

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE 1970's: A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE

(A Report to the Congress by Richard Nixon, President of the United States, February 18, 1970)

DEFENSE

Our important interests and those of our friends are still threatened by those nations which would exploit change and which proclaim hostility to the United States as one of the fundamental tenets of their policies. We do not assume that these nations will always remain hostile, and will work toward improved relationships wherever possible. But we will not underestimate any threat to us or our allies, nor lightly base our present policies on untested assumptions about the future.

At the beginning of my trip last summer through Asia, I described at Guam the principles that underlie our cooperative approach to the defense of our common interests. In my speech on November 3, I summarized the key elements of this approach:

The United States will keep all its treaty commitments.

We shall provide a shield if a nuclear power threatens the freedom of a nation allied with us, or of a nation whose survival we consider vital to our security and the security of the region as a whole.

In cases involving other types of aggression we shall furnish military and economic assistance when requested and as appropriate. But we shall look to the nation directly threatened to assume the primary responsibility of providing the manpower for its defense.

This approach requires our commitment to helping our partners develop their own strength. In doing so, we must strike a care-

ful balance. If we do too little to help them—and erode their belief in our commitments—they may lose the necessary will to conduct their own self-defense or become disheartened about prospects of development. Yet, if we do too much, and American forces do what local forces can and should be doing, we promote dependence rather than independence.

In providing for a more responsible role for Asian nations in their own defense, the Nixon Doctrine means not only a more effective use of common resources, but also an American policy which can best be sustained over the long run.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART). The pending business is S. 3430, a bill to amend the Peace Corps Act, as amended.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, as a reminder to Senators I wish to state the following on behalf of the majority leader.

The Senate will shortly adjourn until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. Following disposition of the reading of the Journal tomorrow morning, the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS) will be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes. Following the speech by the Senator from Utah the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) will be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes, during which he will

participate in a colloquy with the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), following which the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) will be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

Following the speech by the Senator from Idaho there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes. Following the routine morning business, the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 10, 1970, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 9, 1970:

AMBASSADOR

Robert McClintock, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Venezuela.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, April 9, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William J. Peckham, First United Methodist Church, Green Valley, Ill., offered the following prayer:

We bow our heads today, our Father, acknowledging our dependence on You and our need for Your help and guidance. We confess the ease with which we tend to believe in ourselves and our wisdom, and the difficulty we often face in genuinely seeking to know Your will for us.

For these men and women who must make decisions today affecting the lives and destinies of many of our people, we ask for special help. Guard us all from confusing necessity with ultimate good. Save us from the pride of person, party, or position which might prevent us from being sensitive to the needs of all people.

We ask for Your particular blessing to be on all of our citizens—civilian and military—who are serving this Nation in positions of service and sacrifice throughout the world. May they, and may we, be responsible stewards of the duties and opportunities which are ours.

We pray for peace. We ask that You will enable us all to be peacemakers to bring reconciliation to an often divided and broken family of man. Finally, may Your will be done and Your kingdom come in us, and on earth, as it is in Heaven.

We ask this in the strong name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 3690. An act to increase the pay of Federal employees.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. MAHON, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file privileged reports on the following appropriation bills for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971: the Office of Education appropriation bill; the legislative branch appropriation bill; and the Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office appropriation bill.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on the bills.

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

There was no objection.

LET THE KNIFE CUT BOTH WAYS

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

Mr. SIKES, Mr. Speaker, the Carswell case is ended. A tragic story has been acted out and the book is closed. It is a straight case of discrimination as ugly as any that has been witnessed in our times. The vote was not really based on qualification or fitness; the outcome was determined on the fact that Judge Carswell is a southern conservative. Some of the liberal and minority groups have the knife out for anyone who does not conform to their standards of judicial fitness; that is, anyone who does not subscribe to the sociological patterns established by the Earl Warren court. There are some who are still seeking revenge for the defeat of liberal Justice Fortas. The question now is: Who can be persuaded to accept the nomination and run the gauntlet of hatred and persecution which obviously awaits anyone other than a liberal?

It is to be anticipated that considerable time may elapse before there is another nomination. During the interim, it would be well to look into the fitness of those already on the Court. It has long been evident there is at least one prime candidate for impeachment. He is Justice Douglas. By his activities in and out of

the Court he has cast reflection upon it. Rather than tolerate this unbecoming conduct, the Congress has a responsibility to seek corrective action. It has long been discussed, and it should now be undertaken. Let the knife cut both ways.

FRIENDSHIP, BALTIMORE, NONSTOP TO HAWAII

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

Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. Speaker, I have today been advised that a longstanding project of mine has at last been resolved. My great city of Baltimore and its fine international airport will at last be connected nonstop with our newest State and tropical Pacific paradise, the great State of Hawaii.

This major improvement in air service for Baltimore, and the entire metropolitan area will occur June 1, 1970, when United Air Lines inaugurates the first nonstop flights between Friendship International Airport and Honolulu.

This airline, which carries a third of the daily passenger traffic at Baltimore, received authority for this nonstop route in the recent important transpacific route investigation conducted by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The flight to the 50th State will require 10 hours, 5 minutes westbound, or 2 hours, 15 minutes less than present service which is now routed from Baltimore via Chicago to Hawaii.

While we all love the great and vital Windy City in the Midwest—when you are on your way to Hawaii and the vast beautiful blue Pacific—who really wants to stop over in Chicago?

Seriously, we who have worked so hard over the years to develop Friendship into a first-class international air terminal that is second to none in the world were particularly pleased that the CAB recognized Baltimore's stature and specified that United's nonstop service must be offered through Friendship.

The nonstop Baltimore-Honolulu run of 4,851 miles will be the second longest flight segment on the carrier's system.

For the passenger, this nonstop flight offers new convenience in traveling to the famed Hawaiian resort areas, as well as premium inflight service, including gourmet meals and a feature movie. For the shipper, the McDonnell Douglas DC-8 jet, specially designed for overwater service with a range of 6,000 miles, provides cargo space for almost 7 tons.

When the first nonstop flight lifts off the Friendship runway on June 1 another Baltimore "first" will become a reality. I am pleased that this major trunk carrier will be able to offer this new nonstop service from my city to the entire Baltimore-Washington community.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

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

Mr. PETTIS, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this body yesterday ap-

proved House Joint Resolution 1124 by voice vote, I wish to state for the record that I was opposed to the legislation. It was an action which I believe Congress will live to regret.

My concern arises primarily from the fact that we are establishing a pattern which will force both labor and management in this country to the conclusion that the only way in which future disputes can be resolved is to bring them to Capitol Hill. What is to happen to meaningful labor-management negotiations if, at the sign of the first serious difficulty in the bargaining, Congress enters the picture and determines the settlement?

It is my strong feeling that we have not really settled anything by our action yesterday, but rather postponed an issue and worsened the normal labor-management relationships which have contributed so much to the success of what we often refer to as the American way of life. It saddens me to reflect on our past record in this particular arena; where we have "settled" disputes, each "settlement" has used different formulas and none with any lasting success.

As an advocate of collective bargaining, who in private life has successfully participated on both sides of the table in this more satisfactory process of resolving differences, I cannot believe that we are now giving up and substituting in its place compulsory arbitration—which should be anathema to both labor and management.

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER FIREMEN'S WEEK

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

Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my distinguished colleague Mr. SAYLOR in cosponsoring his resolution to create a National Volunteer Firemen's Week, September 19 to 26, 1970.

Volunteer firemen, who protect the homes and businesses of millions of Americans, labor long and tiring hours in one of the most difficult of all professions. I feel it is both necessary and proper during 1 week in the year to pause and honor the thousands upon thousands of men all over this country who face danger and death without pay or reward, simply to help their neighbors. If they can dedicate their lives 52 weeks a year, surely it is not asking too much to honor them during National Volunteer Firemen's Week.

The risks and dangers which face every fireman were most tragically pointed out on March 29 in Corry, Pa., a community of 8,000 in Erie County in my congressional district.

While Christians around the world were commemorating the resurrection of our Lord on Easter morning, five young men, all volunteer firemen, lost their lives in a tragic fire in Corry.

These firemen—David Apps, Richard Bringham, Jon Miller, Dennis Rockafellow, and Lauren Shreve—were all members of Corry's Sanford Hose Com-

pany which was first to respond to the alarm. Arriving at the scene of the fire, the members of the hose company encountered what seemed like a routine blaze in a paint store. However, as the men were laying their hoses and advancing toward the burning structure, a gigantic explosion blasted out an entire wall of the building, killing the five men instantly. Twenty-three other firemen were injured.

There is no adequate way to express our mournful feelings on this occasion. Corry Mayor Edward Zarger best summed it up when he said, "Our town is crying."

How can we pay tribute to this supreme heroism? We cannot, in reality, repay our debt to these men. Suffice it to say that their dedication to the public safety is an irreplaceable and priceless gift of love for one's fellow man.

I know that my colleagues join with me in extending our sympathy to the families of these five members of the Sanford Hose Company. They comprise a tiny cross section of America. They bespeak of all that is great in this Nation.

Weeks, years, resolutions, and memorial funds cannot make up what we lost on Eastern Sunday in Corry, Pa.; but, I do hope that my colleagues will join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) and me in cosponsoring this fitting resolution to memorialize the five volunteer firemen from Corry, and all volunteer firemen across the country.

PETITION ON BEHALF OF PRISONERS IN NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. ZWACH, Mr. Speaker, we all deplore the deaths, the wounds, the injuries, and the diseases suffered by our armed forces in Vietnam. This is a toll from which all of us hope and pray our Nation can be spared.

The deaths are final. The wounds, the injuries, the diseases are known conditions. They can be overcome.

But there is a much more serious aspect to this conflict, one much more heartrending, and that is the almost complete lack of information about those servicemen missing in action.

Their people know not whether they are alive, in good health, getting enough to eat.

Think of the wives, the families of these men, living with this terrible uncertainty.

Never before, in my memory, has one nation been so callous of the responsibilities and obligations to humanity as the regime of North Vietnam.

Recently, while I was in our Sixth Congressional District, I was given a petition signed by over 90 percent of the people of Cold Spring, one of our more progressive communities, praying that the President and Congress of the United States do all in their power to exert pressure on the leaders of North Vietnam and the Vietcong to extend humane treatment to all of the men they hold prisoner, and further asking that the

United States seek the support of other nations in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I join the good people of Cold Spring, Minn., in their effort in this instance.

I am today presenting this petition for reference to the proper committee.

CONGRESSMAN FREY EXPLAINS VOTE ON CONFERENCE REPORT

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, as an individual who believes strongly in the right of equal justice and who has been strongly involved with our young people and their educational process, it was with a deep feeling of frustration that I cast my vote against the conference report on H.R. 514, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act amendments. I want to make it perfectly clear that my action was not in protest against the bill itself, but against one section which I feel is legally and morally wrong and will have divisive effects upon the people of our great Nation.

The section of the bill I refer to is section 2, or the so-called Stennis amendment. The language in the original amendment is very clear cut, and shows that the desire of Congress is to end all forms of segregation on a nationwide basis. But the conference committee, in my opinion, reversed the intent of this amendment. It now says in essence that segregation is allowable in the North, East, and West, but not in the South. I do not see how the conferees, in clear conscience, again made the South a whipping boy by passing a law which outlaws de jure segregation and yet allows de facto segregation.

In 1954 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that discrimination could no longer be tolerated and that separate schools could no longer be maintained for whites and blacks. This principle should apply everywhere in the country and not just in one section. All parts of this Nation, as well as all Americans, should be treated equally. The U.S. Congress should want to end all segregation, not just segregation in the South.

There can be no halfway segregation, and yet this conference report seems to condone it. Are we to conclude that freedom of choice and the neighborhood school concept should be the law of the land everywhere but in the South? And that forced busing is all right in the South but not acceptable in the rest of the country? According to a recent Gallup poll, the Nation is 8 to 1 against the busing policy.

Have any of you attempted to explain to a child the difference between de facto and de jure segregation? The answer is to have a single national policy on education. This is not a southern question; this is an American question.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 69]

Alexander	Green, Oreg.	Patten
Ashley	Hagan	Philbin
Blackburn	Hall	Pollock
Blatnik	Halpern	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Hanna	Reid, N.Y.
Brown, Mich.	Hansen, Idaho	Rivers
Cabell	Hawkins	Rooney, N.Y.
Clark	Hébert	Rosenthal
Clay	Hosmer	Rostenkowski
Coughlin	Johnson, Pa.	Roudebush
Daddario	Jones, Tenn.	Sandman
Dawson	Kirwan	Saylor
Dent	Kleppe	Scheuer
Diggs	Landrum	Stokes
Dowdy	Leggett	Taft
Flynt	Lujan	Teague, Calif.
Foreman	Miller, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Fulton, Pa.	Mollohan	White
Gallagher	Moorhead	Whitten
Gilbert	Ottinger	Wiggins
Gray	Patman	Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY INCREASES

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 905, Rept. No. 91-993), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 905

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16844) to increase the pay of Federal employees, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendments. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 16844, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3690 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 16844 as passed by the House.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 905 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 905?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider House Resolution 905.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe all the Members of the House understand what this is all about. The easiest way to describe this situation is that we are about to consider a preliminary battle. This makes in order a bill that will provide for a straight across-the-board 6-percent increase in salaries for the postal workers and for other Federal employees and in effect the military services and the legislative employees.

