involvement programs; and special training of lawyers and law students in the juvenile justice field.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Select Committee on Crime, I have been

saddened and alarmed by the rapid growth of our juvenile crime problem. I feel that an Institute such as the one proposed today will make an affirmative and important step toward alleviating this problem.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the bill follows:

H.R. 19327

A bill to establish a Juvenile Research Institute and Training Center

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 1. This Act may be cited as the "Juvenile Research Institute and Training Center Act of 1970".

FINDINGS AND POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that the problems of juvenile crime and juvenile justice are among the most urgent problems facing the United States, and not enough has been done to stem the growing tide of juvenile crime or to improve the administration of the juvenile justice system. Consequently, it is the policy of the Congress that there should be established a single agency charged with improving the juvenile justice system. It should be the duty of such agency to promote research, collect and disseminate data, make grants, initiate experimental projects for the improvement of the juvenile justice system, and take responsibility for coordinating the activities of the various Federal agencies presently involved with juvenile justice.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Federal agency" means any department, agency, or instrumentality, including any wholly owned Government corporation, of the executive branch of Government.

(b) The term "State" means any State of the United States, any territory or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or political subdivision, department, agency, or instrumentality of any of them, but does not include the Panama Canal Zone.

(c) The terms "juvenile justice" and "juvenile justice system" refer to the Federal, State, and local laws and procedures designed to deal with the care and handling of juveniles and juvenile delinquency and includes, but is not limited to, educational, social, psychological, and vocational services, corrective and preventative care, guidance, and training, and other rehabilitative services designed to protect the public and assist juveniles.

ESTABLISHMENT OF INSTITUTION; DIRECTORS

SEC. 4. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the Juvenile Research Institute and Training Center (referred to hereinafter as the "Institute"). The Institute shall be headed by an Executive Director, who shall be appointed for a term of four years by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate provided for GS-18 of the General Schedule contained in section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code. In addition, there shall be two Deputy Directors, who shall be appointed for a term of four years by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of GS-16 of the General Schedule contained in section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(b) (1) AUTHORITY OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTIVE WITH RESPECT TO RULES AND REGULATIONS AND DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Executive Director may—

(A) promulgate such rules and regulations as may be required to carry out the functions of the Institute; and

(B) delegate to any other officer or employee of the Institute authority for the performance of any duty imposed, or the exercise of any power conferred, upon the Institute by this Act, and any reference herein to the Executive Director shall include his duly authorized delegate or delegates.

(2) DUTIES OF DEPUTY DIRECTORS.—The Deputy Directors, in addition to their duties under section 9(b) of this Act, shall perform such duties as are assigned to them by the Executive Director.

STAFF AND RELATED MATTERS

SEC. 5. (a) STAFF.—The Director may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as he deems advisable. The staff shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code governing appointments in the competitive service and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(b) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE; EXPERTS.—In the performance of the functions of the Institute the Executive Director is authorized—

(1) to obtain the service of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5 of the United States Code;

(2) to appoint such advisory committees as he may determine to be necessary or desirable for the effective performance of the functions of the Institute;

(3) to designate representatives to serve on such committees as he may determine to be necessary or desirable to maintain effective liaison with Federal agencies, with departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the States, and with private organizations, which are engaged in activities related to the functions of the Institute; and

(4) to use the services, personnel, and facilities of Federal and State agencies, with their consent, with or without reimbursement therefor as determined by them.

(c) ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon request made by the Executive Director, each Federal agency is authorized and directed—

(1) to make its services, personnel, and facilities available to the greatest practicable extent to the Institute in the performance of its functions; and

(2) subject to provisions of law and regulations relating to the classification of information, to furnish to the Institute such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics as the Institute may determine to be necessary or desirable for the performance of the functions of the Institute.

REPORT

SEC. 6. Each year, the Institute shall transmit to the President and the Congress a report containing (A) a full and complete description of the activities of the Institute during the preceding year, (B) a discussion of matters currently affecting the interests of juveniles and juvenile justice systems, (C) recommendations for the solution of problems relating to juvenile justice, and (D) such recommendations for proposed legislation as the Institute may consider to be necessary or desirable.

Coordinating Committee for Juvenile Justice.

SEC. 7. (a) ESTABLISHMENT AND MEMBERS.—The Juvenile Research Institute and Training Center shall establish, in the Institute, a Coordinating Committee for Juvenile Justice (referred to hereinafter as "Committee"). The Committee shall be composed of the following members:

(1) The Executive Director of the Institute.

- (2) The Director of the Office of Education.
- (3) The Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.
- (4) The Director of the Children's Bureau.
- (5) The Director of the Office of Juvenile Delinquency.
- (6) The Director of the National Institute of Mental Health.
- (7) The Director of the Office of Manpower Training.
- (8) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons.
- (9) The Director of the Model Cities Program.
- (10) The Director of the United States Employment Service.

(11) The Chief Counsel of the legal service division of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

(12) Two United States Senators to be appointed by the President.

(13) Two Representatives in Congress to be appointed by the President.

(b) SPECIAL TERMS OF OFFICE.—The United States Senators and Representatives in Congress shall be appointed to serve on the Committee for a term of two years, and may be reappointed. Any United States Senator or Representative in Congress appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

(c) CHAIRMAN.—The Executive Director of the Institute shall serve as chairman of the Committee and shall designate another member of the Committee to serve as chairman in his absence.

(d) DUTIES.—It shall be the duty of the Committee—

(1) to advise, consult with, and make recommendations with respect to all activities relating to the functions of the Institute;

(2) to assure transmission to the Institute of complete information and data on all activities and projects being carried on within the Federal Government that affect juvenile justice and related matters;

(3) to evaluate the activities of the Federal agencies represented on the Committee and, with respect to matters relating to juvenile justice, identify (A) programs in need of improvement, (B) matters with respect to which there is a needless duplication of effort, and (C) problems which warrant Federal attention; and

(4) to appraise the entire Federal involvement in the juvenile justice system.

(e) MEETINGS.—The Committee shall meet at least six times a year, and at such other times as the chairman or a majority of the Committee deems appropriate.

PROGRAMS

SEC. 8. (a) DATA COLLECTION.—The Institute shall collect, synthesize, and formulate into useful information all available data on juvenile justice and related matters.

(b) PUBLICATIONS.—The Institute from time to time shall compile and disseminate to appropriate Federal, State, local, and private agencies, through such publications (including a periodic journal) and other means as it determines appropriate, such information as it considers to be necessary or helpful with respect to juvenile justice and related matters.

(c) MODEL LAWS AND MINIMUM STANDARDS.—The Institute shall make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of—

(1) preparing a comparison and analysis of State and Federal laws relating to juveniles and juvenile justice;

(2) preparing model laws and recommendations designed to effect a helpful and efficient system of juvenile justice; and

(3) preparing minimum standards with respect to the administrative structure, procedure, and operation of those agencies, institutions, and facilities operated in con-

nected with juvenile justice programs and related matters.

In conducting such investigation and study the Institute shall cooperate with bar associations, Federal, State, and local agencies, and appropriate individuals and private agencies.

(d) CERTIFICATE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT.—Under such rules and regulations as the Executive Director shall establish, the Institute may from time to time issue a certificate of accomplishment to those Federal, State, local, and private agencies, institutions, and facilities involved with juvenile justice which meet such standards of proficiency and excellence as the Institute may establish.

(e) PROGRAM EVALUATION AND ASSISTANCE.—The Institute shall make available trained personnel to Federal, State, local, and private agencies for the purpose of evaluating juvenile justice programs and providing guidance and assistance in carrying out such programs.

(f) MEDIUM AND LONG-TERM TRAINING COURSES.—The Institute shall establish and conduct medium and long-term training courses in matters relating to juvenile justice for such executive and administrative personnel as it may deem appropriate, including community leaders, judges, referees, and persons responsible for programs relating to law enforcement, probation, correction, legal aid, and community based rehabilitation projects. In addition to such other courses of instruction as the Institute may deem appropriate, the curriculum shall include courses on operating methods, administration of juvenile courts and facilities, and procedures for the control and rehabilitation of juveniles who have committed criminal offenses.

(g) SHORT-TERM REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS.—The Institute shall conduct short-term regional training programs, work shops, and seminars with respect to all matters relating to juvenile justice for operating-level personnel employed by Federal, State, and local governments, and private agencies.

GRANTS

SEC. 9. (a) GENERALLY.—Under such rules and regulations as it may establish, the Institute is authorized to make grants under this section to Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies whose programs or projects meet such standards and whose applications meet such requirements as the Institute may require.

(b) AWARD BY DIRECTORS.—The Executive Director and the two Deputy Directors shall act as a review board in awarding grants under this section, and no grant shall be awarded unless a majority of such directors agree thereto.

(c) PURPOSES FOR WHICH GRANTS MAY BE MADE.—Grants for the following purposes are authorized under this section:

(1) COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES FOR JUVENILES.—The Institute may make grants to aid any institution or facility which—

(A) is operated as a home substitute,

(B) provides supervision, guidance, or therapy,

(C) admits juveniles between the ages of 7 and 17, who are classified as truant, drug addicts or drug abusers, runaways, or ungovernable, and

(D) does not house more than 25 such juveniles.