It also has in it provisions increasing the pay of certain judges—a few of them, I do not know the exact number—who were left out in the pay increase that took place last year. They were forgotten. It happens. There is some controversy about this, but their pay increase is not in controversy. They were covered in the bill that is now in conference, a bill that passed the House and the Senate that deals with crime in the District of Columbia. In other words, we are picking up in this bill some judges that are taken care of in another bill.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service came before the Committee on Rules and requested an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. After some inquiry of the members of the committee and the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee who is actually handling this bill, it became clear that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service would be satisfied and, as a matter of fact, pleased with a closed rule. In the light of this situation we felt in the Rules Committee by a very substantial majority that the manner in which we should handle, what I have described as a preliminary bout making way for the main event, would be in a closed rule providing some time for debate.

That is exactly what we have before us.

The rule, aside from it being closed, does allow for some committee amendments. It does also provide that at the conclusion of consideration of the bill, when, as I assume, it will pass, we will then send it to conference for all practical purposes by getting the Senate number on it. That is exactly what is in the resolution. I urge its passage and I yield now to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

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

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Missouri on the explicit and extremely able manner in which he explained precisely what took place today. I agree with what the gentleman said. I concur in his statements.

The only thing I would add would be my own opinion on stressing the impor-

tance of a closed rule on this first part of the so-called package. In my opinion, if we do not have a closed rule, there will be some amendments offered which many of us favor. I think almost everybody on the floor favors the compression amendment, which would cut from 21 to 8 years the time during which the postal employees have to work before they can get to their top salary, but that will be in the second chapter, as I understand it, and if we mess it up today with any amendments in this bill, in my opinion the postal employees may not get any raise for a very long time, and they are entitled to it.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the rule, a closed rule, and I urge adoption of the resolution, House Resolution 905.

I will say to the gentleman from Missouri, I do have a request for time. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the parliamentary situation, we are now considering a resolution making a bill in order. It is a resolution which none of us have seen. We have heard it read. I have only now obtained a copy.

We must adopt the resolution in order to make the bill in order, is that correct, Mr. Speaker, and to provide for general debate?

The SPEAKER. The answer to the gentleman's inquiry is that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And the rule is for 1 hour of general debate?

The SPEAKER. In connection with the rule it would be up to 1 hour. The Chair understands the resolution provides for 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that this bill is to come to the House floor under a closed rule, which will prohibit any Member of the House from offering an amendment to the bill.

I have been prepared to offer an amendment to the bill to provide that the 6-percent pay increase be limited to those workers employed by the Federal Government who are paid under the four statutory pay acts; in other words, the classified workers, the postal field service, the Veterans' Administration, and the Foreign Service.

It seems to me this is where the bill should have been stopped in view of the financial crisis which exists today.

Every Member should understand that this bill calls for an expenditure of \$2.6 billion and was considered in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for the first time this morning in a period of 35 minutes. Not even the members of the committee, except one or two who sponsored this deal, had ever seen the bill before it appeared on our desks in the committee at 10 o'clock this morning.

Thus we are being asked here today to rush through—to ram through the House a bill without the opportunity to offer a single amendment.

This rule ought to be defeated and the Members given the opportunity to work their will.

This bill should not contain pay increases for the Judiciary in the District

of Columbia, because they are now being considered for a pay increase in the District of Columbia crime bill, presently in conference between the House and the Senate. If this bill goes to conference, as I am certain it will if it is passed in the form in which it is presented, we will have in conference in two places the pay increases for the District of Columbia judges.

There are other provisions in this bill which ought not to be there. I happen to believe that the legislative employees are presently well paid. If they are entitled to a further increase it can come in legislation to be considered subsequently, along with the proposed 8-percent pay increase for postal workers. We had no hearings whatever on the necessity for another pay increase for legislative employees.

There are other fringe benefits in this bill that ought not to be there.

I hope the rule will be defeated so that I can offer my amendment to confine this pay increase to at least the four categories of employees of which I have already spoken.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER).

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not consume the 5 minutes, I hope. I am prompted to take the floor in view of the statement of the gentleman from Iowa, for whom I have the highest regard. I would just like to reiterate that I am traditionally opposed to closed rules generally, but I would like to make the observation here that the Committee on Rules saw fit in its wisdom to grant a closed rule in this case.

I would like to add further, Mr. Speaker, that if there was ever a time when a bill should be considered under a closed rule, it seems to me that that time is on this particular bill. I say this because of the agreement worked out between the parties.

Now, I do not like rushing through legislation as we have done in the past 2 days, but the Congress and the administration, I might add, have permitted a situation to drag along whereby we are in another crisis, as it were. Yesterday we passed the railway strike bill in an emergency atmosphere.

I would also like to add, Mr. Speaker, that this pay increase does concern me as much as some previous pay increases because of its contribution to inflation. Yet I would have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that inflation has continued and these people, particularly the postal employees, find themselves the victims of inflation. Unless we stop enacting—and I say this for the hundredth time on this floor—unless we cease and desist from starting these new expensive programs such as the one now under consideration in the Committee on Rules—the welfare bill—we will continue to legislate in an area of crisis. Unless we do so, we are going to have to continue salary increases for the foreseeable future. I have sympathy with these employees who are caught in this trap and therefore have cause for some relief.

So, Mr. Speaker, I propose, in spite of my position on the question of closed

rules, to support my committee on this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I state I join the gentleman from Iowa and a few other Members here this afternoon who oppose the closed rule. Before I specifically state the reason why I do so, I wish to clarify the legislative situation this afternoon.

First of all I trust that no one is under the illusion that this bill constitutes a step which is part of postal reform. This bill is completely aside from any concept of postal reform. All we will be voting for this afternoon is an across-the-board 6-percent pay increase. Any thought that this is a part of postal reform is really not accurate.

Mr. Speaker, the other point I wish to emphasize—and the gentleman from Iowa touched on it—is that bill passed through our committee in 35 minutes this morning, which is hardly normal procedure and, as much as I, personally, am in favor of and will continue to support postal reform, as much as I wish to see that the administration gets its basic plan to renovate the Post Office Department, I do not believe this is the proper way to handle a rule.

There is one specific defect in the bill which I hoped to cure with an amendment but, obviously since we do not have an open rule, I will not have the opportunity to offer that amendment. That would be an amendment to the automatic salary increase that this bill contains for House of Representatives or Members' employees. It would read as follows:

AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Section 3 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

“() The basic compensation of each employee on the rolls on the date of enactment of this Act whose compensation is paid from the clerk hire of a Member of the House of Representatives or the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico is hereby adjusted, effective on the first day of the first month following the date of enactment of this Act, to the lowest multiple of \$5 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior to such first day, except that the foregoing provision of this sentence shall not apply with respect to an employee if, on or before the tenth day following the date of enactment of this Act, the Member or Resident Commissioner by whom such employee is employed transmits to the Clerk of the House of Representatives written notice to the effect that he does not wish such provision to apply to such employee. No employee whose basic compensation is adjusted under this subsection shall receive any additional compensation under subsection (a) for any period prior to the effective date of such adjustment during which such employee was employed in the office of the Member or Resident Commissioner by whom he is employed on the first day of the month following the enactment of this Act. No additional compensation shall be paid to any person under subsection (a) for any period prior to the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act during which such person was employed in the office of a Member or Resident Commissioner (other than a Member or Resident Commissioner by whom he is employed on such day) unless

on or before the tenth day following the date of enactment of this Act such Member or Resident Commissioner notifies the disbursing office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives in writing that he wishes such employee to receive such additional compensation for such period. If, before the expiration of the period within which such notice may be given, such Member or Resident Commissioner dies without having transmitted such notice, such notice shall be considered to have been transmitted."

Let me take a moment to explain one interesting fact. Whenever a pay raise is granted across the board, employees in the House automatically receive it. In the Senate they merely receive the authorization to increase the salary of their employees and every Member of the Senate has the option to grant the degree of increase that he feels is warranted.

However, under our procedure in the House every employee in your office or every member of a committee's staff receives a automatic 6-percent increase under this bill. If you have just given your employee a pay raise or for some reason you think their pay scale is in order, then you have to be a Simon Legree and by your negative action take away the pay increase that this bill grants.

If we had an open rule, I would offer an amendment that would put the House employees and the committee employees under the same procedure under which the Senate operates which means that you would have the authority to grant the pay increases, but it would be by a positive action on the part of the Member and not a negative action to take away an automatic pay increase.

I should also suggest to the Members that there is much more that could be discussed. There are other Members who have perfecting and helpful amendments. I really do not believe there is any real opposition to this bill, but this bill is not sacred and is not perfect. It could use some adjustment and improvement.

It is my understanding that the argument for the closed rule is to the effect that the Senate will turn around and accept our bill and that it will be on the President's desk this evening. This is not so at all. It is my understanding that the Senate will insist on a conference, because there have been amendments placed in the House bill in the committee that are unacceptable to the Senate. I do not believe there is any need for a closed rule and I would strongly recommend Members join us in seeking an open rule.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern that has been expressed by my colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

We did not have sufficient time during the meeting of the committee this morning to properly consider this bill. I had an amendment that would have been offered had time permitted. At the beginning of the session the committee adopted a motion that I opposed which provided that we would vote at 10:45

on reporting out the entire bill. While the committee meeting was scheduled for 10 a.m., we were late in getting started and spent very little time on the legislation. This, in my opinion, is not the correct way to legislate. Nevertheless the major part of this bill which provides a 6-percent across-the-board increase in pay to all Government employees, both civilian and military, is desirable. Had time permitted, Mr. Speaker, I believe our committee should have considered the proposal advocated by the American Federation of Government Employees that the raise for classified employees be at the flat rate of \$615. The president of the federation in testimony before a Senate committee pointed out that more than 600,000 classified workers receive \$7,500 or less in annual salary and in this legislation they will receive as low as a \$200 raise while those in the highest grades will receive more than a \$2,000 increase. If we actually face an emergency situation it does not seem we are facing it in a responsible manner. I also have objection to the lack of proper consideration for the other portions of the bill.

However, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we do have a reason to have a closed rule today, notwithstanding the objection that has been made by the gentleman from Iowa, the gentleman from Illinois, and myself to the procedure that we had in the committee. And that is that we have had a conference within the executive branch of the Government, between labor representatives and Government officials. There have been some tentative agreements made, and if we have an open rule today I believe there will be some amendments offered which will prove embarrassing to the administration. And I would hope that we will adopt the version of the Committee on Rules and have a closed rule today, even though our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service only spent a few minutes in considering this legislation.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have two more requests for time.

First, Mr. Speaker, I will yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE).

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I rise in opposition to the action that has been taken by the Committee on Rules in this instance. I am very much aware of some of the considerations which are behind the action by which the Committee on Rules decided to bring in a closed rule only.

I believe the Members of the House have to understand that the action taken within the committee this morning was taken in limiting debate on this matter with the understanding I believe by all the Members that there would be an opportunity to offer amendments on the floor that we did not have time to offer in the committee. It is for that reason, and that reason alone, that I rise in opposition to the adoption of this resolution on the rule.

I believe it needs to be pointed out also

that sections 8, 9, and 10 of the bill have been passed by this House before, and the Senate saw fit to delete them when they returned that measure to this body. There is no assurance at all that the Members of the Senate will accept it when we put it in this second time, and send it to them again.

I am aware also of the jurisdictional conflict with respect to section 6 dealing with the pay of the District of Columbia judges. I believe the summary manner in which we handled that in committee is subject to a great deal of question.

Section 7, which calls for a 20-percent increase in certain expense allowances to former Presidents, has never been the subject of any discussion or any hearings before our committee. It is contained within the Senate bill, but our committee has never had the opportunity to even determine whether or not there is any justification for this 20-percent increase.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I very reluctantly rise in opposition to the closed rule, and I hope the House will defeat the closed rule and give us the opportunity to propose some amendments to this legislation.

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

Mr. McCLURE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

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

Mr. Speaker, I favor a closed rule. I am sorry that the majority of our committee does not agree with my colleague in the well, but we have to move this thing along, and we would continue for quite a few days on this bill if we did not have a closed rule, so I support the closed rule.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, in spite of what the gentleman from Nebraska says, I believe this is an extremely important piece of legislation, and I do not believe that we have to carry on in this precipitous manner. Whether everyone has plans for the weekend, I believe those plans can be changed for the purpose of considering this legislation so that it is not necessary that we continue with what I consider to be unseemingly precipitous action.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very plain that I support the general concept of a pay increase for the workers of the Federal Government as embraced in the 6-percent provision which is the major portion of this legislation. I want that to be understood, that my opposition to the closed rule is not on the basis of being opposed to granting Federal employees a raise, because I believe they are entitled to it, and I think our hearings have indicated that.

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

Mr. McCLURE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the action of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which has reported this bill to the floor today.

There is no doubt that we shall pass this bill this afternoon, and in so doing we will be voting deserving raises in pay to our postal employees, to our other civil servants, and to members of the military. This raise in pay has been long overdue.

I wish to note that the press of most important business will make it impossible for me to be present and to cast my vote for this bill. In the normal course of events, I would pair my affirmative vote with the vote of someone opposed to the bill. In this case, however, the committee has done such an efficient job that it has been impossible to find a vote opposed to the bill with which I might pair. I commend the committee for its fine work, and I wanted the Members of the House to know that my own vote, were I present to cast it, would be in the affirmative.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON).

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

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support of this bill. I think it is badly needed.

As the gentleman stated, it has been needed for a long period of time. I support this increase and I hope that the House will vote for the rule and will promptly vote on the legislation itself.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, I must join those who are criticizing the type of rule that we will be operating under here today. I think it is extremely unfortunate that we are unable to have an open rule. As a member of the committee, I am sure as the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McCURE) just said—all members of the committee were under the impression that we would be having an open rule and that we would have an opportunity to present very important amendments to this bill.

I do not know of anyone who will be voting against the bill. I suppose we could probably have a voice vote when the debate is finished and dispose of this bill very promptly because everyone is for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, there are parts of it, however, that should not be in the bill and the point raised by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) is an extremely important question.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the very important things the postal employees have found objection to is the way we treat our own employees and ourselves so far as salary increases are concerned, which far overshadows what we are able to do for them when these pay raises come up.

Here we are talking of a 6-percent pay raise that will go to all Government employees plus a special raise for District judges here in the District of Columbia. This means that many of our staff people, who are up in the highest brackets, will be getting from \$1,000 to \$1,500 a year wage raise when the very people that we are trying to help, the low-paid postal employees and Government employees will be getting probably \$300 to \$450 a year increase, which just is not right.

I think that the compression problem that the gentleman from California (Mr.

SMITH) made reference to when speaking on the rule is extremely important.

This is the amendment I had hoped I would have an opportunity to introduce during the course of debate on the bill. I think we all have become aware of the fact, and those of you who did not know it before, that it takes 21 years for postal employees to achieve the top salary that they are entitled to receive. The amendment would have reduced this to 8 years.

This is one of the items that had been agreed to, I believe, in the negotiations going on, and there is no reason in the world why we could not have had this included in the bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I feel we have to do something more than just provide a 6-percent pay raise to the postal employees at this time. We have to sweeten this thing in some manner for them in order to assure them we are serious about wanting to do something to rectify the inequities that they have been living under for the past several years.

I would hope that we could defeat the previous question. I do not know—I have to be realistic about this thing—there are not enough Members on the floor, if we were to try to make an effort to defeat the previous question, who would understand what the issue was when they come in to cast their votes. So it probably would be a pursuit of futility if the effort is made. Yet, I am giving consideration at this time to asking for the defeat of the previous question when it comes up in order that we can give serious consideration to several important amendments which should be adopted in order to make this a better bill than it is.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON), there were—ayes 43, noes 22.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16844) to increase the pay of Federal employees, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16844) with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CORBETT) will be recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the coordination and cooperation extended by the leadership, on both sides of the aisle, in dealing with the pending bill, H.R. 16844 on an expedited basis.

As you know, the House approved last October a postal pay bill, H.R. 13000, and the Senate approved a much different version in December. The bill has since been in conference.

As I reported to the House at the time, we finally were able to arrange to sit down with the Senate conferees in three sessions, just before the Easter recess. But the Senate panel voted to defer further consideration pending negotiations downtown between the administration and the postal unions.

The first stage of the agreement between the parties called for an across-the-board 6-percent retroactive pay increase for Federal employees who are customarily covered by general salary bills reported by our committee. The retroactive feature would be to the first pay period beginning on or after December 27, 1969.

The increases will apply to employees who are paid under the four statutory salary systems—the general schedule, the postal field service schedule, the schedule of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, and the Foreign Service schedules.

The increases also will apply to other groups of employees who have been included in previous salary bills. On the other hand, certain officers of the House are excluded.

The figure of 6 percent across the board is beyond the scope of conference on H.R. 13000. Thus it becomes necessary to handle this matter by separate legislation. This is what is involved in the bill before you today, which is very similar to S. 3690, approved yesterday by the Senate.

The bill before you was acted upon this morning by our Subcommittee on Compensation and then was approved by our full committee in executive session. The vote on reporting the bill was 24 to 1.

Mr. Chairman, just so that there will be no misunderstanding as to the relationship of the pending bill to the overall package which is being worked out between the administration and the postal unions, let me explain:

The pending bill is the first stage of the so-called package.

In testimony last Monday before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Postmaster General Blount was asked in considerable detail whether we needed to wait for the balance of the package before acting upon the 6-percent raise across the board.

The Postmaster General said that he would prefer that all actions be consolidated, but if it meant a delay in action on the pending bill then he preferred that we proceed separately with the 6-percent pay raise.

In testifying before the Senate Committee, General Blount was asked:

Are there conditions attached to the Congress following through on enactment (of

other features) before a 6 percent pay increase retroactively would be in order?

In reply, Postmaster General Blount told the committee:

Mr. Chairman, we have no provisions or no conditions on the 6-percent retroactive pay increase. We looked at this matter in these negotiations and tried to arrive at what we felt was an equitable situation for everybody involved. This proposal was made to the unions in good faith without any conditions involved.

The foregoing statement by the Postmaster General seems to me to make it abundantly clear that the administration attaches no conditions whatsoever to the 6-percent raise we are considering here today.

In other words, only the 6-percent across-the-board retroactive pay raise is involved at this point and that is what is involved in the pending bill.

There is obvious need for prompt action on the pending bill. I support it fully. I hope that the bill will be approved by the House.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. I wish to compliment the gentleman for his fine statement and on the work he has done during this period of crisis. I am concerned as one who has sponsored and appeared before the gentleman's committee for the corporation bill which the administration has sent up here. Can we expect that to be forthcoming in the near future?

Mr. DULSKI. As I stated before the Rules Committee, we filed a report on this bill yesterday, and as soon as possible, I will ask for a rule for the Postal Reform Act as reported out by our committee.

Mr. CONTE. I wonder if the gentleman agrees with me—I have not been able to discuss the point with him—that one of the great inequities I have observed, sitting on the Appropriations Committee and handling the Post Office budget for 12 years, is that when we authorize pay raises, such as the proposed pay raise of 6 percent, which is certainly needed, some person in Oshkosh, Wyo., or Montana, turns out to be the highest-paid person in town, and another person doing the same work in a high cost-of-living area such as New York City, Boston, Cleveland, or Buffalo, turns out to be the lowest paid guy in town.

This is certainly inequitable. I hope the corporation will be one of those things that will straighten out this inequity.

The third question I have is: Will this pay raise apply to our own employees?

Mr. DULSKI. Yes; it will.

Mr. CONTE. There is no way under the closed rule that we can ferret this out?

Mr. DULSKI. No; not under the closed rule.

Mr. CONTE. I talked with the gentleman from Arizona last night on this. I hope this committee will look some day in the future, rather than to giving an across-the-board increase, the discretion should be left with the Congressman to determine what raise he wants to give

his employees. As it stands at present, if the Congressman does not want to give the raise he must lower the employees' basic salary.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I yield 5 minutes now to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, we meet today in the aftermath of a postal crisis, the first postal work stoppage in the history of this country. We meet today to begin to correct some basic inequities and deficiencies in the postal system, and in the system by which we have undertaken to adjust the pay from time to time.

This is a crisis which, in my judgment, should not have happened. There has been a great deal of oratory, much of it partisan, on both sides in an attempt to fix the blame for the situation that caused this work stoppage, but I believe the job of all of us now is not to try to fix the blame—there is probably enough to go around—but the job of all of us is to get on with this situation and to find the answers.

This is the first installment in the search for answers as in this legislation which we take up today. This will not answer all the questions. It sets aside for later consideration many of the problems that bother Members of the House. We have heard of some of them already, and we will hear about others later today.

We hear that following the work stoppage the administration went into negotiations with the seven main postal employee organizations. In the beginning of the negotiations there was very strong feeling on the part of the employee groups that they simply were not going to have a pay increase tied to reform. This was a matter of fundamental doctrine on their part, and so the first agreement that came out of those negotiations was that without conditions, without strings, without being tied to reform, because of the delay and the lag in comparability for postal employees, there would be an agreement to a 6-percent across-the-board retroactive pay increase.

So it is this first agreement we are here today to carry out and to enact into law before this week is gone.

The other questions—and there are several questions and they are thorny and difficult questions such as postal reform and the additional 8-percent increase for postal employees, and the problem of whether the classified employees are to get an additional raise beyond the 6 percent that is included here—all these things we set aside today, and we do not seek to deal with them or to solve them in this legislation.

I do not particularly like closed rules. I wish we had the time to consider all these matters under an open rule today, but the fact is that we are not yet out of the woods in this serious situation that affects the country. Postal organization employee groups around the country are still meeting, and there are some votes in meetings scheduled for today and tomorrow. One thing we can do is to show everyone in the country that

there is movement toward resolving the situation, that we are going to begin to act, and if we carry out our responsibilities, the responsibilities which we in the Congress should have discharged months ago, we can, I believe, show the country that solutions are in sight and that progress is being made.

Mr. Chairman, this is the reason why I strongly support this bill and feel it is in the interest of the country and all concerned that we pass it today.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, in the last bill we had a commission for the purpose of considering employee salaries. There is nothing in this bill to provide for a commission of that kind?

Mr. UDALL. Nothing of that kind. It is my hope we will find a permanent way to fix salaries, but this is a stopgap raise for the Federal employees which we are considering today.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, can the gentleman tell me why the committee included the District of Columbia judges' salaries in this bill?

Mr. UDALL. Yes; I will be happy to respond to that question. The gentleman will recall that in 1969 Members of Congress and Federal judges and Cabinet and Federal executives of all levels received substantial pay increases as a result of the work of the Quadrennial Commission on those salaries.

The only Presidential appointees, the only judicial officers of the United States, who were omitted from that machinery—by oversight—were the court of general sessions in the District and the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. So here are some 33 judges who have been totally overlooked when all the other top Federal appointees have had substantial pay raises.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman is aware of the fact that pay raises were included for these judges in the District of Columbia crime bill.

Mr. UDALL. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield for one other question?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is the level of salaries in this bill in keeping with the level which was included in the District of Columbia crime bill?

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the District of Columbia Committee and has an interest in this legislation. Let me say to him that these are the precise salaries which his committee approved and which the House approved. These salaries are the House versions.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I assume that the gentleman was merely trying to expedite the effectiveness of the salaries?

Mr. UDALL. That is right. I do this as an interim settlement of this problem. I take the view that the final result on the salaries will come out, on a permanent basis, from the conference on the District of Columbia crime bill.

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

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

Mr. COLLIER. So long as the judges are included in this—and I believe it is proper that they be included—is there anything in this bill having anything to do with their clerks?

Mr. UDALL. Well, all salaries for the legislative, judicial, and executive branches are to be a 6-percent increase across the board.

Mr. COLLIER. Six percent in the case of some of the clerks might get them above the poverty level.

Mr. UDALL. I would hope so, if they are in poverty.

Mr. COLLIER. I mention this perhaps lightly, but in a serious vein. I have a son who was a clerk. He no longer is. I, therefore, have no conflict of interest.

At some time someone ought to do a review of this. It is a fact that most of the clerks are outstanding law students who have completed law school. For them to be obliged to work for the salaries they are is nothing short of a shame.

Beyond that, it goes one step further. This means that unless a young man comes from a home from which he can get financial assistance most of the time he is deprived, from the standpoint of economics, from being privileged to serve in this kind of a position.

I would hope that at some time someone would take a good, hard look at the totally inadequate salaries paid to these law clerks, and do something about it, as something is being done in other areas, and perhaps in some areas not as well deserving.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is a vigorous advocate of salary adjustments for these people. I join him in his efforts and in his remarks.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOGAN. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, now in the well.

I should like to say further, in relation to the remarks about the local judges who were overlooked at the time of the previous pay raises, the District of Columbia crime bill recently passed by the House provides an effective date 6 months after the enactment of the bill. This would further prolong the inequity, which the bill before us would correct.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Arizona not only for this presentation but also for the many presentations he has made on the floor of the House down through the years on this matter. He has certainly been a forthright legislator and a leader in this field. He is very knowledgeable, and has done his homework.