No grant under this paragraph shall be for an amount in excess of 66 per centum of the costs of maintenance, rental, staff, and auxiliary services under the project or program with respect to which such grant is made.

(2) PROGRAMS TO DIVERT JUVENILES FROM THE JUDICIAL PROCESS.—The Institute may make grants to aid communities in establishing programs to which police agencies or courts may refer apprehended or pre-delinquent juveniles. No grant under this para-

graph shall be for an amount in excess of 66 per centum of the costs of maintenance and staff of the project or program with respect to which such grant is made.

(3) COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROGRAMS.—The Institute may make grants to aid in the establishment of local "volunteer corps" which provide effective community involvement to youths. No grant under this paragraph shall be for an amount in excess of 66 per centum of the costs of the salary and other expenses of a full-time staff worker for the project or program with respect to which such grant is made.

(4) LEGAL REPRESENTATION.—The Institute may make grants to assist in the formation of a trained corps of juvenile court attorneys if the program or project for which a grant is requested will—

(A) insure representation of not less than two-thirds of all juveniles appearing in the juvenile courts of the jurisdiction in which the corps is to be formed, and

(B) incorporate for the participating attorneys special training approved or conducted in conjunction with standards and policies established by the Institute.

With respect to any program or project for which a grant is made under this paragraph, the Institute shall conduct, within the twelve month period beginning on the date a grant is received under this paragraph, an evaluation of such program or project with special reference to such factors as the time of appointment of counsel, the degree of delay in effecting disposition of cases, the extent to which juveniles are accorded all legal rights in the trial process, the percentage of cases disposed of other than by plea, and the extent of counsel's involvement in detention hearings and disposition hearings. No grant under this paragraph shall be for an amount in excess of 50 per centum of the cost of the fees of the attorneys participating in the project or program with respect to which such grant is made.

(5) POSTGRADUATE LEGAL TRAINING.—The Institute may make grants for the purpose of aiding law schools in developing postgraduate legal training in programs in relating to juvenile justice if—

(A) such law schools submit an itemized plan, with respect to courses, practical work, and the theory of such training,

(B) such training includes prosecution and defense techniques, and

(C) such training programs are designed to meet certain minimum standards established by the Institute in cooperation with participating law schools. No grant under this paragraph shall be for an amount in excess of the total amount which represents 40 per centum of the costs for teachers' salaries, 50 per centum of the costs of all other expenses, and 60 per centum of the cost of fellowship stipends for study in the project or program with respect to which such grant is made.

(6) POST-INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT.—The Institute may make grants for education and training to youths leaving institutions to reenter the community and to youths on probation, if such programs are coordinated by public juvenile agencies in conjunction with private industry.

TRAINING

SEC. 10 (a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Institute is authorized, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, to make grants or contracts for projects for the training of personnel employed in or preparing for employment in fields related to the diagnosis, treatment, or rehabilitation of youths who are delinquent or in danger of becoming delinquent, or for the counseling or instruction of parents in the improving or parental instruction and supervision of youths who are delinquent or in danger of becoming delinquent. Such projects shall include special programs which provide youths and adults with training for career opportunities, in-

cluding new types of careers, in such fields. Such projects may include, among other things, development of courses of study and of interrelated curricula in schools, colleges, and universities, establishment of short-term institutes for training at such schools, colleges, and universities, inservice training, and traineeships with such stipends, including allowances for travel and subsistence expenses, as the Secretary may determine to be necessary.

(b) **RECIPIENTS AND CONDITIONS OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.**—Such grants may be made to and such contracts may be made with any Federal, State, or local public or nonprofit private agency or organization; and to the extent it deems it appropriate, the Institute shall require the recipient of any such grant or contract to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the projects for which the grant or contract is made.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 11. For the purpose of carrying out this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and \$4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 18127) making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-1456)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18127) "making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Quality Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions 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 13, 26, and 28.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 25, 27, and 29; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,929,160,000"; and the Senate 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 "\$353,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$39,597,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$84,000,000"; 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 "\$25,480,000"; 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 "\$19,065,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$186,793,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$22,375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,230,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 17, 20, 21, and 22.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN J. RHODES,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
(except amendment No. 4),
HOWARD W. ROBISON,
(I reserve on amendment
No. 4),
FRANK T. BOW,
(except amendment No. 4).

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
JOHN STENNIS,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
GORDON ALLOTT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18127) making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Quality Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the

Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions 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—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Operating Expenses

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$1,929,160,000 instead of \$1,965,500,000 as proposed by the House, and \$1,900,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the Senate bill includes \$8,000,000 for the Weapons program for increased costs arising from strikes at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Rocky Flats, Colorado, and the Nevada test site; \$390,000 for research on an isotopic powered artificial heart; and \$1,700,000 for related changes in selected resources. The increase over the Senate bill figure also reflects an adjustment of \$18,770,000 to correct an error in the Senate bill total.

The reduction below the House bill includes \$2,000,000 in the Special nuclear materials program; \$3,560,000 in the Reactor development program; \$2,000,000 in the Physical research program; \$140,000 in the Biology and medicine program; \$100,000 in the Civilian application of nuclear explosives program (Plowshare); \$3,540,000 in changes in selected resources; and \$25,000,000 based on the availability of carryover of unobligated balances from fiscal year 1970.

Plant and Capital Equipment

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$353,600,000 instead of \$360,100,000 as proposed by the House, and \$336,100,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the Senate bill consists of \$500,000 for planning the Addition to the physics building (human radiobiology facility), Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois; \$600,000 for planning the National Nuclear Science Information Center, Oak Ridge, Tennessee; and \$300,000 for a radiotherapy linear accelerator facility at the Puerto Rico Nuclear Center. The increase also reflects an adjustment of \$16,100,000 to correct an error in the Senate bill total.

The reduction below the House bill includes \$5,000,000 in the allowance for the 200 BEV accelerator, Du Page and Kane Counties near Chicago, Illinois, for which a total of \$60 million is appropriated to continue construction, and \$1,500,000 for the Addition to the physics building (human radiobiology facility), Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois.

The conferees are in agreement that available funds shall be reprogrammed to provide for necessary repair and replacement of the Tandem Vande Graaff Accelerator and Computer damaged by fire at the University of Wisconsin, at Madison.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE— CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Corps of Engineers—Civil General Investigations

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$39,597,000 instead of \$38,599,000 as proposed by the House and \$41,616,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes \$689,000 for studies as listed below and restoration of \$349,000 of the House reduction for anticipated additional unobligated carryover balances.

The conferees are in agreement that the funds provided for the San Francisco Bay Area in-depth study will not be used until review and approval by the committees of the detailed plan of survey now being formulated.

The increase provided over the House bill shall be allocated to the following studies:

Alaska:	(N) Anchorage small boat basin..... \$20,000	Maine:	(FC) South coastal urban areas..... 1 25,000	Oregon:	(FC) Luckiamute River..... 10,000
	(FC) Ship Creek and Eagle River..... 10,000	Missouri:	(N) Cape Girardeau Harbor..... 15,000	Rhode Island:	(N) Newport Harbor..... 8,000
Arkansas:	(FC) Arkansas River, vicinity of North Little Rock (Dark Hollow)..... 15,000		(FC) Kansas City-North Kansas City-Birmingham..... 4,000	Texas:	(FC) Red River and tributaries above Denison Dam, Texas & Oklahoma..... 1 10,000
California:	(N) Richmond Harbor..... 10,000	Nebraska:	(FC) Lost-Dry and Twin Creek Basins..... 1 10,000	Virginia:	(N) Norfolk Harbor, Craney Island disposal area..... 1 20,000
	(N) San Francisco Bay Area (in depth)..... 150,000	New Jersey:	(N) Sandy Hook Bay..... \$10,000	(FC) Upper Roanoke River..... 20,000	
	(FC) Wildcat and San Pablo Creeks..... 30,000	New Mexico:	(FC) Pojoaque River and Tributaries..... 1 10,000	Washington:	(FC) Crab Creek..... 1 6,000
Florida:	(N) Eastern and Redfish Lakes..... 10,000	New York:	(N) Niagara River, Niagara Falls improvement..... 1 50,000	(N) Grays Harbor & Chehalis River and Hoquiam River..... 1 83,000	
Georgia:	(N) Altamaha River..... 1 8,000	North Carolina:	(BE) Bogue Banks..... 1 10,000	1 Increase in House bill figure.	
	(FC) Satilla River Basin..... 15,000	(FC) Eastern North Carolina above Cape Lookout..... 1 10,000	(N) Hatteras Inlet..... 10,000	Construction, General	
Illinois:	(FC) Mississippi River, Mile 123-162 (Ohio to Missouri River)..... 10,000	North Dakota:	(FC) Buford-Trenton..... 15,000	Amendment No. 4: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment providing a total appropriation of \$852,063,000, of which \$807,000 shall be available to continue planning on the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam and Reservoirs, Maine.	
	(N) Muscooten Bay, Illinois River..... 5,000	Oklahoma:	(FC) Pembina River..... 25,000	The funds appropriated under this heading are to be allocated as shown in the following tabulation:	
Indiana:	(FC) Fall Creek..... 1 10,000	(FC) Red River Bank Stabilization Index to Denison Dam, Ark., Okla., and Texas..... 10,000			
Kansas:	(FC) Missouri River at Atchison, Kansas..... 5,000				
Louisiana:	(FC) Louisiana Coastal area..... 1 30,000				