As the gentleman knows, I am quite disturbed about some of the features of this bill. I feel the postal workers certainly need it. I am disturbed that the pay raise goes across the board and no consideration is being given at this time to allowing a higher pay raise to the post-

al workers in the high-cost-of-living zones as opposed to those in the low-cost-of-living zones, such as in some small town or in some small State.

Mr. UDALL. Let me say to the gentleman on that point, I believe the real answer to all of our postal problems is the kind of basic postal reform which both the gentleman and I support.

One of the things being negotiated and talked about in the major postal reform proposals is giving to the postal unions the right to negotiate an average wage, so that the union of the man in New York can negotiate a higher wage for him, as compared to that negotiated by the union for the man who works in one of my small towns in Arizona, who does not need the same amount.

Mr. CONTE. That is encouraging. The other thing that bothers me—and maybe we can make some legislative history here and get this thing off the ground—is the question of our own employees. We should have the right to determine whether they are deserving of this 6-percent pay increase or whether it should be 3 percent or maybe 10 percent. Therefore, I would rather see the fund itself increased and give the discretion to the Congressmen rather than having a 6-percent straight-across-the-board increase.

Mr. UDALL. Let me say to the gentleman and to other Members who have raised this point that I believe there will probably be another major Federal salary bill dealing with the classified and other Federal employees later this year, after postal reform. It is my hope and intention that we can resolve some of the basic things that are wrong with the pay system as it affects the House employees. I fully agree with the gentleman, and I wish I could vote for the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) because I believe something is long overdue in this field. I would personally junk the whole hypocritical system of basic pay, but maybe if we can work later this year on legislation in this field, we can get rid of this unfair system for our employees.

Mr. CONTE. Is it not true, if the gentleman will yield further, that under this system we are voting for today we have no alternative and, in fact, some of the Senate pages will get more starting salary than a postal worker who is married and has a family?

Mr. UDALL. I have not seen the figures, but it is entirely possible.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

As I understand the bill today, it is sort of a result of negotiations and bargaining as a result of an illegal strike. Is that a fair assessment?

Mr. UDALL. The events have been variously categorized, and some have said it is an illegal strike. Certainly it is against the law for Federal employees to withhold their services, so I guess one could call it that.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. What we

are being asked to do, then, is vote up or down on a negotiation that is at best perhaps not in accordance with the law. The thing that bothers me about it is we will take one issue here, and I ask the gentleman here whether he has any commitments or knows of any commitments on the part of any of the unions, for example, to support postal reform and, if so, has it has been agreed on as to what that reform will be? How in the world can any such agreement, if in fact there is one, bind the Members of this House?

Mr. UDALL. It cannot. No agreement of the unions and the administration can bind the House. We have our legislative responsibilities. They can recommend to us, and we can either accept or reject or modify these recommendations. That is the spirit in which I intend to receive anything that comes out of these negotiations.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I understand the gentleman is correct and he states my understanding of the situation, but I find that we are being handed here a piece of legislation as a result of a strike that I believe to be illegal no matter what different name others might put on it. There is no commitment tied to it. That is one of the main issues involved in this question of postal reform. We have H.R. 4, as I recall it, about ready to come to the floor. As I understand from what I read in the papers and from what the gentleman says, there is no assurance that is what the so-called negotiators are going to agree on. So at this point we do not really know what we will have up for consideration.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is right. We will have to wait and see. Negotiations are due to end tomorrow, and hopefully they will have some kind of a package to present to us. We will compare it with H.R. 4 and get the ideas of all of the Members of the House, and someday soon let us have a rousing good debate and settle the whole question of postal reform.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. If I may impose on the gentleman's time for one more point, the sooner we have a responsible postal reform bill that gets the Congress out of all of this day-to-day activity the better off this country will be.

Mr. UDALL. I agree with the gentleman.

I yield to my good friend from Montana.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think it should be said in response to the inquiries made by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) that there is a mechanism today under the Pay Act of 1967 whereby the President can delegate the authority for making a differential in pay for New York City, for instance, as compared with another city. Such a survey was made.

The President, pursuant to that law of 1967, delegated the authority to make a differential pay scale to the Civil Service Commission. The Post Office Department did make such a request and the request

was made specifically concerning the city of Los Angeles. However, when they found out it would cost \$7 million a year in that city alone, that was the end of it.

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. When they found out it was going to cost \$7 million additionally at just the one location in Los Angeles that was the end of the request of the Post Office Department. It never did get to the Civil Service Commission for a decision. But right now for all those who have questions about wage and pay differentials, the authority is in the President to delegate it even to the Postmaster General to make differentials in pay. So, do not worry that we have to do anything about it in any bill that comes up here. The authority has already been delegated.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the \$36,000 limitation contained in section 4(c) of the bill apply only to the basic pay of military personnel?

Mr. UDALL. I am happy to help the gentleman make some legislative history on this question because this question has been raised by some members of the Committee on Armed Services. My understanding is that a question has been raised in applying the \$36,000 limitation contained in section 4(c), the words "pay, compensation, or salary" include for military personnel quarters and subsistence allowances and the income tax advantage thereon, or whether those words, as applied to military personnel, include only basic pay. It generally was understood that it applied only to basic pay, but some doubt was raised informally by the Comptroller General's Office. Whatever doubt may exist could be resolved and I hope can be cured by this legislative history.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Relative to the President's power of delegation to the Civil Service Commission—I believe it was in 1967—the then President, of course, did not exercise that authority. However, I would want to say that following up the view of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), where there is a higher cost of living in the larger cities as compared to the smaller cities I think the gentleman in the well was here several years ago, and at least I was, when the greatest champion of that procedure was our former colleague Katherine St. George. She tried to get legislation out of the committee to provide higher salaries for those postal

workers in the larger cities as compared to postal workers in the smaller communities, but it never got anywhere. Also, the unions were opposed to that very much—

Mr. UDALL. Yes; the employee organizations.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And, there was a good reason for it, because the man in New York does the same type of heavy work as a man in Waterloo, Iowa. Their duties are the same and they should be paid on an equal basis.

Mr. UDALL. This is a serious problem and there are strong views on it. It is my hope that we can solve it. I hope we will decide it and resolve it and find a better way to solve it as we go down the road.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor and one who voted for this legislation in the Subcommittee on Compensation and the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wish to express to the Members of the House my strong support for H.R. 16844.

While a staunch supporter of H.R. 13000 which the House passed last October, authorizing a pay raise for postal employees and creating a Federal pay comparability system, at that time I expressed my disappointment that the classified employees were not included in the provisions of that pay raise and said I hoped that Congress would soon act to rectify this omission.

Therefore, I am very pleased that this richly deserved pay increase for Government employees is before us today. Under H.R. 16844, 5.6 million civilian and military employees will receive a 6-percent pay increase, retroactive to December 27, 1969. I would like to point out that this bill includes the 6-percent pay raise for postal employees, as negotiated recently by Postmaster General Blount and the postal employee union leaders.

Despite my vehement disapproval of the recent wildcat postal strike, I do favor speedy passage of the postal pay raise which has been pending since last July. In my position as a Member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have been made fully aware of the needed improvements in working and wage conditions for postal workers.

It has pleased me greatly that the postal employees of my district remained available and on duty throughout the recent strike, although given the same provocation, being subjected to the same working and wage conditions.

There are several reasons why I feel it is incumbent upon Congress to authorize this pay raise at this time. Foremost among them is the Government's commitment under law to a policy of pay comparability, providing Government employees salaries which correspond with those in business and industry. Because of the timelag in ascertaining comparability figures and obtaining congressional approval of pay legislation to close the gap, even now the bill before us will only bring the salaries of Government workers comparable to those of private industry as of last July 1.

I have heard the argument that this will fan inflation. Well, I, too, am concerned over inflation. I agree that Gov-

ernment spending is one of the chief causes of inflation and believe that it should be reduced. At the same time, I consider the Government's obligations to its employees of prime importance and among those that must be met.

The last year's 10-percent increase in the cost of living has had its effect on the family budgets of Government employees the same as those of everyone else. Government employees shop in the same grocery stores as their neighbors who work in private industry, pay the same rental and taxes as their neighbors. In fact, I am very much aware that the families of over 200,000 Government workers residing in my district have felt deeply the sharp rises in the costs of shelter, food, clothing, and taxes in the Washington metropolitan area, which are among the highest in the country. In view of this rise in the cost of living, Government employees will not realize a gain from this pay raise, but merely recoup their losses of the past several months and be able to better cope with present price levels.

I think you believe, as President Nixon does and as I do, that the Federal Government has an obligation to insure each of its employees fair treatment in return for his or her dedication. It would seem to me to be grossly unfair to again call upon Federal employees to bear the brunt of inflation without relief while no one else does.

On behalf of 5.6 million Federal workers, I urge your support and vote for this legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot sincerely say that this is a good bill. I believe it more resembles a spare tire that we badly need to put on, and, therefore, I am supporting the bill.

However, there is a strong necessity that we strike sections 8, 9, and 10 from this bill, because, as I am informed by the ranking minority member of the Senate committee that he, in conference with the chairman of the Senate committee, have made it abundantly clear that they will not accept these three sections which are not related directly to title of the bill.

These three sections happen to be good legislation, which have passed the House in the past, and I believe they will again in the future. However, for the very reasons which the gentleman from Arizona mentioned we are going to have to clean up that particular part of the bill if we are going to avoid going into conference, which conference, I understand, could not happen prior to next week.

So, Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I will make a motion to recommit, and strike these three sections if—and I so address my remarks to our distinguished chairman—he finds that this amendment is acceptable.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman repeat his statement?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a motion to recommit and instruct the committee to strike out sections 8, 9, and 10 of the bill, which I understand the Senate committee is not agreeable to. And so my question was, Would the chairman of the committee agree with me on this matter?

Mr. DULSKI. I do not believe that I am in a position right at the present time. I said I would support H.R. 16844 as reported by the committee. I would not commit myself at the present time to support a motion to recommit.

Mr. CORBETT. I would appreciate it if the gentleman will check with the Members over there if he can readily, and let me know, because I am in the position that if the amendment is not agreed to then I am going to have to vote against the bill to keep my record clear on being opposed to the bill. I am opposed to this bill at it stands because of those three sections which will delay final action on the bill indefinitely.

Mr. DULSKI. The gentleman may be correct, but I suggest to the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee that at the present time we are trying to make arrangements to have the bill accepted as it is. As a result, my position must depend on the outcome of these arrangements.

Mr. CORBETT. I wish I could know pretty quickly, because I understand from the ranking minority member of the Senate committee, in conference with his chairman, that they have decided that they would not accept these sections of the bill, and I talked with the gentleman within the hour.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DULSKI. As the gentleman knows, I have always supported legislation giving equitable pay to all Federal employees. Nevertheless, if these three sections of the bill will delay any further action, so far as pay increases for postal and Federal employees are concerned, I would support his motion.

Mr. CORBETT. I know the gentleman is very concerned about this matter, but I can assure the gentleman that delay is the answer.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I hope the gentleman will not offer his motion to recommit, because in my general frame of mind I am inclined to oppose it. I resent being pushed around by the other body. They have added a couple of things here, including \$16,000 additional money for the staffs of ex-Presidents; they have added some things for the District judges, which I support, which we have gone along with.

Now here are three little fringe benefits that the bill affects—the border patrol and the customs people. It affects them. A number of Federal employees who work 60 or 80 or 100 miles out in the boondocks.

Mr. CORBETT. Will the gentleman address himself to the bill?

Mr. UDALL. It affects the dredge operators of the Corps of Engineers. The Nixon administration approved and the Johnson administration approved of the provisions and they have been drawn carefully to meet the objections of the administration.

Two of them passed the House in the last Congress and passed the House in this Congress. I cannot see some Federal employees being left out of this thing and being treated in this high-handed fashion

by some Members of the other body who probably do not even know what is involved in this section.

The total cost of these three items is \$100,000.

If that is the way they want to play, I say let us call their bluff, but I am not going to put up with them for myself.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman has the time, but of course I would be glad to yield to him.

Mr. CORBETT. I was just trying to get a word in edgeways.

I would like to ask the gentleman further if it is not true that these three sections are unrelated and that we will not have any difficulty getting them through the House.

The Senator informed me they never had a hearing and never had the bills in their committee and that they were not necessarily opposed to them. They were uninformed about them.

I would like to ask the gentleman another question. If we just move to knock out two of these sections and let in one so that we could tell the other body—well, you cannot push us around but rather it is your turn to get together—would that satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. UDALL. I would rather not negotiate with the gentleman publicly.

My position is: the three ought to have been in there and, as I said, they were approved by the administration and do not cost anything. But we do have a little time before the motion to recommit is being offered and maybe we can discuss it.

Mr. CORBETT. I do not mind discussing things in public. I am sorry the gentleman does.

However, Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset this is not necessarily a good bill. It could be amended—and tax cut, and so on. But for the time being, it is the only spare tire that we have available so I am going to urge the Committee to adopt the bill and I could announce to the Chair that we have no further requests for time except I want to yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16844 and wish to commend the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for their promptness in reporting this measure to the floor for consideration.

Mr. Chairman, on every previous occasion when the Congress considered the subject of a pay increase for postal and Federal employees the question of the inflationary effects and the cost to the Government was always raised. These of course, are proper questions, but I submit, Mr. Chairman, their pay raise as well as all previous pay increases are necessary as a result of inflation rather than a cause of inflation. Insofar as the cost is concerned, I say that we cannot afford not to meet this responsibility of paying our own employees a salary comparable to what their counterparts are paid in private industry. If we are going to continue to attract the most capable people into Federal service and encourage them to remain in Federal service

after they are better trained, then we must be competitive in pay and working conditions with other employers. In other words we are going to get exactly what we pay for. In the long run, therefore, this pay raise will not result in greater expense in the operation of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, one of the very attractive features of this bill is the retroactive feature which makes the 6-percent pay raise effective December 27, 1969. One of the problems of trying to obtain comparability in the past is the timelag between a pay raise in private industry and the time that it takes to obtain congressional approval of a similar increase. This timelag in the past has amounted to excess of 1 year. This bill will close this gap to approximately 6 months.

This bill does not go as far as some of us would desire but it is a good compromise and I hope that my colleagues will approve it overwhelmingly.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a few questions of those who are sponsoring this legislation because I am greatly concerned about the way we are being asked to legislate here today.

First, I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona if he knows how much this bill will cost?

Mr. UDALL. It will cost in this fiscal year, between January 1 and July 1 of this year, \$1,300,000,000.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. That is \$1,300,000,000?

Mr. UDALL. That includes the military which will automatically get a 6-percent raise—the men in uniform also. The first full year's cost—the first full fiscal year cost will be \$2,600,000,000.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. That is \$2,600,000,000?

Mr. UDALL. Yes; \$2,600,000,000.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. How is it going to be paid for?

Mr. UDALL. In dollars, I would think.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. The President has suggested that there be an increase in first-class postage to 10 cents and it has been suggested that there be an increase in second- and third-class postage, in order to cover the cost, and pay as you go, as has been said—is that the gentleman's understanding of the way this increase will be paid for?

Mr. UDALL. Let us get very clear on that point. Of that \$1 billion increase, only about \$400 million—\$380 million, roughly, is due to increased postal salaries. We cannot saddle a lady who buys a stamp with the cost of a pay increase for a Congressman's aide, an employee of the Department of Agriculture, or someone at the Defense Department or a member of the armed services. I am willing to be responsible for and to vote an increase in postage on all classes of mail sufficient to pay for any raises provided for the postal people that I support. I am not willing to saddle the Postal Establishment for the cost of running the Department of the Interior.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Did any commitment come out of the negotiations that were referred to earlier concerning

support from the unions or any other interested parties in favor of increasing postage to pay for the cost of this raise?

Mr. UDALL. I am not a party to these negotiations. They have not been concluded. I do not know whether the unions will come out in favor of postal rate increases. Traditionally they have not. Traditionally they have taken the view that these are separate matters. They want their pay, and they expect the Congress to say what is right and fair.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. The thing that bothers me is that we are being separated to death, it looks like, in our approach to this whole problem. The cart has been placed before the horse, if you will. After an illegal strike we have brought before us a bill which contains no commitment as to where the money is coming from, no commitment as to postal reform, or no solution of any of the other related problems. It disturbs me that we are put in this position in this way.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Certainly, I yield to the chairman.

Mr. DULSKI. The gentleman in the well has asked why we are not asking for an increase in rates or postal reform. As the gentleman knows, we have a subcommittee that deals with compensation and another dealing with rates. Postal pay matters are separate and apart from ratemaking. I might add that in the matter of rates, the administration has proposed an increase of about 70 percent in postage for first-class mail and a very minor increase in second- and third-class mail. It would seem that the administration intends to charge the complete cost of this bill to postal patrons, even though the largest cost involved is the increase in wages to other than postal employees. Such a course is unacceptable to me and I assure you that we will deal with their proposed injustice when it comes before my committee.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. All I am saying is that we are being badgered into something here today that is tied into too many other things, just to have this one issue before this body. This is what disturbs me.

As far as second- and third-class rates are concerned, or as far as what the President has proposed for first-class rates, surely I am concerned about this. The question is, What is the committee going to come out with in the final analysis? Is the committee going to come out with second- and third-class rates that in fact will pay their share? All of this shows why we need to go on with this business of postal reform, to consider the Post Office employees, the sad state they are in today, because this body and the other body have not done a proper job.

We are not equipped to do a job of this type. The rates are in the situation they are in today because this body is unable in an election year to face up to the problem and make changes in them. The sooner we can get the Post Office on a proper basis, with proper postal reform, the sooner the Post Office will be run

better, and the people of this country will get their mail better, and the employees of the Post Office will feel a lot better about their job in serving the public.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Surely, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am also on the Rate Subcommittee. I think we ought to talk about that a little bit. About 80 percent of surface mail, letter mail, is sent by business houses and is charged off as business expenses on income tax, and so forth. There is the elderly man or the elderly woman who does write a letter and we do not want to penalize him or her. But I want to remind the chairman of this committee that in 1967 when we had our rate hearings, the one category of mail which is second class, newspapers and magazines, only paid approximately 25 percent to 26 percent of its way. I had a motion adopted in the subcommittee to increase those rates and also to charge a 25-percent surcharge for the priority handling that they receive.

That passed the subcommittee. When it got to the full committee, the newspapers and the magazines and their lobbyists got busy, and the full committee knocked it out. That is where a good share of where the revenue should come from, the second-class rates for the newspapers and magazines.

Administration after administration in the past since I have been here, for 14 years, has always held those rates down. In 1967, there was an agreement between the newspaper and the magazine publishers with the Postmaster General and the administration that they would support the postal rate increase bill if they had their rates left at a very low level. But by raising those rates we can pick up a great deal of money by making them pay their way.

As far as the third-class mail is concerned, it pays approximately 100 percent of its way when we consider the fact that they have been continually increased and also that under the previous administration they have been forced to ZIP code all their mail and after sacking and tagging they have to deliver their own mail to their post office. When we take that into consideration, along with the increase in rates which they have had saddled upon them in the last several years, they are paying approximately 100 percent of their way.

So if we want to talk about rates, we can talk about the newspapers and the magazines. It was stated in 1967, when we had our postal rate bill up, that the Wall Street Journal alone is subsidized by the Federal Government to the tune of \$10 million a year. That is something which should be dealt with and dealt with promptly.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Of course, the gentleman is helping to make my point, which very simply is this. This whole operation is so tied up with political considerations, that the sooner we get it out of that area and get it into a proper postal authority or corporation, the better off this country will be.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman well knows I am very much in favor of postal reform.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. The gentleman has been one of the leaders in this movement, and I commend him.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have been very much in favor of reform of the Post Office Department, which our committee finally did pass, a few days before the strike came along. As a matter of fact, we knew about this strike or the rumblings of it a year ago, and if we had acted promptly on a true reform and pay bill a year ago, we would not have had this strike and the work stoppages all over the country. But we did not, and there were reasons why that was not done, but I will not dwell on that now.

But I say there is a great deal of money which can be picked up in the second-class newspaper and magazine rates. The time is long past due when this should have been taken up.

I want to say another thing, too, while I am on my feet, if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, some consideration ought to be given to this idea. If the gentleman posts a letter in New York and it travels to California, that is at the rate of 7 cents paid today. If we post a letter in the District of Columbia to Maryland, we pay the same rate of 7 cents. The gentleman knows and I know and this House knows it takes a great deal more expense out of the Post Office Department's budget to send a letter from New York to California than it does to send one from the District of Columbia to Maryland. That is something that ought to be looked into.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. The gentleman is correct and, of course, it points up again the inflexibility of the Congress to act on a situation like this. Perhaps a postal rate commission can resolve those problems. I hope so. But certainly this Congress is not flexible enough to resolve those types of situations, considering the political arena in which we operate.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If we can get this postal reform established and get rid of all these pressure groups and these lobby groups who keep pestering those of us on the committee, we will get this type of thing the gentleman talks about and bring in the money to help pay for these salary increases.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the very able gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. I want to take a moment to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama for his contribution. I believe he has performed a great service to his constituency and the constituency of every Member of this body. This whole problem is illustrative of the need for postal reform. It is a desperate situation.

The gentleman from Nebraska mentioned that it costs far more to send a

letter from here to California than from here to Maryland, but that the price is the same. I would add, the way the postal service operates today, it takes just as long to get a letter from here to Maryland as it does to get a letter from here to California, because of the inefficiencies and inequities built into this archaic system run by the Congress of the United States. The Congress is not competent to run the Post Office.

It is well past time we put it on an efficient basis, so that it can serve the people of this Nation at a reasonable cost.

I appreciate the gentleman's raising the point of the need for reform. I support him in his statement. I, for one, do not believe I can support raising postal rates until I see a real prospect for better service through postal reform.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I should like to say, to their everlasting credit, the good postal workers in my district saw fit to stay on the job. They were not involved in any illegal strike against their country and I commend them for the restraint.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD).

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this bill and I will vote for its passage. As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I believe I am as familiar as most Members—but apparently not as familiar as all Members in this Chamber—with what has been going on.

There is a difference, it seems, as to who is given information about what has been happening and what will happen.

A conference committee has been bogged down since last fall with pay legislation passed by the House in October, which would have increased pay for postal workers beginning last October 1. Our conferees tell me this delay is due to the unwillingness of the Members of the other body to proceed to conference so that we can send the bill to the President of the United States.

I am told by conferees on both the Democratic and Republican sides of the aisle on my committee that when they finally went to conference, there was no conference at all, because the Members of the other body are privy to negotiations which are taking place behind closed doors.

I submit that it is not very practical to try to reach agreement by having a public meeting where everybody is making speeches. Negotiations should be held in an atmosphere where they are likely to produce results.

As a member of the committee, I do feel some resentment, for myself and also the other members of the committee, on learning from newspaper and other sources that Members of the other body, serving on our counterpart committee, have apparently been privy to information coming from the administration, from the unions, and from others, while we have been kept almost entirely in the dark.

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is stating a fact. I believe what the gentleman is saying, in other words, is that if there is going to be communication on the situation at this time let the communication extend to the conferees on the part of the House as well as of the other body. We have been locked out.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Thank you. I am really trying to say that I am serving notice now to all of my friends who have an interest in the matters concerning the Post Office Department that I am perfectly willing to listen to any recommendation reached independently or in concert by representatives of labor or the administration or anyone else who has an interest in it. I want to make it clear, however, that this is the last time I will accept—lock, stock, and barrel—what somebody else has written in the form of legislation, no matter how badly we may need it. I agree that we need the postal pay increase very badly. We should have proceeded with the pay legislation that we passed last fall. What we are doing today should have been done months ago. There is no way to solve that problem now, but we should not overlook the fact that we are walking into a little bit of a trap. I took a look at the President's message, and I suggest that every Member read it very carefully, because he has given us a script as to how we, as the legislative branch, will be expected to act so that we accomplish what he sets forth in his message as his understanding with the several forces with whom he has been negotiating. Particularly, you should note that in his message, the President makes it very clear that he is talking about a pay-as-you-go postal pay increase. This is very unusual, because when you examine the message you discover that the President is not asking us to pay as you go with respect only to the postal employees. A quick calculation by a member of our staff indicates that we would not have to raise first-class mail by more than 1 cent if we raised other classes proportionately. In order to pay for the 6 percent in this bill and the additional 8 percent that the President indicates will be given to the employees during the first session of collective bargaining after the adoption of his postal reform plan or postal corporation.

If we look at the message, we see he states very distinctly that the postal salary increase contributes about \$600 million to the current deficit. Yet the rate increases proposed by him would raise \$2.3 billion, which means he is asking us to increase first-class rates under the guise of meeting the demands of postal workers, but which actually would finance a raise for all military and civilian employees of the Federal Government. This is a sham and a fraud. We should certainly have our eyes open here. We would be placed in a position, after we pass this legislation, of having an 8-percent increase sent to us in a fancy package tied up with postal reform and a lot of other things. Postal reform means whatever you want it to mean, because nobody is against it but we all have our own ideas as to what it means. You

will be placed in a position of either voting for or against an 8-percent increase for the postal workers. This is the first step, if you will read the script, in a series of steps apparently planned by the President and the administration to not only write legislation but to orchestrate the entire performance and tell us exactly when and how we will adopt it and in what order. You should recognize that the President's proposed rate increase would raise 19 times as much money from first-class postage users as from both second- and third-class users—the two principal business users of mail. I do not think the American public is ready for another rate jump after the one we gave them in 1967.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against the previous question on the rule, because I think the unprecedented situation of bringing this or any other bill from our committee to this floor under a closed rule is a dangerous one. I would have offered an amendment here, but I cannot, under the closed rule.