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1971 (including reserve)		Conference allowance (including reserve)		Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1971 (including reserve)		Conference allowance (including reserve)	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Alabama:					(MP) Ozark lock and dam..... \$11,700,000				
(N) Alabama River channel improvement..... \$792,000			\$792,000		(FC) Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La. and Tex..... 1 2,600,000			1 2,900,000	
(N) Claiborne lock and dam..... 1 2,802,000			1 2,802,000		California:				
(R) John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam..... 5,000,000			5,000,000		(FC) Alameda Creek, Del Valle Dam..... 2,800,000			2,800,000	
(MP) Jones Bluff lock and dam..... 1 6,400,000			1 6,400,000		(FC) Buchanan Reservoir..... 1 350,000			1 1,550,000	
(MP) Millers Ferry lock and dam..... 2,544,000			2,544,000		(FC) Butler Valley Reservoir..... \$900,000			\$900,000	
(FC) Montgomery Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss..... 1,000,000			1,000,000	\$50,000	(FC) Chester, Feather River..... 1,100,000			1,100,000	50,000
(N) Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi. (See Mississippi.)					(FC) Corte Madera Creek..... 1,100,000			1,100,000	
West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.)					(N) Crescent City Harbor..... 85,000			85,000	
Alaska:					(FC) Cucamonga Creek..... 1 430,000			1 620,000	
(FC) Chena River Reservoirs, Fairbanks..... \$950,000			950,000		(FC) Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Reservoir..... 1 8,000,000			1 8,000,000	
(N) Make Harbor..... 50,000			100,000	100,000	(FC) Hidden Reservoir..... 1 240,000			1 2,040,000	
(N) King Cove Harbor..... 1 60,000			100,000	1 60,000	(FC) Klamath River..... 853,000			853,000	
(N) Sergius and Whitestone Narrows..... 200,000			200,000		(FC) Lakeport Reservoir, Scotts Creek..... 225,000			225,000	
(MP) Snettisham power project..... 12,000,000			12,000,000		(FC) Los Angeles County drainage area..... 750,000			750,000	
Arizona:					(FC) Lower San Joaquin River..... 720,000			1,500,000	
(FC) Gila River Camelsback Reservoir Site to Salt River..... 500,000			500,000		(FC) Lytle and Warm Creeks, Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.)				
(FC) Gila River and tributaries downstream from Painted Rock Reservoir..... 1 1,715,000			1,000,000	1 1,715,000	(MP) Marysville Reservoir..... 894,000			894,000	
(FC) Indian Bend Wash..... 40,000			40,000		(FC) Merced Reservoir (New Exchequer) (Reimbursement)..... 390,000			390,000	
(FC) Phoenix and vicinity Santa Rosa Wash (Tat Momolikot Dam)..... 1 1,000,000			1,000,000		(FC) Mojave River Reservoir (West Fork)..... 7,060,000			7,060,000	
(FC) Winslow..... 1 1,390,000			1,390,000		(N) Monterey Harbor..... 150,000			300,000	150,000
Arkansas:					(FC) Napa River..... 400,000				
(N) Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma; navigation locks and dams..... 25,333,000			25,333,000		(FC) New Bullards Bar Reservoir (reimbursement)..... 751,000			751,000	
(FC) Bayou Bartholomew (1950 and 1966 acts), Ark. and La..... 260,000			260,000		(FC) New Don Pedro Reservoir (reimbursement)..... 2,200,000			2,200,000	
(FC) Bell Foley Reservoir..... 1 160,000			1 160,000		(MP) New Melones Reservoir..... 1 11,900,000			1 11,900,000	
(MP) De Gray Reservoir..... 8,500,000			8,500,000		(N) Oakland Harbor..... 3,400,000			3,400,000	
(FC) De Queen Reservoir..... 1,030,000			1,030,000		(FC) Oroville Reservoir (reimbursement)..... 3,213,000			3,213,000	
(FC) Dierks Reservoir..... 1,600,000			1,600,000		(FC) Pajaro River (1966 act)..... 200,000			200,000	
(FC) Garland City..... 135,000			135,000		(N) Port Hueneme Harbor..... 1 60,000			1 60,000	
(FC) Gilliam Reservoir..... 1 900,000			1 900,000		(FC) Russian River Basin (Coyote Valley Dam)..... 300,000			300,000	
(FC) Little Rock levee..... 433,000			433,000		(FC) Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries..... 500,000			500,000	
(MP) Narrows Dam (3d unit)..... 150,000			150,000		(FC) Sacramento River bank protection..... 2,600,000			2,600,000	
(N) Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La..... 1 5,750,000			1 5,750,000		(N) San Diego Harbor..... 1 120,000			1 150,000	
					(FC) San Diego River and Mission Valley..... 558,000			558,000	
					(N) San Francisco Bay to Stockton (John F. Baldwin and Stockton ship channels)..... 1 1,000,000			1 1,000,000	

Footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1971 (including reserve)		Conference allowance (including reserve)		Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1971 (including reserve)		Conference allowance (including reserve)	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
California—Continued					(FC)				
Santa Paula Creek	\$ 250,000		\$ 500,000		Levee District 23 (Dively), Kaskaskia River			\$ 60,000	
Sonoma Creek		\$ 210,000		\$ 210,000	(FC)				
Sweetwater River		575,000		575,000	(FC)				
Tahquitz Creek	\$ 250,000		\$ 500,000		(FC)			\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
Walnut Creek	1,500,000		1,500,000		(FC)				
Colorado:					(FC)				
Bear Creek (Mount Carbon Reservoir (land acquisition))		400,000	400,000	600,000	(N)		\$ 500,000	1,100,000	
Boulder				50,000	(N)				1,000,000
Chatfield Reservoir	\$ 13,200,000		\$ 13,200,000		(FC)			200,000	
Trinidad Reservoir	\$ 3,400,000		\$ 3,400,000		(FC)			190,000	190,000
Connecticut:					(FC)			140,000	140,000
Ansonia-Derby	5,600,000		5,600,000		(N)				
Derby	\$ 2,700,000		\$ 2,700,000		(N)				
New London Barrier	1,150,000		1,150,000		(FC)				
Park River				100,000	(N)				
Stratford		250,000		250,000	(FC)				
Trumbull Pond Reservoir	250,000		250,000		(N)				
Delaware:					(FC)				
Delaware coast					(FC)				
Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Del., Pa. and N.J. (See New Jersey.)		50,000		50,000	(FC)				
Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal), pt. II, Delaware and Maryland.	\$ 19,200,000		\$ 19,200,000		(FC)				
Florida:					(FC)				
Apalachicola River channel improvement	1,110,000		1,110,000		(FC)				
Brevard County		50,000		50,000	(FC)				
Canaveral Harbor	450,000		450,000		(FC)				
Central and Southern Florida	\$ 19,400,000		\$ 10,500,000		(FC)				
Cross-Florida Barge Canal	\$ 6,000,000		\$ 7,000,000		(N)				
Four Rivers basins	\$ 5,000,000		\$ 5,000,000		(FC)				
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway St. Marks to Tampa Bay (ecological study)		\$ 20,000		\$ 200,000	(FC)				
Jacksonville Harbor (1965 act)	\$ 2,300,000		\$ 2,500,000		(FC)				
Miami Harbor		\$ 150,000		\$ 210,000	(FC)				
Mullet Key	100,000		100,000		(FC)				
Pinellas County, Treasure Island	50,000		50,000		(FC)				
Georgia:					(FC)				
Carters Dam	\$ 13,400,000		\$ 13,400,000		(FC)				
Savannah Harbor, 40 feet (widening and deepening)	\$ 2,060,000		\$ 2,060,000		(N)				
Savannah Harbor (sediment basin)	\$ 2,300,000		\$ 2,300,000		(FC)				
Sprewell Bluff Dam	\$ 750,000		\$ 1,800,000		(FC)				
Trotters Shoals Reservoir, Ga. and S.C. (land acquisition)				500,000	(N)				
West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga.	13,000,000		13,000,000		(FC)				
Hawaii:					(FC)				
Heeia-Kaa Harbor				49,000	(FC)				
Kawaihae Harbor	\$ 750,000		\$ 1,852,000		(FC)				
Lahaina Harbor		41,000		41,000	(FC)				
Nawiliwili Harbor (section 107)	(211,000)		(211,000)		(FC)				
Waikiki Beach	\$ 500,000		\$ 700,000		(FC)				
Idaho:					(FC)				
Dworshak (Bruce Eddy) Reservoir	\$ 57,400,000		\$ 57,400,000		(FC)				
Ririe Reservoir	\$ 4,800,000		\$ 4,800,000		(FC)				
Stuart Gulch Reservoir (resumption)				75,000	(N)				
Weiser River (Restudy)		40,000		40,000	(FC)				
Illinois:					(FC)				
Calumet River and Harbor (1962 and 1965 acts)	290,000		290,000		(FC)				
East Moline		30,000		30,000	(FC)				
East St. Louis and vicinity		1,379,000		1,379,000	(FC)				
England Pond Levee	200,000		200,000		(FC)				
Freeport	1,000,000		300,000		(FC)				
Fulton		120,000		120,000	(FC)				
Horse Island and Crescent Bridge (Mississippi River), Ill. and Iowa	367,000		367,000		(N)				
Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana	3,364,000		3,364,000		(FC)				
Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. II, Illinois and Indiana		100,000		100,000	(FC)				
Illinois Waterway Duplicate Locks		400,000		400,000	(FC)				
Kaskaskia River (navigation)	\$ 12,317,000		\$ 12,317,000		(FC)				
(FC)					(FC)				
Levee District 23 (Dively), Kaskaskia River									
Levee unit No. 1, Wabash River (restudy)									
Lincoln Dam and Reservoir	\$ 500,000								
Lock and dam, 26, Alton, Ill. and Mo.		200,000							
Louisville Dam and Reservoir		190,000							
Milan		140,000							
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:									
(a) Chain of rocks	750,000			750,000					
(b) Regulating works	1,340,000			2,340,000					
Mound City lock and dam, Ill. and Ky. (land acquisition)				200,000					
Oakley Reservoir (land acquisition)	298,000			298,000					
Peoria		100,000		100,000					
Rend Lake Reservoir	9,825,000			9,825,000					
Rochester and McCleary's Bluff Levee	400,000			400,000					
Rock Island	1,000,000			1,000,000					
Saline River and tributaries	1,800,000			1,800,000					
Shelbyville Reservoir	3,700,000			3,700,000					
Smithland locks and dam, Ill. and Ky.	1,820,000			1,820,000					
Indiana:									
Big Pine Dam and Reservoir (land acquisition)				100,000					
Brookville Reservoir	3,240,000			3,240,000					
Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	8,000,000			8,000,000					
Clifty Creek Reservoir (land acquisition)				150,000					
Greenfield Bayou Levee				100,000					
Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modifications, pts. I and II, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)									
Island levee	660,000			660,000					
Lafayette Dam and Reservoir	2,400,000			1,800,000					
Mason J. Niblack (pumping facilities)		150,000		150,000					
Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	16,900,000			16,900,000					
Patoka Dam and Reservoir (land acquisition)	525,000			525,000					
Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	5,300,000			5,300,000					
West Terre Haute	495,000			495,000					
Iowa:									
Ames Reservoir	2,400,000			1,600,000					
Bettendorf		30,000		30,000					
Big Sioux River at Sioux City, Iowa and S. Dak.		180,000		150,000					
Clinton		176,000		176,000					
David's Creek Reservoir		110,000		110,000					
Des Moines	600,000			600,000					
Dubuque	3,500,000			3,500,000					
Fort Madison Harbor	100,000			100,000					
Guttenberg	1,800,000			1,100,000					
Horse Island and Crescent Bridge, Mississippi River Ill. and Iowa. (See Illinois.)									
Iowa River Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	1,987,000			1,987,000					
Marshalltown	900,000			900,000					
Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	1,370,000			1,370,000					
Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	15,000,000			16,000,000					
Rathbun Reservoir	2,706,000			2,706,000					
Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock	1,570,000			1,570,000					
Saylorville Reservoir	3,250,000			3,250,000					
Waterloo	200,000			150,000					
Kansas:									
Arkansas—Red River chloride control, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas (see Texas).									

Footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1971 (including reserve)		Conference allowance (including reserve)		Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1971 (including reserve)		Conference allowance (including reserve)	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Kansas—Continued					Louisiana—Continued				
(FC) Cedar Point Reservoir		\$ 90,000		\$125,000	(N) Red River emergency bank protection	\$1,900,000			\$1,900,000
(FC) Clinton Reservoir (land acquisition)	\$1,960,000		\$1,960,000		N and (Bank Stab.) Red River Waterway, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex. (Mississippi River to Shreveport only)				\$600,000
(FC) Cow Creek, Hutchinson	\$ 850,000		\$ 850,000		Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC) Dodge City			500,000		(N) Vermilion lock (replacement)		\$100,000		100,000
(FC) El Dorado Reservoir	\$ 700,000		\$1,100,000		Maine: Dickey-Lincoln School Dam and reservoirs		807,000		807,000
(FC) Garnett Reservoir (restudy)		75,000		75,000	Maryland: Anacostia River (north-east and northwest branches) (sec. 205)				(450,000)
(FC) Grove Reservoir (re-sumption)				150,000	(N) Baltimore Harbor and channels	400,000			400,000
(FC) Hays	200,000		200,000		(FC) Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va.	\$4,800,000			\$4,800,000
(FC) Hillsdale Reservoir		225,000		225,000	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal), pt. II. (See Delaware.)				
(FC) Kansas City (1962 mod.)	\$1,300,000		\$1,300,000		Massachusetts: Charles River Dam		450,000		450,000
(FC) Lawrence	\$2,000,000		\$2,000,000		(N) Fall River Harbor, Mass. and R.I.		\$125,000	325,000	\$125,000
(FC) Melvern Reservoir	7,000,000		7,000,000		(FC) Nookage Reservoir		200,000		200,000
Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)					(N) Provincetown Harbor	\$1,300,000			\$1,300,000
Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)					(FC) Saxonville				50,000
(FC) Onaga Reservoir		325,000		325,000	(BE) Wessagussett Beach (reimbursement)	175,000			175,000
(FC) Perry Reservoir	\$2,281,000		\$2,281,000		(N) Weymouth Fore and Town Rivers	\$3,600,000			\$3,600,000
(FC) Topeka	1,000,000		1,000,000		(FC) Whitmanville Reservoir		100,000		100,000
Kentucky:					Michigan:				
Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)					(N) Great Lakes connecting channels	1,800,000			1,800,000
(FC) Carr Fork Reservoir	\$6,500,000		\$6,500,000		(N) Lexington Harbor		\$55,000		\$55,000
(FC) Cave Run Reservoir	6,425,000		6,425,000		(N) Point Lookout Harbor, Au Gres River	1,100,000			1,100,000
(FC) Falmouth Reservoir		50,000		50,000	(FC) River Rouge	3,500,000			3,500,000
(FC) Fishtrap Reservoir	1,600,000		1,600,000		(FC) Saginaw River (flood control)	1,200,000			1,200,000
(FC) Frankfort-North Frankfort	314,000		314,000		(R) South Haven Harbor	275,000			275,000
(FC) Green River Reservoir	1,643,000		1,643,000		Minnesota: Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak.	\$685,000			\$685,000
(FC) Kehoe Reservoir		200,000		200,000	(FC) Mankato and North Mankato	1,000,000			1,000,000
(MP) Laurel River Reservoir	4,300,000		4,300,000		(FC) Roseau River				150,000
(FC) Martin	\$150,000		\$150,000		(FC) Zumbro River				50,000
(FC) Martins Fork Reservoir	\$300,000		\$300,000		Mississippi: Jackson and East Jackson	600,000			600,000
Mound City lock and dam III, and Ky. (see Illinois.)					(FC) Tallahala Reservoir		\$240,000		\$240,000
Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)					Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala., and Miss. (See Alabama.)				
(FC) Paintsville Reservoir			900,000		(FC) Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi	\$1,700,000			\$1,700,000
Smithland lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky. (See Illinois.)					Missouri: Brookfield Reservoir		\$110,000		\$110,000
(FC) Southwestern Jefferson County		170,000		170,000	(FC) Chariton-Little Chariton Basins				400,000
(FC) Taylorsville Reservoir		90,000	300,000	90,000	(FC) Chariton River (1944 act)	\$1,400,000			\$1,400,000
Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)					(MP) Clarence Cannon (Joanna) Reservoir	\$5,400,000			\$5,400,000
(FC) Yatesville Reservoir		75,000		75,000	(FC) Dry Fork and East Fork Reservoirs (Fishing River) (restudy)				50,000
Louisiana:					Mississippi:				
(N) Atchafalaya River, Bayous Chene, Boeuf and Black Bayou Bartholomew, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)		10,000		70,000	(MP) Harry S. Truman Reservoir (formerly Kay-singer Bluff Reservoir)	13,000,000			\$14,000,000
(FC) Bayou Boeuf and tributaries	\$100,000		\$150,000		(FC) Little Blue River Channel		50,000		50,000
(N) Bayou LaFourche and LaFourche Jump Waterway	\$930,000		\$930,000		(FC) Little Blue River Reservoirs, land acquisition	2,180,000			\$4,000,000
(FC) Caddo Dam	687,000		687,000		(FC) Lock and dam 26, Allou, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)				
(FC) Lake Pontchartrain, and vicinity	\$10,750,000		\$14,500,000		(FC) Meramec Park Reservoir (land acquisition)	1,450,000			\$1,450,000
(N) Mermentau River (Lake Arthur Bridge)	\$500,000		\$1,000,000		(FC) Mercer Reservoir				150,000
(N) Michoud Canal			50,000						
(N) Mississippi River, gulf outlet	2,000,000		2,000,000						
(N) Mississippi River outlets, Venice		50,000		50,000					
(FC) Monroe floodwall			30,000						
(FC) Morgan City and vicinity	1,100,000		1,100,000						
(FC) New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection	3,500,000		4,400,000						
Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)									
(FC) Ouachita River levees			80,000						
(N) Overton-Red River Waterway (lower 31 miles only)	1,000,000		1,000,000						

Footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1971 (including reserve)		Conference allowance (including reserve)	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Missouri—Continued				
(FC) Mississippi River Agricultural Area No. 8 (Elsberry drainage district)				\$120,000
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)				
Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC) Pattonsburg Reservoir (town relocation only)				50,000
(FC) St. Louis	\$2,700,000		\$2,700,000	
(FC) Smithville Reservoir		\$396,000		396,000
(MP) Stockton Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC) Union Reservoir		422,000		422,000
(FC) Union Reservoir (advance participation, highway bridge)	\$300,000		\$300,000	
Montana:				
(FC) Great Falls	\$1,200,000		\$1,200,000	
(MP) Libby Reservoir	55,000,000		57,500,000	
(FC) Miles City (restudy)		35,000		35,000
Nebraska:				
(FC) Little Papillion Creek—Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)	373,000		373,000	
Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC) Papillion Creek and Tributaries (land acquisition)		\$515,000		\$515,000
Nevada:				
(FC) Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev.	2,400,000		2,400,000	
New Hampshire:				
(FC) Beaver Brook Reservoir		150,000		150,000
New Jersey:				
(FC) Elizabeth	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(N) Newark Bay Hackensack and Passaic Rivers	\$2,550,000		\$3,500,000	
(FC) Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N) Shrewsbury River Inlet		140,000		140,000
(FC) South Orange, Rahway River	\$125,000		\$125,000	
Tocks Island Reservoir Pa., N.J. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)				
(FC) Albuquerque diversion channels	200,000		200,000	
(FC) Cochiti Reservoir	6,850,000		6,850,000	
(FC) Los Esteros Reservoir and modification of Alamogordo Dam	200,000		200,000	
New York:				
(N) Cattaraugus Harbor				30,000
(FC) East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay		180,000		180,000
(BE) Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet	\$500,000		\$500,000	
(FC) Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point	\$1,500,000		\$1,500,000	
(N) Hamlin Beach Harbor		\$50,000		\$50,000
(N) Irondequoit Bay	\$100,000		\$100,000	
(N) Moriches Inlet		114,000		114,000
(N) New York Harbor (anchorage)	\$3,600,000		\$3,600,000	
(FC) Nichols	525,000		525,000	
(FC) North Ellenville	1,250,000		1,250,000	
(N) Oak Orchard Harbor		200,000		200,000
(FC) Red Creek		135,000		135,000
(FC) Rosendale	657,000		657,000	
(FC) Salamanca	330,000		330,000	
(FC) Staten Island (Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill)		120,000		120,000
Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., N.J. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)				
(FC) Yonkers		35,000		35,000
North Carolina:				
(BE) Carolina Beach and vicinity	487,000		487,000	
(N) Drum Inlet (Section 107)			(90,000)	
(FC) Falls Reservoir	\$800,000		\$800,000	
(FC) Howards Mill Reservoir				100,000
(FC) New Hope Reservoir	\$6,500,000		\$6,500,000	
(FC) Randleman Reservoir		\$125,000		\$125,000
(FC) Reddies River Reservoir		\$175,000		\$175,000

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1971 (including reserve)		Conference allowance (including reserve)	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
North Dakota:				
(R) Garrison Reservoir Lake Sakakawea (embankment repair)	\$1,480,000		\$700,000	
Dahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)				
(FC) Minot		\$75,000		\$100,000
(FC) Missouri River, Garrison Dam to Lake Dahe	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC) Pembina (Section 205)				(300,000)
(FC) Pipestem Reservoir	450,000		450,000	
Ohio:				
(FC) Alum Creek Reservoir	\$3,100,000		\$3,100,000	
(FC) Athens	2,078,000		2,078,000	
(FC) Bellaire (restudy)		100,000		100,000
(FC) Caesar Creek Reservoir	\$2,800,000		\$2,800,000	
(FC) Chillicothe				75,000
(FC) Clarence J. Brown Dam and Reservoir	3,306,000		3,306,000	
(N) Cleveland Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC) East Fork Reservoir	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC) East Lake Chagrin River				60,000
(FC) Fremont	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000	
(N) Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	15,200,000		15,200,000	
(N) Lorain Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC) Mill Creek Reservoir		288,000		288,000
(FC) Newark		185,000		185,000
(FC) North Branch Kokosing River Reservoir	12,300,000		12,300,000	
(FC) Paint Creek Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(N) Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	3,350,000		3,350,000	
(FC) Salt Creek Reservoir (land acquisition)				400,000
(FC) Utica Reservoir		225,000		225,000
(N) Vermilion Harbor		30,000		30,000
(N) Willow Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	\$15,200,000		\$15,200,000	
(FC) Youngstown, Crab Creek	900,000		900,000	
Oklahoma:				
Arkansas Red River chloride control, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. (See Texas.)				
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC) Birch Reservoir		238,000		238,000
(FC) Clayton Reservoir	\$600,000		\$600,000	
(FC) Copan Reservoir	\$1,200,000		\$1,200,000	
(FC) Crutcho Creek	6,100,000		6,100,000	
(FC) Hugo Reservoir	(300,000)		(300,000)	
(FC) Joe Creek (section 205)	\$11,550,000		\$11,550,000	
(FC) Kaw Reservoir	\$525,000		\$525,000	
(FC) Lukfata Reservoir	700,000		700,000	
(FC) Oologah Reservoir	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(MP) Optima Reservoir				
Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam	5,986,000		5,986,000	
(FC) Waurika Reservoir	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(MP) Webbers Falls lock and dam	11,500,000		11,500,000	
Oregon:				
(MP) Bonneville lock and dam (2d power unit) Oregon and Washington		400,000		400,000
(MP) Bonneville lock and dam (mod. for peaking) Oregon and Washington	\$6,500,000		\$6,500,000	
(FC) Catherine Creek Reservoir		250,000		250,000
(N) Columbia River and lower Willamette River 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington	3,000,000		3,450,000	
(FC) Elk Creek Reservoir	400,000		400,000	
(MP) Green Peter Reservoir (including Foster Regulating Dam)	1,394,000		1,394,000	
(MP) John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	7,200,000		7,200,000	
(FC) John Day River	380,000		380,000	
(MP) Lost Creek Reservoir	6,100,000		6,100,000	
(FC) Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(MP) McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	1,420,000		1,420,000	
(MP) The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington (additional power units)	\$13,000,000		\$13,000,000	

Footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1971 (including reserve)		Conference allowance (including reserve)		Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1971 (including reserve)		Conference allowance (including reserve)	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Oregon—Continued					Texas—Continued				
(N) Tillamook Bay (south jetty).....	\$1,700,000		\$2,100,000		(FC) Millican Reservoir.....		\$50,000		\$150,000
(FC) Willamette River Basin bank protection.....	230,000		230,000		(N) Mouth of Colorado River.....		190,000		185,000
(N) Yaquina Bay and Harbor.....	1,200,000		1,200,000		(FC) Navasota Reservoir.....		100,000		
Pennsylvania:					(N) Port Aransas (section 107).....	(\$365,000)		(\$365,000)	
(FC) Beltzville Reservoir.....	2,318,000		2,318,000		(N) Port Isabel, side channel (section 107).....	(15,000)		(15,000)	
(FC) Blue Marsh Reservoir (land acquisition).....	640,000		640,000		(FC) Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection).....	6,840,000		6,840,000	
(FC) Chartiers Creek.....	5,700,000		5,700,000		Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.).....				
(FC) Delaware River Philadelphia to Sea An-chorages, Del., Pa., and N.J. (see New Jersey).....					(N) Sabine-Neches Waterway 40 feet and channel to Echo.....	15,400,000		15,400,000	
(FC) DuBois.....	1,100,000		1,200,000		(FC) San Antonio Channel.....	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC) Foster Joseph Sayers Dam (Blanchard).....	824,000		824,000		(FC) San Gabriel River tribu-tary to Brazos River.....	1,200,000		1,400,000	
(FC) Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir.....	1,625,000		1,625,000		(FC) Taylors Bayou.....	250,000		250,000	
BE Presque Isle Peninsula (reimbursement).....	350,000		350,000		(FC) Texas City and vicinity hurricane protection.....	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC) Raystown Reservoir.....	13,900,000		13,900,000		(N) Trinity River bridges.....	2,750,000		2,750,000	
(FC) Tioga-Hammond Reservoir.....	1,750,000		1,750,000		(N) Trinity River project.....		500,000		500,000
(MP) Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., N.J., and N.Y.....	8,250,000		11,850,000		(FC) Vince and Little Vince Bayous.....	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC) Union City Reservoir.....	2,905,000		2,905,000		(N) Wallisville Reservoir, Trinity River.....	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC) Woodcock Creek Reservoir.....	4,750,000		4,750,000		(MP) Whitney Reservoir.....	300,000		300,000	
Rhode Island:					Utah:				
(BE) Cliff Walk, Newport.....	50,000		50,000		(FC) Little Dell Reservoir.....		25,000		150,000
Fall River Harbor, Mass. and R.I. (See Mass.).....					Vermont:				
(N) Providence River and Harbor.....	1,480,000		1,480,000		(FC) Bennington.....	250,000		250,000	
South Carolina:					Virginia:				
(N) Cooper River-Charleston Harbor.....		\$25,000		\$150,000	(FC) Four Mile Run.....				175,000
(BE) Hunting Island Beach.....	284,000		284,000		(FC) Gathright Reservoir.....	1,300,000		1,300,000	
Trotters Shoals Reservoir, Georgia and South Carolina (See Georgia).....					(N) Hampton Roads.....	6,100,000		6,100,000	
South Dakota:					(MP) Salem Church Reservoir.....		600,000		600,000
(MP) Big Bend Dam-Lake Sharpe.....	1,700,000		1,700,000		(BE) Virginia Beach (reim-bursement).....	90,000		90,000	
Big Sioux River at Sioux City, Iowa and S.Dak. (See Iowa).....					Washington:				
Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak. (See Minnesota).....					Bonneville lock and dam (2d power unit), Oregon and Wash-ington. (See Oregon.).....				650,000
(MP) Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.....	1,900,000		1,900,000		(MP) Chief Joseph Dam (ad-ditional units).....				
Tennessee:					Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.).....				
(MP) Cordell Hull lock and dam.....	9,500,000		9,500,000		(MP) Ice Harbor lock and dam (additional units).....	600,000		600,000	
(MP) J. Percy Priest Reservoir (Nashville Davidson County Bridge).....			839,000		(MP) John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.).....				
Texas:					(MP) Little Goose lock and dam.....	9,570,000		9,570,000	
(FC) Aquilla Creek Reservoir.....				100,000	(MP) Little Goose lock and dam (additional units).....				150,000
(FC) Arkansas-Red River chloride control (pt. 1), Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas.....		250,000		250,000	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Wash-ington. (See Oregon.).....				
(FC) Arkansas-Red River chloride control (supplemental studies) Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. (Resump-tion).....					(MP) Lower Granite lock and dam.....	21,150,000		21,150,000	
(FC) Aubrey Reservoir.....		175,000		410,000	(MP) Lower Monumental lock and dam.....	2,250,000		2,250,000	
(FC) Belton Reservoir (raise water level).....	1,688,000		1,688,000	1,300,000	(FC) McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Wash-ington. (See Oregon.).....				20,000
(FC) Big Pine Reservoir.....				40,000	(FC) Pullman (restudy).....		20,000		
(R) Brazos Island Harbor.....	770,000		770,000		The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.).....				
(FC) Buffalo Bayou and tributaries.....	1,000,000		1,000,000		(FC) Vancouver Lake.....		65,000		150,000
(N) Cedar Bayou (deferred).....		15,000		160,000	(FC) Wynoochee River Reservoir.....	1,625,000		1,815,000	
(FC) Cooper Reservoir and channels.....	2,500,000		2,900,000		West Virginia:				
(N) Corpus Christi ship channel.....		35,000		35,000	(FC) Beech Fork Lake.....	2,400,000		2,400,000	
(FC) Duck Creek channel improvement.....		182,000		182,000	(FC) Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland).....				
(FC) Elm Fork Floodway.....		220,000		220,000	(FC) Burnsville Lake.....	1,570,000		1,050,000	
(FC) El Paso.....	2,800,000		2,800,000		(FC) East Lynn Lake.....	2,100,000		2,100,000	
(FC) Freeport and vicinity.....	2,000,000		2,000,000		Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.).....				150,000
(N) Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, New Orleans to Houston 16 ft. channel, La. and Tex. (Corpus Christi cutoff only).....				200,000	(FC) Leading Creek Lake.....				
(FC) Highland Bayou.....	1,000,000		1,000,000		(FC) R. D. Bailey (Justice) Lake.....	10,700,000		10,700,000	
(FC) Lake Kemp Reservoir.....	1,300,000		1,300,000		Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.).....				
(FC) Lakeview Reservoir.....		112,000		112,000	(FC) Rowlesburg Lake (land acquisition).....	900,000		1,500,000	
(FC) Lavon Reservoir modifi-cation and channel improvement.....	1,840,000		1,840,000						

Footnotes at end of table.

	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1971 (including reserve)		Conference allowance (including reserve)			Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1971 (including reserve)		Conference allowance (including reserve)	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Construction, general, State and project					Construction, general, State and project				
(FC) Washington—Continued					(FC) Miscellaneous—Continued				
Stonewall Jackson Lake	\$1,050,000		\$1,700,000		Snagging and clearing	\$200,000		\$200,000	
West Fork Lake		\$200,000		\$200,000	Recreation facilities, completed projects	1,700,000		1,800,000	
Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio)					Land acquisition fund	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Wisconsin:					Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	625,000		625,000	
(N) Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)	1,200,000		1,200,000		Aquatic plant control (1965 act)	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(R) Kenosha Harbor	240,000		240,000		Employees compensation	925,000		925,000	
(FC) La Farge Reservoir, Kickapoo River	1,280,000		1,280,000		Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	-66,700,000		-70,125,000	
(N) Manitowoc Harbor	200,000		200,000		Reduction based on anticipated additional carryover balances			-25,168,000	
(R) Racine Harbor	630,000		630,000		Less fiscal year 1970 budgetary reserve included above	-67,836,000	-\$4,464,000	-67,836,000	-\$4,464,000
Miscellaneous:					Grand total, construction, general	804,720,000	16,678,000	829,096,000	22,967,000
(N) Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to \$500,000 (sec. 107)	3,000,000		3,090,000			(821,398,000)		(852,063,000)	
(FC) Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation (sec. 205)	10,000,000		10,750,000						
(FC) Emergency bank protection	200,000		200,000						

¹ Total includes congressional add-on in 1970 placed in budgetary reserve which will be released or use in fiscal year 1971.

² Financed from fiscal year 1970 budgetary reserve.

Sprewell Bluff Dam and Reservoir, Ga.—The conferees have approved the advance participation by the Corps of Engineers with the Georgia State Highway Department in the construction of a high level bridge in connection with State Route #190.

Pattonsburg Reservoir, Highway I-35 Crossing, Mo.—The conferees are in agreement that the participation by the Corps of Engineers with the Missouri State Highway Department shall be limited at the present time to the acquisition of rights-of-way for which funds are available.

Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir, Pa. and N.J.—In reference to the increase provided in the House bill of \$3.6 million for land acquisition, the conferees are in agreement that all hardship cases, including both split and non-split tracts, shall be given equal consideration in establishing land to be acquired for project purposes within the available funds.

Millican and Navasota Reservoirs, Texas.—The conferees are in agreement that the \$150,000 allocated for preconstruction planning on the Millican project shall be used primarily for environmental and ecological studies of the Millican and Navasota Reservoirs, as specified in the Senate Committee report.

Recreation facilities, completed projects.—The increase over the House Bill figure shall be allocated as follows: Millwood Reservoir, Arkansas, \$75,000; John Redmond Reservoir, Kansas, \$30,000; Keystone Reservoir, Oklahoma, \$75,000; and Ferrells Bridge Reservoir, Texas, \$78,000.

Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$84,000,000 instead of \$79,578,000 as proposed by the House and \$91,004,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes \$20,000 for the Old and Atchafalaya Rivers, Louisiana, study; \$20,000 for the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tennessee, study; \$10,000 for the Wolf and Loosahatchie Rivers, Tenn., and Miss., study; \$1,250,000 for Channel improvement; \$1,250,000 for the St. Francis Basin; \$2,000,000 for the Atchafalaya Basin; and a decrease of \$128,000 for savings and slippage.

Operation and Maintenance, General

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$292,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$290,000,000 as proposed by the House.

General Expenses

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$25,480,000 instead of \$25,350,000 as proposed by the

House and \$25,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill amount includes \$67,000 for six new positions in the Office of the Chief and \$63,000 to make provision for five additional positions in the Division offices for environmental quality activities.

Administrative Provisions

Amendment No. 8: Provides a limitation of \$181,000,000 on the capital of the revolving funds, Corps of Engineers, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$178,500,000 as proposed by the House.

THE PANAMA CANAL Canal Zone Government Operating Expenses

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$44,129,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$43,800,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill amount is for unanticipated cost increases which occurred subsequent to the budget submission.