I had hoped to once again submit the amendment which I offered to the 1967 Federal Salary Act to deal more realistically with postal employees in areas of relatively high wages and exceptionally high living costs.

During the floor debate on the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967, an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) in the form of a substitute to my own amendment on the same subject and was adopted. My amendment, at that time, would have made it mandatory that area wage rates be adopted. The Udall amendment to the 1967 bill said that the Postmaster General "may" adjust these rates. The Udall substitute amendment to the 1967 bill was adopted by the House, but was dropped in conference at the insistence of the other body.

My amendment said:

(c) Section 5303(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (2) there "except positions in the postal field service which are unique to the service."

(d) That part of the text of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, under the heading "SALARY STEPS AND PROMOTIONS" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 3561. Higher Minimum rates; Presidential authority

"(a) When the President finds that the pay rates in private enterprise for one or more occupations in one or more areas or locations are so substantially above the rates of basic compensation of those positions of the postal field service which are unique to that service as to handicap significantly the Government's recruitment or retention of well-qualified employees for such positions, he shall establish for such positions in the areas or locations higher minimum rates of basic compensation for one or more levels and shall make corresponding increases in other step rates of the pay range for each such level.

"(b) Within the limitations of subsection (a) of this section, rates of basic compensation established under that subsection may be revised from time to time by the President.

"(c) An increase in rate of basic compensation established under that subsection is not an equivalent increase in compensation

within the meaning of section 3552 of this title.

"(d) The rate of basic compensation established under this section and received by an individual immediately before a statutory increase, which becomes effective prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of the statute, in the compensation of employees in the postal field service, shall be initially adjusted, effective on the effective date of the statutory increase, under conversion rules prescribed by the President.

"(e) All actions, revisions and adjustments under this section have the force and effect of statute.

"(f) The President may authorize the Postmaster General to exercise the authority conferred on the President by this section."

(e) The table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting—

"3561. Higher minimum rates; Presidential authority."

immediately below—

"3560. Salary Protection."

This amendment would have placed upon the Postmaster General, through the President, the requirement to set higher minimum rates of pay for postal employees in those areas where private industry wages exceed postal wages so as to significantly handicap the Post Office Department in recruiting and retaining qualified personnel.

Since I cannot offer my amendment under a closed rule, I plan to introduce a bill Monday to achieve the same result.

Under current law, title 5, section 5303, United States Code, the President has the general authority to establish higher minimum rates of pay for Federal employees in the four statutory pay systems. These systems include the general schedule, the postal field service, Foreign Service, and the Veterans' Administration. The authority to so establish these special rates is delegated by the President to the Civil Service Commission.

Each agency under these pay systems may petition the Civil Service Commission to authorize special minimum rates. However, it has become obvious that the Postmaster General is reluctant to make such a request, and as a result this statute has not been applied to postal employees.

The purpose of the bill, which I am going to introduce, will be to relieve the Postmaster General of the burden of petitioning the Civil Service Commission and to place with him the responsibility to establish special rates of pay in those areas where they are justified.

Recent events tell us that a measure of this nature is necessary to solve at least one of the major problems that confront the operation of our postal system.

This problem is our failure to recognize the fact that the labor market is different in our big industrial States and big cities than in other parts of the country. Thus, the ability of the Post Office Department, from a management point of view, to compete with industry for qualified labor is hampered by its inability to make differentials in pay.

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H.R. 16844 which was approved by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee this morning.

Basically, this bill provides a 6-percent pay raise for all Federal employees retroactive to December 27.

This pay raise is most certainly justified. The recent postal strike emphatically demonstrated to us the inadequate wages which many postal employees are forced to accept. We must also realize, however, that a substantial majority of all Federal employees are working at salaries below those enjoyed by their counterparts in private industry.

In 1962, Congress enacted the principle that all Federal salaries should be comparable to those paid in private industry. The general feeling was—and still is—that we cannot expect to have efficient, effective Government without paying fair salaries to attract competent employees. It is false economy to keep Federal salaries artificially low in order to save money. We lose far more in efficiency than we gain.

We have made great strides toward this goal of comparability, but unfortunately Federal salaries in most areas still lag far behind private industry rates.

Postal employees—particularly letter carriers and clerks—have been hard hit by this lag in comparability. And therein lies the fundamental cause of the postal strike.

This 6-percent raise is part of a package negotiated between the Post Office Department and major postal unions. It must be emphasized, however, that this raise will bring Federal salaries only to July 1969 private industry levels. Further action in the near future may be necessary to fulfill our oft-stated commitment to all Federal employees.

Mr. Chairman, we will be called upon soon to take action on the other segments of the negotiated agreement. This agreement includes an additional 8-percent increase for postal employees upon the enactment of a postal reform bill. It also calls for a reduction in the time it takes to reach the top step of a postal field service level. The present period is 21 years; this would be reduced to 8. I was particularly hopeful that this latter provision could be incorporated in the bill pending before us today. I supported such an amendment in committee this morning. Unfortunately, the amendment was defeated, not because the committee opposed the provision, but because of the fear that its inclusion at this point might have upset the negotiations now being held between the Department and the unions.

I am confident that when the second phase of this package is presented in the next few days it will include both the additional 8-percent raise and the compression features of the agreement, and I strongly urge my colleagues to accept these proposals also.

The measure pending today is a vital first step toward solving the problems raised by the postal strike, and I am confident that it will be overwhelmingly endorsed.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have supported pay increase legislation, I believe, at all times since becoming a Member of this body. I have recognized the principle of comparability in pay between the private and governmental sections of the economy. I voted in favor of the pay legislation which passed the House on October 14, 1969.

But I shall vote against the bill now before the Committee. It is the fruit of an illegal strike against the Government. It is the result of negotiations between the executive branch and the postal employee organizations, in which, so far as I know, neither this House nor the other body had any voice.

This legislation is here as the result of an illegal strike and under the threat of another. In 1966 Congress made participation in a strike against the Government a felony. It declared that an individual who participates in such a strike shall be ineligible to hold Federal employment. Passage of the present bill under the circumstances in which it is presented makes the antistrike law a nullity. Employee groups now know that they can strike and get away with it. The antistrike law might as well be repealed.

The end result of all this is to transfer the labor cost of Government into the so-called uncontrollable part of the Federal budget. Congress has lost another round in the struggle to maintain itself as a coequal branch of Government. In the future, the labor cost of Government will be decided by negotiation between the executive and employee organizations. The congressional role is being reduced to that of pro forma ratification.

I have no quarrel with the need for a genuine reform in the pay schedules of the Postal Department. But this action of the House here today is not legislating.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. OLSEN).

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and very strongly recommend that we pass this 6-percent across-the-board increase for the benefit of all our Federal employees as well as our postal employees.

Mr. Chairman, it is my feeling that we must recognize that this is purely a cost-of-living increase on which we are voting. Of course, there are other problems that beset the Post Office Department that we will take up in other legislation and, perhaps, it will be separated. One cannot predict how anything will come out of the committee. But I should like to see us vote on postal rates separate from postal reform. However, we do not have any idea, of course, as to how it will come out of the committee.

I think everyone should know that if as a result of this increase we have to raise postal rates, we are going to have to pay for the increase in this bill that goes to postal workers. The increase for other employees will have to be paid out

of other tax revenues. That is my opinion. Then, I think postal reform should be a separate matter. As a matter of fact, I very strongly oppose some of the postal reforms that have been talked about. However, I think our committee will work the will of the committee and bring it to the floor for the working of the will of the House of Representatives on all the other issues. In my opinion it would be wrong to delay this 6-percent cost-of-living increase awaiting postal reform.

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

Mr. OLSEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that later on we will be called upon to raise postal rates in order to pay for the increases contained in this bill insofar as the postal employees are concerned?

Mr. OLSEN. I think you can expect a postal rate bill to come out of the committee to pay for the cost of the postal workers' increase.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, what the gentleman is saying is that those of us who support this bill now are obligating ourselves to vote for postal rate increases in the future?

Mr. OLSEN. No; I am not saying that. I am not saying that you are obligated to do so. You will have to speak for yourself. I am not going to obligate you as to whether you should support the Post Office Department's reforms. Undoubtedly some Members will want to continue to support the Post Office Department out of general taxation and not vote for a postal increase. However, that will be the subject of a later discussion.

Mr. KAZEN. What I want to get clear from the gentleman is whether we are bound now if we support this bill to vote for increased postal rates to pay for the increases provided for under this bill?

Mr. OLSEN. I do not think anyone is bound to vote for postal rate increases in order to pay for the cost of this bill. We can finance the Post Office Department out of many kinds of revenue.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRASCO).

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, and I rise in support of the legislation before this body.

Like other speakers before me, I am not sure that this is a model piece of legislation, but I am sure of one thing—that the money in it is needed by the postal employees.

During the course of this debate I heard a number of Members take the well and talk about the illegal strike. I do not condone the action that was taken, but being a Member from New York, and obviously that strike emanated from New York, I would like to take a moment of your time to talk about the human element involved in that action.

You know, both administrations, during the time that I have served in this Congress, have indicated to me that they have been insensitive to the needs of the Post Office Department and its employees. As a result of that, while many

of us advance the slogan "I fight poverty—I work," we have in New York more than 4,000 postal employees who have full-time jobs and who are receiving supplemental welfare assistance. We have literally got the postal employees in economic chains, so let us take a look at what happened here before we talk about the strike and who called it.

In October of last year this body passed legislation that would give the postal employee a fair and adequate raise. With threats of veto from this administration, and over the fact that the Senate refused to act, we waited from October until now. The only way this legislation was brought to the floor of the House was because of that illegal strike. This is unfortunate, but did we really give the employees any choice?

I do not believe that this body or the administration has a right under those circumstances to point an accusing finger at people who have no food on their table.

You know, New York has a particular kind of a problem, because in that town, with \$10,000 a year, you are broke. So when you take men with families and start them at \$6,000 a year, and then after they have been there 21 years you give them \$8,000, no one in good conscience can come into the well of the House and accuse them of illegal actions. In doing so, that proves an additional insensitivity on the part of the Congress.

Something that is very, very classic of what has been going on is the statement made by my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CORBETT), about the fact that he had received a call from the Senate saying "take out of the bill sections 8, 9 and 10," which costs \$100,000 a year, and for people who need that increase, "otherwise come Hell or high water we will not go to conference on this bill, and the people who need the money can just continue not to have it." That is the kind of game that they have been playing on the other side. Like my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), I am tired of being pushed around. It reflects no credit on this body to engage in childish games to get this legislation passed. I am going to go along with the chairman of the subcommittee on pay and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, let me say in conclusion before we accuse those people who initiated the strike—and again I say I do not condone the illegal strike—let us look at the human element and stop singing that song: "Your Lips Tell Me No, No, But There's Yes, Yes in Your Eyes," in reverse to those people. Let us call it square for once and give them what they deserve, because they are entitled to it.

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

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

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to correct an impression in the statement the gentleman made. The call I referred to did not say that they would not go to conference; the call said that they would have to go to conference if we included these things which they did not like. I want to get that definitely clear. I went on to say that the conference could not happen until next week.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I apologize if I was mistaken, but I would appreciate it if, the next time that the other body calls you can get the number for me so I can call them and tell them about some of my gripes.

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

Mr. BRASCO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DULSKI. I for one can readily appreciate the statement of the gentleman from New York. Not to be asked to participate in the recent conferences on postal pay and reform is an affront to me, as chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. So I can understand the gentleman's frustration.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL).

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, the residents of my district were outraged recently when the subway fare was raised by 50 percent. The average citizen, already strapped by inflation's burdens, was asked to pay for the mismanagement of governmental leaders, most of whom rarely see the inside of a subway station.

Now John Doe is being asked to bail out the politicians again—the Nixon administration to be precise.

The President proposes that the cost of first-class mail—mainly utilized by individual citizens—be raised by 66 percent to cover a deserved 6-percent increase in salary for all Federal employees and an extra 8 per cent for postal workers.

Raising the price of first-class mail, which already more than pays its way, is tantamount to imposing a sales tax on the general public. This is all the more onerous when business enterprises and mail order houses, under the Nixon proposal, would receive preferential treatment. Second-class mail costs would rise by only 16 percent and junk mail—third class—by only 5 percent, even though they are currently operating at a deficit and are subsidized by the taxpayer.

The President originally sought to delay Federal employees pay raises on the grounds of inflationary pressures, although he refused to issue wage and price guidelines for private industry. Now that the postal strike has backed the President into a corner, his administration has evidently decided the public interest once again must be sacrificed.

Unfair pay scales would not be redressed from the General Treasury as they should be. Instead of diverting some of the appropriations pouring endlessly

into Vietnam, the President is further taxing the public so his administration can boast of a budget surplus and strong anti-inflationary policies at the end of the coming fiscal year.

Another element of the Nixon administration's proposal reflects its callousness. One of the inequities leading to the postal strike was the political extortion employed by the administration, which tied pay raises to postal reform. An examination of the White House's new proposal shows the same technique has been retained, since the 8-percent increase planned solely for postal workers is still linked to postal reform.

Congress must assert its leadership in the wake of the administration's failure to recognize national priorities and spread the burdens of our burgeoning economy equitably.

I will support the general pay raise for all Federal workers, for they deserve this increase.

I will support the extra pay increase for all postal employees, for they have been promised more and given less than any other group of Federal workers.

But I will oppose any attempt to finance these increases with a regressive postal rate increase.

And I shall continue to oppose this administration's basic error of tying a legitimate need of postal workers for more pay to Post Office reform. Whatever the merits of that plan—and I shall consider them carefully—they must be judged separately and on their own merits.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to announce a correction in an earlier statement that I made, namely, that I would move to recommit and strike sections 8, 9, and 10.

Now then my motion to recommit will be restricted to cutting out section 9 and section 10.

As to section 8, the chairman of the Civil Service Commission is very much for that and I hope the other body might accept that without the cumbersome business of going to conference.

Also, I would like to emphasize that I favor these sections, but they should be separate and handled separately. I hope the committee will soon do so.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER).

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this legislation today will provide a 6-percent across-the-board increase in the salaries of postal and other Federal employees. The 6 percent will also apply to military personnel under the provision of section 6A of the act of December 16, 1967.

The Federal pay increase legislation is long overdue. In a public statement of October 19, 1969, I pointed out that postal employees were lagging behind comparable positions in the private enterprise fields at the same levels. I trust that my colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will forgive me for the way in which I have pursued them, both Democrats and Republicans, to get this legislation to the floor. It was my belief that this was one of the most necessary things to help in keeping

morale alive for the postal and other Federal employees. I had very strong feelings about it, and I know that my friends on the committee understood this.

Postal and other Federal employees are denied the right to strike. The only protection they have in securing salary raises to keep them level with employees in the private field is their recourse to the Congress of the United States. In spite of the fact that we only got to the legislation today, I do want to commend the postal and other Federal employees for the patience they have shown in staying on the job and delivering the mail under discouraging circumstances which seemed to ignore their vital interests.

In my own district, I do not have a record of notice of a single employee who did stay away from his job or had a "sick-out." The employees in my district were loyal in every respect. They are to be commended for their actions under these difficult circumstances.

Fortunately, the 6-percent pay increase is made retroactive to the first day of the first pay period which began on December 27, 1969. This was done in order to reduce the timelag between the ascertainment of the Bureau of Labor Statistics survey of actual wages being paid in the private sector of the economy and the effective date of Federal salary adjustments. The President of the United States, the Postmaster General, and the Bureau of the Budget all spoke directly in favor of enactment of this legislation. I know that there are many others of my colleagues who felt that enactment of this legislation should have taken place months ago, and with them I have joined. They are to be commended for the diligence with which they acted in using their influence to get this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, even though this legislation is long overdue, I am glad at least that it is here today on the floor for action, and that these employees who so badly need this raise will be able to get it along with some back pay which will at least alleviate some of the injustices to which postal and Federal employees have been subject to in the last few months.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN).

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me time. I simply want to add to what we have been told so effectively by my friend, the able gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD). This bill does nothing in fact to correct the basic injustices of the wage scale that the postal employees live with. It is at best a cost of living adjustment, already long overdue.

Is it not high time that we faced the necessity of paying postal employees a decent living wage? I will vote for this bill, but it is hardly the kind of legislation that entitles us to congratulate ourselves for having dealt fairly with the grievances of the postal employees. It may provide a respite so we have time to

deal fairly with those grievances. I hope it does. But I hope we then use it to deal with those grievances at least. Let me emphasize that we will not have solved the postal crisis, even the short-range one, when we pass this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this point in commenting on the statement of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD), a member of the committee. I was on the committee when the amendment was offered by the gentleman, and I opposed it. I hope if it ever comes before this body it will be rejected for the simple reason that I am sick and tired of having northern Congressmen suggesting that postal workers in the South, in Atlanta, Ga., or Willacoochee, Ga., for example, receive less than what is paid to postal workers in New York City or in Detroit.

Postal workers in the South do deserve this raise. They are entitled to it and I intend to vote for it.

Mr. Chairman, I will not support any wage differential that is going to treat people in the South differently than people in the North. We are getting a little bit tired of being kicked around by northerners who think that they should be paid more than southerners. It costs just as much, and in fact more, to buy an automobile in Atlanta, Ga., than it would in New York City or Detroit, Mich. Postal workers in the South are doing the same work and they are entitled to the same pay.

A television set costs the same amount of money in the South as the North and I say our postal workers in the South are entitled to everything the postal workers in the North are entitled to. I for one am going to see that they are not denied it by any amendment designed to raise only the wages in the North.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I certainly am opposed to discriminating against anyone anywhere in the country on grounds of race, sex, region, or anything else that is not connected to individual worth.

The problem is that it costs a great deal more to live in the metropolitan areas of the country, whether in the North or in the South, than it costs to live in rural areas or in small towns. So it is not a question of the region of the country, but rather a question of differences in the cost of living.

I would also like to say something about all these denunciations of the postal employees for resorting to what some people have called "blackmail." What is it if it is not "blackmail" when the Administration refuses to approve salary adjustments whose merit they do not even try to dispute, unless it gets its way on other legislative matters? Who has been holding who hostage for what and for how long? It seems to me it would be accurate to say that it is the postal employees who have been held hostage—the faithful men and women whose legitimate requests have been treated with something between disre-

gard and contempt for as long as most of us here can remember. In short, should people's wages be kept below what everyone acknowledges to be fair as a lever to pry loose other legislation?

Let me stress that I want to be just as fair to postal employees in Atlanta, or anywhere else, as to postal employees in New York, but I wish my friends from Georgia and other States would be concerned also about fair wages for all workingmen in their States. If they are, perhaps they will even support legislation that would help textile workers and workers in other industries to be paid adequately.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I should like to explain the way my amendment would work. It would provide comparability in the very important sense of being comparable to what is the labor market in the area where one is hiring employees. I suggest that the way to be sure that the Atlanta postal worker is paid as much as in Detroit is to join me in other legislation which would eliminate some of the repressive labor legislation that you have in your State and to bring the wages of your textile workers and a few automobile workers that you have up to the level of the Detroit automobile workers. Then the postal workers would automatically have their wages brought into line with what the Detroit worker would get. It is not a system that would be used against the people in the South. It is not me who wants to hold back the wages in the South. I hope that you are not suggesting that rather than see progress for anyone, we should retain the status quo of repressed wages for everybody.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I will yield in a minute. I want to try again to make something explicitly clear. No one I know of is proposing discriminatory pay scales based on region. My friend from Georgia keeps implying that we are trying to discriminate against the South. That is simply not so. All we are saying is that salaries for Government employees must be comparable to wages paid to other kinds of employees all over the United States. That is the principle that governs the pay of wage board employees. After all, the cost of living has something to do with how much people must earn to live decently, and it has something to do as well with how management must go about hiring people.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia. Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Michigan said that apparently I did not understand his amendment. I understood full well. I understood that what he was proposing was a method of paying more money for doing the same job to an employee in New York City than to an employee in Macon, Georgia. I say that the employee in Macon, Georgia, is entitled to the same amount of money for doing the same job. You talk about comparability. I will talk about comparability of the work that people perform.

I do not intend to support any measure which will create any regional wage differential in this House for postal workers. If I do not understand the amendment as the gentleman from Michigan says, then the postal worker who would get less money for the same kind of labor in the South under his amendment certainly would understand it.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. If my hearing is not failing me, my friend from Georgia has abandoned Atlanta, which he represents, and adopted Macon, which he does not. I wonder if that could be because it has occurred to him that under a fair formula, postal employees in Atlanta would be paid pretty much the same on the same scale as postal employees in other metropolitan areas around the country. That fact, of course, would dispel any theory that anti-Southern bias is involved in the proposal of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Macon, Savannah, Columbus, Augusta, Atlanta—any of them.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I seem not to have converted the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, though I seem to keep expanding his constituency.

We have strayed from the main point I was trying to make: that a cost-of-living adjustment such as is included in this bill—whether done across the Nation or by area—does not meet the issue we should be facing. We are tinkering with an unfair wage scale. We should instead adopt a fair wage scale. If we want to tinker, we could then tinker with that. It would be much fairer and wiser to find a way to give Government employees fair pay without requiring congressional decisions every time adjustments are necessary. A procedure like that would be better for the employees, it would be better for the Congress, and heaven knows it would be better for the country.

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss).

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, this debate here today takes me back some 15 years to the 84th Congress and the first major floor fight in which I found myself. On that occasion the postal pay bill came to the floor by the discharge petition route. I believe it went through two vetoes, and finally on the third time around it was adopted. We needed postal reform then, and we need it now, but we need to reform the method whereby we deal with the employees of the Federal Government, be they in the Post Office or in the classified service of our Government. We have one of the most cumbersome and outmoded systems of salary-setting that exists anywhere on earth today.

We will continue for the next 15 years unless some of the suggestions discussed here today by gentlemen such as Mr. UDALL of Arizona and Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD of Michigan are given careful and serious consideration.

In my State, I believe we have a model system of setting salaries. It takes into consideration the differing levels of income in different parts of the State. It also arranges for annual adjustment of salaries so that there is not the long lag time. If we were to pass a bill today that brought to Federal employees complete comparability with their counterparts in private industry, they would still be out of pocket because of the long lag time which they inevitably encounter between pay raises.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the distinguished gentlemen of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to concentrate their energies upon seeking this kind of solution so that we may fashion the kind of machinery which deals fairly with our employees.

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

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, we had that machinery in the bill H.R. 13000, but we never got it out of conference.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the other body can dig in with its heels and be extremely difficult to deal with, but sometimes we are going to have to dig in with ours and be just as difficult to deal with, because the objective here is in every sense a legitimate one.

There is a public need and a crying need. This Nation should be a model employer. It should have the finest methods of dealing with its employees. It is a disgrace to find we are not in any sense a model employer, that we abuse and exact far more from our employees than they can tolerate. That is illustrated in the act of defiance, if we want to call it that, of the postal workers actually going on strike. It is illustrated today by the intolerable conditions under which the air controllers are required to work. We ought to be better housekeepers of our own establishment and deal more fairly with the people who work for the American public.

I urge the adoption of this bill as an interim measure and suggest we move on rapidly to give true equality in pay to Federal workers.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I support the pay raise for postal and civil service employees. It is clearly overdue. The cost of living has made the present pay structure obsolete, and it never has been truly comparable to that for similar work in private industry.

Emphatically, however, I want it clearly understood that my support for this measure is based solely upon equity and merit and that it should not under any circumstances be misconstrued by any person as a bribe or reward to postal workers because of the recent illegal strike conducted by a relatively small irresponsible fringe group from among their numbers.

It should be emphasized that both the House and the Senate have supported similar pay increase legislation which passed both bodies last year. Obviously, we were aware of the need for a more realistic pay scale. The present proposal is considerably short of the amounts re-

quested by the fringe group in the demands which accompanied its arrogant action last month.

It should be made clear at every opportunity that the great overwhelming majority of American postal and civil service employees are sensible and patriotic Americans, dedicated to the high calling they serve, and that the preponderant majority of them declined to participate in this irresponsible effort to blackmail the Government and the public for whom they work.

Beyond this, I think it is imperative that those who instigated and willfully participated in this illegal strike against the Government must be punished in some measure for their malfeasance. The law clearly defines this as an illegal action. It was clearly contrary to their sworn oaths. It bespoke a brazen, arrogant, and selfish disregard for their word of honor, for their country, and for the people of the country.

If this act is allowed to go wholly unpunished by the administrative branch of Government charged with carrying out the laws which already exist, then an extremely dangerous precedent will have been established. It will have been established that one may strike illegally against his own Government and avoid paying the penalty prescribed by law. Such a precedent, to me, would be unthinkable.

There can be absolutely no excuse whatever for any public employee to strike against the Government and the people he is sworn to serve.

During my 15 years in Congress, I have worked closely with the postal workers of my area in numerous efforts to improve their wages and working conditions. We have fought many battles together, and I count among the postal employees many very good personal friends. They are intelligent, levelheaded, dedicated people who feel, as I do, that Government service is not just a job but a public trust.

Every American depends upon the postal service, and every American is entitled to feel that his confidence is not misplaced.

In the wake of the shameful, lawless, and irresponsible strike by postal carriers in New York and several other places, I can only say that, while I am utterly appalled at the reckless acts of those few, my trust in the postal employees generally has not been misplaced.

Therefore, I gladly support this bill. In doing so, however, I call upon the administrative branch of Government to uphold and carry out the law which makes that strike punishable. Punishments listed in the existing law include fine, imprisonment, and dismissal from the service.