Capital Outlay

Amendments Nos. 10, 11, and 12: Adjust passenger motor vehicle limitations to provide two additional ambulances as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,850,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Panama Canal Company Corporation

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15: Adjust passenger motor vehicle limitations for the Corporation to delete authority for the addition of two vehicles related to the adjustments made under amendments 10, 11, and 12 for the Canal Zone Government.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

FEDERAL WATER QUALITY ADMINISTRATION

Pollution Control Operations and Research
Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$98,618,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$98,018,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill is for initiation of the Alaska Village Safe Water Facilities Demonstration Project authorized in the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970.

Construction Grants for Waste Treatment Works

Amendment No. 17: 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 provides that funds appropriated

for fiscal year 1970 and allocated to States shall not be reallocated in accordance with section 8(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, until May 15, 1971, instead of December 31, 1970.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION General Investigations

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$19,065,000 instead of \$19,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,100,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes \$40,000 for a reappraisal of the feasibility study of the Medford Division, Rogue River Project, Oregon, and \$25,000 to initiate a reconnaissance study of Western Box Elder County, Utah.

Construction and Rehabilitation

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$186,793,000 instead of \$181,810,000 as proposed by the House and \$187,931,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill shall be allocated as follows: Central Valley Project, Auburn-Folsom South Unit, Calif., \$2,000,000; Tualatin Project, Ore., (land acquisition), \$400,000; Washoe Project, Nev. and Calif. (drainage and minor construction), \$185,000; Cascade Irrigation District, Wash. (rehabilitation and betterment), \$5,000; Shoshone project, Garland Division, Wyo. (rehabilitation and betterment), \$200,000; Uncompahgre project, Gunnison Tunnel, Colo. (rehabilitation and betterment), \$133,000; Garrison Diversion Unit, N.D., \$1,000,000; Garrison Diversion Unit, Minot Extension, N.D., \$470,000; Oahe Unit, S.D. (land acquisition), \$350,000; Investigations, Missouri River Basin Division, to initiate a study for water development in eastern Montana, \$100,000; and Other Department Agencies, Missouri River Basin, to continue artifact preservation work in connection with the steamboat Bertrand, \$140,000.

The allowance of \$16,840,000 approved for the Westlands distribution and drainage system of the San Luis Unit of the Central Valley Project, California, includes \$1,500,000 for the Pleasant Valley Canal.

Amendments Nos. 20 and 21: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments which appropriate \$5,000 for the Cascade Irrigation District, Ellenberg, Wash., to initiate a rehabilitation and betterment program under the Act of August 7, 1949, as amended, to be repaid in full under conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and

concur in the Senate amendment which provides that not to exceed \$140,000 of the appropriation may be used for archeological salvage of the cargo of the steamboat "Bertrand" in the Missouri River Basin.

Upper Colorado River Storage Project

Amendments Nos. 23, 24, and 25: Appropriate \$22,375,000 instead of \$21,260,000 as proposed by the House and \$23,175,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes \$150,000 for the Curecanti unit, Colo.; \$100,000 for additional advance planning on the Animas-LaPlata participating project, Colo.; \$475,000 for the San Juan-Chama participating project, Colo. and N.M.; \$50,000 to initiate advance planning on the San Miguel participating project, Colo.; and \$340,000 for recreation and fish and wildlife facilities (Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife), including: \$300,000 for additional facilities at the Jones Hole National Fish Hatchery, Utah; \$18,000 for reservoir fishery investigations, Heron Reservoir, San Juan-Chama project, Colo. and New Mexico; and \$22,000 for waterfowl area land acquisition, Hammond project, New Mexico.

The allowance of \$165,000 for the Fruitland Mesa Participating project, Colorado, includes \$30,000 for initiating construction on the replacement of siphons on the Gould Canal and \$135,000 to continue advance planning on the project. Construction approval at this time is limited to the siphon replacement.

The conferees have approved the acceptance of \$10,000 in contributed funds from the San Miguel Water Conservancy District for pre-construction planning on the San Miguel Participating project, Colorado.

Colorado River Basin Project

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$7,698,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$6,498,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the Senate bill is for the initiation of construction of the Central Arizona project.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION Construction

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$91,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$90,500,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill is for the procurement of equipment in connection with the 230 KV line from Toledo to Wendson.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

The conferees have approved the proposal of the Southeastern Power Administration to use consolidated net billing for the settlement of its accounts with the Alabama Power Company and the Georgia Power Company.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Underground Electric Power Transmission Research

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$750,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The allowance includes \$50,000 for administration and contract supervision, including the provision for two additional positions, as proposed by the House.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority Fund

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$56,180,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$54,180,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provides \$2,000,000 for the Upper French Broad Project, Mills River Reservoir, North Carolina, consisting of \$600,000 for planning and administration and \$1,400,000 for land acquisition.

To comply with the requirements of state law, the conferees are in agreement that

prior to the expenditure of any of the funds provided for the Yellow Creek Port project, the Tennessee Valley Authority enter into a new contract, or modify repayment provisions of the existing contract, with the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board and the Tombigbee River Valley Water Management District of Mississippi, providing that funds available from the sale or lease of industrial sites and related lands or interests in lands owned other than by the United States shall be paid into the Bond and Interest Sinking Fund of the Port, and such excess revenues shall then be paid into the Federal Sinking Fund together with all available revenues derived from the use of federal facilities.

WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

Water Resources Planning

Amendments Nos. 30 and 31: Appropriate \$5,150,000 instead of \$4,550,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,550,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill is for planning grants to the states under title III providing a total of \$3,600,000 for this purpose.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1971 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1970 total, the 1971 budget estimate total, and the House and the Senate bills follow:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970..	\$4,768,767,500
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971 (as amended)	5,263,433,000
House bill, fiscal year 1971..	5,236,808,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1971..	5,258,695,000
Conference agreement.....	5,239,324,000

¹ Includes \$852,208,000 in amendments Nos. 4, 21 and 22 reported in technical disagreement.

Conference agreement compared with:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970..	+470,556,500
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971 (as amended)	-24,109,000
House bill, fiscal year 1971..	+2,516,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1971..	-19,371,000

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN J. RHODES,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
(except Amendment No. 4),
HOWARD W. ROBINSON,
(I reserve on Amendment No. 4).

FRANK T. BOW,
(except Amendment No. 4),

Managers on the Part of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous request, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUNGATE (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today through September 25, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN, 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:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MIKVA) to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHIPLEY, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. MCCARTHY, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. DIGGS, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. ALEXANDER, for 60 minutes, on September 23.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WINN) to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SCHMITZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WINN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. ZWACH in two instances.
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. ADAIR.
Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. SCOTT.
Mr. TAFT.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.
Mr. WEICKER.

Mr. MESKILL.
Mr. WOLD in two instances.

Mr. SCHADEBERG.
Mr. MIZE.

Mr. WHALEN.
Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. MAILLIARD.
Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. ASHBROOK.
Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. WATSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MIKVA), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FISHER in three instances.
Mr. MCCARTHY in five instances.

Mr. EILBERG in three instances.
Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. WOLFF.
Mr. CASEY.

Mr. PATMAN in two instances.
Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. MIKVA in three instances.
Mr. WALDIE in four instances.

Mr. COHELAN in five instances.
Mr. HAGAN.

Mr. KOCH in two instances.

Mr. BOGGS.
Mr. DIGGS in two instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.
Mr. SIKES in five instances.
Mr. RODINO in two instances.
Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.
Mr. RYAN in four instances.
Mr. FLOWERS in three instances.
Mr. ROONEY of New York in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 368. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 58. An act providing for the addition of the Freeman School to the Homestead National Monument of America in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes;

S. 621. An act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; and

S. 2208. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of a national lakeshore on Lake Tahoe in the State of Nevada and California, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 21, 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:

2382. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting the semiannual report on architectural and engineering fees in excess of \$25,000, covering the period ended December 31, 1969, pursuant to section 102 of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriations Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2383. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to Docket Nos. 105, 106, 107, and 108, *The Osage Nation, Plaintiff v. The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055, 25 U.S.C., 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2384. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for maximum entrance and retention ages, training, and early retirement for air traffic controllers, and for other purposes; 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. EVINS of Tennessee: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 18127 (Rept. No. 91-1456). 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. CRANE:

H.R. 19276. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$625 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DADDARIO (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

H.R. 19277. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to encourage the development and utilization of new and improved methods of waste disposal and pollution control; to assist small business concerns to effect conversions required to meet applicable pollution control standards; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 19278. A bill to amend section 12 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to the control of hazardous polluting substances; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 19279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that pensions paid to retired law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 19280. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a portion of the salary of a full-time policeman or other State or local law enforcement officer shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 19281. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for certain nonreimbursable expenses incurred by volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 19282. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax the interest on certain obligations of volunteer fire departments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 19283. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a program of grants to medical schools to provide scholarships to students who will provide service to communities determined to have a shortage of and need for physicians; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 19284. A bill to create a health security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 19285. A bill to provide for the development of a uniform system of quality grades for consumer food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 19286. A bill to enable consumers to protect themselves against arbitrary, erroneous, and malicious credit information; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 19287. A bill to make the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 applicable to individuals preparing to be vol-

unteer firemen; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 19288. A bill to amend the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 to improve intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and the economy and efficiency of government, by providing Federal cooperation and assistance in the establishment and strengthening of State and local offices of consumer protection; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 19289. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 19290. A bill to require that certain durable products be prominently labeled as to date of manufacture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19291. A bill to require that durable consumer products be labeled as to durability and performance life; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19292. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to provide for child-resistant packaging to protect children from serious personal injury or serious illness resulting from handling, using, or ingesting any hazardous substance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19293. A bill to provide minimum disclosure standards for written warranties and guarantees of consumer products against defect or malfunction; to define minimum Federal content standards for such warranties and guarantees; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19294. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide increased protection for consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19295. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, to add an additional title to provide for motor vehicle safety collision standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19296. A bill to require that certain short-shelf-life durable products be prominently labeled as to the date beyond which performance life becomes diminished; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19297. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to require that in the labeling and advertising of certain drugs sold by prescription the "established name" of such drugs must appear each time the proprietary name is used, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19298. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19299. A bill to require that certain processed or packaged consumer products be labeled with certain information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19300. A bill to require that certain drugs and pharmaceuticals be prominently labeled as to the date beyond which potency or efficacy becomes diminished; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19301. A bill to prohibit commercial flights over land areas of the United States until the problem of sonic boom has been solved and its effects controlled; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19302. A bill to ban the mailing of unsolicited credit cards and require that solicited credit cards sent through the mails

be sent by registered or certified mail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19303. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for certain nonreimbursable expenses incurred by volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 19304. A bill relating to the status of volunteer firemen's organizations for purposes of liability for Federal income taxes and reports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 19305. A bill to require that the procedures and conduct of National Guard organizations used by States to control civil disturbances within their borders in time of peace conforms to the discipline of the Army and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 19306. A bill to prohibit commercial flights by aircraft at supersonic speeds within the United States until the Congress approves findings by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency that such flights will not have detrimental physiological or psychological effects on persons on the ground; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. VAN DERLIN, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. FRASER, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. REES, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. CABELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ALBERT, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. HAYS):

H.R. 19307. A bill to amend title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Board shall require the boycotting of certain movement by aircraft in cases of international aircraft hijacking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ROE, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. FINDLEY):

H.R. 19308. A bill to amend title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Board shall require the boycotting of certain movement by aircraft in cases of international aircraft hijacking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 19309. A bill to amend section 203 of title 18, United States Code, to forbid the solicitation or acceptance of payment in return for assisting individuals with regard to positions in any military component, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PREYER of North Carolina:

H.R. 19310. A bill to amend title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that, in cases of international aircraft hijacking, American air carriers shall be prohibited from transporting certain persons until such time as the hijacker has been extradited to the flag country of the hijacked aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 19311. A bill to amend section 319 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19312. A bill to prohibit flight in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution for the killing of a policeman or fireman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 19317. A bill to prohibit assaults on State law enforcement officers, firemen, and

judicial officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 19314. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit educational assistance allowances to be paid for refresher training in certain aviation mechanics; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 19315. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations governing the humane treatment of animals transported in air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 19316. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, so as to prohibit the distribution, sale, or offer for sale of the element mercury, or chemical compounds containing mercury, for use in insecticides, fungicides, and rodenticides; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BEALL of Maryland (for himself, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. ESCH):

H.R. 19317. A bill to prohibit assaults on State law enforcement officers, firemen, and judicial officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 19318. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand, improve, and better coordinate the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 19319. 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. FISH:

H.R. 19320. A bill to deter aircraft piracy by invoking a commercial air traffic quarantine against countries abetting aircraft piracy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 19321. A bill to provide a private right of action to protect the air, water, and other natural resources of the United States and the public trust therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 19322. 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. GIAIMO (for himself, Mr. ECKHARDT, and Mr. PEPPER):

H.R. 19323. 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. HANNA (for himself, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FEIGHAN):

H.R. 19324. A bill to provide protection for the fish resources of the United States including the freshwater and marine fish cultural industries against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of fish and shellfish, for the study of water pollution and fish diseases, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mrs. SULLIVAN):

H.R. 19325. A bill to carry out the recommendations of the Presidential Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mrs. CHISHOLM):

H.R. 19326. A bill to provide for a program of Federal assistance in the development, acquisition, and installation of aircraft anti-hijacking detection systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. KEE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. FRASER, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. TUNNEY):

H.R. 19327. A bill to establish a Juvenile Research Institute and Training Center; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

H.R. 19328. A bill to establish a Commission on the medical and psychological adequacy of the physical and mental examinations conducted by the Armed Forces with respect to registrants under the selective service laws; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 19329. A bill to require the Department of Defense to determine disposal dates and methods for disposing of certain military material; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 19330. A bill to provide that amounts in the highway trust fund may be used only for highway purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. RHODES, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. FEIGHER, Mr. ROE, and Mr. TALCOTT):

H.R. 19331. A bill to establish a Consumer Affairs Service in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, and Mr. FREY):

H.R. 19332. A bill to provide a penalty for unlawful assault upon policemen, firemen, and other law enforcement personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. KEITH, Mr. HARVEY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia):

H.R. 19333. A bill to provide greater protection for customers of registered brokers and dealers and members of national securities exchanges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. BUSH, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mrs. MAY, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. MOSHER,

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. FARSTEIN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. NIX, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. O'KONSKI, and Mr. ARENDIS):

H.R. 19334. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. BUTON, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 19335. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 19336. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a program for flood prevention and other purposes in the Lower Rio Grande Basin, Tex., to enhance and stabilize the agricultural economy of the area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLOWERS:

H.R. 19337. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain disabled veterans eligible for assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 19338. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in order to provide for the establishment of a National Health Service Corps; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 19339. A bill to prohibit flight in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution for the killing of a policeman or fireman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 19340. A bill relating to the control of organized crime in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 19341. A bill to create a health security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. UDALL, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. RYAN, Mr. McCLURE, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. MORTON, Mr. GUDE, and Mr. BEALL of Maryland):

H.R. 19342. A bill to establish and develop the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 19343. A bill to create a National Agricultural Bargaining Board, to provide stand-

ards for the accreditation of associations of producers, to define the mutual obligation of handlers and associations of producers to negotiate regarding agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 19344. A bill to provide for control of the use of the element mercury or its compounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 1372. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning October 5, 1970, and ending October 9, 1970, as "National PTA Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 1373. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a comprehensive investigation of unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in the home improvement industry, to expand its enforcement activities in this area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.J. Res. 1374. Joint resolution concerning a Citizenship Commencement Ceremony for new voters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H. Con. Res. 737. Concurrent resolution urging the President to determine and undertake appropriate actions with respect to stopping armed attacks on aircraft and passengers engaged in international travel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES (for himself, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. EHLBERG, Mr. FISH, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HULL, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McKNEALLY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ROGERS, of Florida, Mr. SIKES, Mr. WHALEN, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H. Con. Res. 738. Concurrent resolution urging the President to determine and undertake appropriate actions with respect to stopping armed attacks on aircraft and passengers engaged in international travel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. Con. Res. 739. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BUSH, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. FREY, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. RUTH,

Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SIKES, Mr. WATSON, and Mr. WHITTEN):

H. Res. 1213. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to an early resolution by the Supreme Court of the problems involved in desegregating the Nation's public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. HUNT Mr. POBELL Mr. RODINO, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. HICKS, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. McKNEALLY, Mr. HAYS, Mr. ROE, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. CAREY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. WEICKER):

H. Res. 1214. Resolution calling for a national commitment to cure and control cancer within this decade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. Res. 1215. Resolution providing for the copying and distribution by the U.S. Capitol Historical Society of the film of the ceremonies and reenactment of the 100th anniversary of the Second Inauguration of President Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 19345. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie E. Yotz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 19346. A bill for the relief of Walter O. Ivey, sergeant, U.S. Army (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 19347. A bill for the relief of Wallace L. Locke, Jr., lance corporal, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

437. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to private enterprise; to the Committee on Government Operations.

438. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to fish and wildlife; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

439. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Federal earned income exemption for welfare families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—Thursday, September 17, 1970

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose ear is open to those of humble spirit and of contrite heart, hear us in our morning prayer. Watch over the deliberations of the Members of this body. Embue them with the spirit of wisdom, goodness, and truth; and so rule their hearts and the hearts

of all the people as to make this Nation strong and great in the fear of God.

Brood over the nations of the world dispelling fear and hate, instilling brotherhood and mutual good will. Convert peace talkers into peacemakers—the patient builders of understanding and cooperation and fraternity. May mankind win by persuasion and love what cannot be attained by threats and force. May Thy kingdom come and Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

In the name of Him in whose will is our peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, September 16, 1970, is dispensed with.

DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair now lays before the Senate the