Obviously, it would be impractical to invoke jail sentences against all the postal workers who so cravenly betrayed their trust. But there is nothing whatever to prohibit a fine or a reduction in grade, or in the case of the leaders who fomented this act of anarchy, dismissal from the service.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, as a former postal worker and one who has long

championed the cause of comparability I am delighted that the Congress is at long last beginning to recognize its responsibilities to the thousands of postal workers who serve the Nation. We have long used great amounts of rhetoric about comparability and pay increases. But rhetoric will not pay bills and rhetoric will not encourage trained personnel to stay in postal services at low wages.

It is high time that we approve postal pay raises, and I am therefore glad to indicate my strong support for the bill which is before us today. It is another major step down the road to a more effective postal system.

However, we simply must not stop here. We must examine the very nature of the postal system and the reasons that it has been allowed to deteriorate into present disgraceful conditions. Among the most serious problems in the postal system has been the lack of proper personnel management. It is incredible that within the system there is no means of recognizing those employees who are particularly talented and dedicated. Promotions are difficult to achieve and frequently take place only at a financial sacrifice to the postal worker involved. It takes an incredible 21 years for a postal worker to achieve top pay scale. There is little or no opportunity for a postal worker to bargain for improved working conditions and regulations.

I firmly believe that the proposed postal reform legislation which would create a postal corporation, run on a businesslike basis—including businesslike negotiations between management and labor—would go a long way toward correcting this situation. Because of the provisions in the proposed bill which would allow for raising outside capital for improvement in equipment, buildings, and systems, this legislation would provide better working surroundings for our postal workers and would make their job easier. In order to deal with the increasing burden of mail, our postal workers need the assistance of modern, up-to-date methods and machines.

I therefore urge this House to take prompt action on the second phase of the postal negotiations—the postal reform legislation including an additional pay raise for workers to bring them closer to true comparability.

There is one major disappointment in this bill today. I believe that it is very important that this House give the bill a closed rule and did not give a chance for free and open debate to separate all matters from the pay increase. In doing so they failed to allow this House to work its will in separating out the postal pay increase and in examining that issue separately from the general Federal employees' pay increase.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to express my support of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970. I am especially glad to see the postal employees get a well-merited increase.

Hopefully, we will soon act on postal reform, which I believe is essential to the future well-being of the postal service and of its employees.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr.

Chairman, I rise in full support of this long overdue bill to raise the pay of postal and Government workers. This House passed back in October 1969, a postal pay bill which would have granted a substantial and equitable increase to all Federal employees as well as removing many of the inequities now plaguing these workers.

In the meantime, in the face of a threat of a Presidential veto, a threat reinforced by the extraordinary veto of the HEW-Labor Department appropriation bill, the salary bill was held up in the other body pending hearings and consideration of total postal reform. The administration's position was that unless postal reform embodied the administration's postal corporation concept, the President would refuse to sign into law a raise for postal and other classified workers.

In short, a raise for postal and classified workers was held hostage in return for which the Congress must pay ransom in the form of a postal corporation.

This is not the way to legislate. The result was a postal strike unprecedented in the American history; 160,000 postal workers, disgusted by political blackmail, lost faith in the ability of their Government to respond to reason and justice and, in words from another era in our labor history, "hit the bricks."

I have stated before that, as a legislator who took an oath to support the Constitution and laws of the United States, I could not support the strike regardless of my sympathy to the plight of these workers. But neither can I support this type of political blackmail by which the only losers are postal and government workers. It is not the way gentlemen make laws.

There is no question of the justice of the demands of these workers. All the parties have admitted that fact.

Postal workers in large cities often must work two jobs while their wives work another in order to make ends meet. I was told of one family, which I am advised is representative of thousands more, whose salary is only \$10 more than the minimum required to qualify for welfare. In this case, if this postal worker could have qualified for welfare, his family would have been entitled to hundreds of dollars more in health and food benefits. In the New York-New Jersey area, the Federal Government has stated that a family of four living in moderate circumstances needs \$11,700 per year. The top salary a postal clerk or carrier can earn after 12 steps and 21 years of service, however, is \$8,442.

Moreover, all the parties admit that the 6-percent raise upon which we are voting today is not adequate. The administration has promised to support another 8-percent increase for postal workers later in the year providing Congress votes for postal reform. Regrettably, however, I have heard it said that the reform must be a postal corporation. This form of pressure, which accrues only to the detriment of the innocent workers would be reprehensible and likely to result in another stalemate and possible strike. I strongly urge the administration not to

take us down the same road and give us two postal strikes in the same year.

The Congress is invested with the authority and responsibility to reform the postal system consistent with the President's approval. If the Congress and the Chief Executive are to be at loggerheads, however, let the loser be limited to one or the other, and not the postal and Government workers who deserve far better treatment than they have had until today.

I do not believe that a Government pay raise ought to be tied in any way to acceptance of postal reform. If Government employees deserve a raise, that raise should come about as a result of economic and not political justification.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, while because of illness I am not on the floor, I want my views and my strong support of this legislation to be clearly known.

We are lucky to have such fine postal workers and Federal employees with their good approach toward government and their loyal service through the years to the American people. Too often their willingness and outstanding work has reacted to the detriment of the very employees who are giving such good service.

I want to make my position crystal clear and my strong support of this legislation plain. I firmly believe in complete comparability with private industry and that our Government should be the employer that everybody looks to for leadership and should not always be lagging. I look ahead to the procedures being developed by adequate negotiations with employee representatives and the Government, so that the negotiations are a high level of collective bargaining.

The recent negotiated package also includes a subsequent 8-percent raise for postal workers only, linked with postal reform, going part way toward the postal corporation plan proposed by President Nixon. I have long favored the reform of the Post Office Department for better efficiency, so there could be better pay, better fringe benefits, and better retirement, as well as good service for the American public. I have said many times a good day's work is worth a good day's pay.

I hope we are overcoming the feeling that any group of Government employees should bear the full brunt of the fight against inflation, and that they should be the ones who are always held behind under all administrations because of so-called budgetary limitations. I am glad that we are moving forward to obtain justice for our fine Government employees and postal workers. This should be the start of the development of basic procedures for negotiation between Government officials and employee representatives.

The postal unions and Government employee unions have shown responsibility. They have responded to the needs of the people when it was shown that the mail had to be delivered. They are to be complimented.

On any reform in the Post Office we must see that it is not used in order to have subsidies for various kinds of mail because of political pressures, but there

must be just rates for everybody. I think there should be a thorough checking by the congressional committees of the justice of the current rate structure now being charged. There are some portions of this legislation that I personally do not favor, but overall I feel that it is the best interest of the American people, the postal employees, and the Federal Government employees, as well as their unions.

I recall that we in the House of Representatives did our duty when on last October 18 we passed pay raise legislation retroactive to October 1, 1969. The bill then was sent to the Senate where it was not acted upon until later in December when the first session of the 91st Congress was almost over. At that time the Senate passed a much weaker bill. An extended period then occurred when there was no meeting of the conference committee on the disagreeing vote between the two Houses. This period extended so long that, naturally, the Government employees and the postal workers were upset and felt that they were being ignored. We in Congress have the duty to represent these people and represent them well.

As a World War II Navy veteran myself, it is especially gratifying to see, that included in this legislation is, a pay raise for our fine 3½ million service men and women. These dedicated men and women are defending our country, maintaining the security of the American people, safeguarding the freedom of the sea and airways, and protecting the free world.

The U.S. serviceman is called on for day and night duty. He not only bravely accepts peril to himself, but separation from his family, friends and loved ones for extended periods of time.

I favor working toward a volunteer U.S. military service, highly paid and technically trained. I also favor maintaining the fine reserve units which add so much to our protection and give such loyal service right at home. We must not allow these units to be overlooked in these unsettled times.

We must all work for an early peace with honor. This must be our American goal. Tragically, we have not had the support of our friends and allies in the free world in Vietnam as we had hoped but every man that has served in Vietnam and his family are to be congratulated on their high patriotism, devotion to duty and dedication.

Count on my strong support of this legislation to provide just pay for our postal workers, Government employees, and good U.S. service men and women.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, whatever may be said about the dramatic atmosphere in which this legislation developed, there can be no doubt that the salary adjustments contained in H.R. 16844 amount to no more than simple justice. Consumer prices rose more than 6 percent during the past year, and Government employees, no less than workers in the private sector, need a 6-percent pay raise merely to recapture the ground lost on the treadmill of inflation.

We cannot condone the very questionable tactics used by some to dramatize

their economic hardships, but we can move to correct the deplorable conditions that precipitated them. The starting salary of postal employees, a group long noted for loyalty and dedication to service, is \$6,176, with a top limit of \$8,442—a range of less than \$2,300—after 21 years of service. Little wonder that the postal service has such alarmingly high rates of personnel turnover, approaching 50 percent in recent years. Such a turnover rate is completely inconsistent with the building of a dedicated corps of career employees.

The administration has displayed initiative in meeting with employee representatives and agreeing on a proposal to be submitted to Congress. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 16844 represents a responsible beginning toward remedying the deficiencies in the postal and Federal employee pay schedules.

Since 1962, the Congress has been rightfully committed to the principle that pay rates in governmental service should be comparable to pay in the private sector for work of similar skill. As I pointed out just last October during discussions of the proposed Federal Comparability Pay Act of 1969, Congress, the executive branch, and the country at large have a vital interest in seeing that Government employees "achieve their objectives of obtaining fair pay and fair treatment in accord with comparable standards of our American free enterprise system."

It is in this spirit that I urge speedy approval, without crippling amendments, of H.R. 16844.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the plight of postal workers and their families can be overlooked no longer. Their grievances are real and legitimate. In many areas of the country the economic standing of postal employees qualifies them for public assistance payments. The great cost of living increases of the last few years have compounded the already grievous situation. I support full comparability now. For years these men and women have been promised wage comparability relative to similar work in private enterprise and have never received it. The bill now under consideration falls once again to meet that commitment. When voting today on H.R. 16844, Congress should recognize that a retroactive 6-percent wage increase is a step in the right direction but will not by any stretch of the imagination relieve the conditions under which postal employees have worked for so long.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my voice in support of postal pay increases. It is truly shocking to have to face up to how badly paid our postal employees have remained throughout this period of rampant inflation.

If I have any regret, it is simply that action was not completed earlier to grant these much-needed pay raises for Post Office employees, and at the same time thereby have spared ourselves a lot of the turmoil and upheaval of these last few weeks. We all recall very vividly that this body authorized a pay increase of 5.4 percent in October 1969. It is most

unfortunate that we were not able to meet in conference with the other body so that we might have finished action months ago to meet the justifiable plea of our Post Office employees for more equitable compensation.

So by all means, let us take swift action and make the 6 percent increase the law—the better to get on with consideration of a further 3 percent increase and meaningful postal reform.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, little more than a year has gone by since this House, by its inaction, fleeced the American taxpayers to put money into the pockets of Federal employees—including Congressmen—who are supposed to be the servants and not the masters of the American people.

At that time there was an agreement between the leadership of both parties to allow the salary increase which had been recommended by a shadow group under the Federal Salary Act take effect by the simple expedient of taking a recess. Then no Member could be able to prevent the pay raise—and better still, no Member would need explain to his constituents why he had commenced his term of office by increasing his salary.

The position which I took at that time was not exactly popular. I tried to prevent the pay raise. I introduced a measure, House Resolution 208, to stop this business. Nothing was done. I include that measure in my remarks at this point:

H. RES. 208

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby disapprove all of the recommendations of the President of the United States, with respect to the rates of pay of offices and positions within the purview of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of section 225(f) of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 643; Public Law 90-206), transmitted by the President to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

It was apparent to me then, and it is apparent to me now, that the cost of salary increases will come out of the pockets of the hard-working American taxpayer. He can expect the surtax to be continued, other taxes to be increased or imposed, and the postage to go up—possibly to 10 cents. What he does not pay directly, he will pay indirectly, either in the cost of doing business passed on to him in the products he buys, or in the cruel tax of inflation on consumers if we go to further deficit financing.

As I said last February, I hold the stewardship of the one vote of the people who sent me here to represent them in this body. I intend to vote today as we did not have the opportunity to vote last February—against the salary increase which will come out of their pockets and speed up the spiral of inflation.

American taxpayers, paying the highest taxes in the history of the Republic, are entitled to representation in their Congress. I will represent my people and vote against this irresponsible measure.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to House Resolution 905, the bill shall be consid-

ered as having been read for amendment, and no amendments to the bill are in order except by direction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and such amendments are not subject to amendment.

The bill is as follows:

H.R. 16844

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970".

Sec. 2. (a) (1) The President shall increase the rates of basic pay, basic compensation, and salaries (as such rates were increased by Executive Order Numbered 11474, dated June 16, 1969) contained in the schedules listed in paragraph (2) of this subsection by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable and with regard to maintaining approximately equal increments within any grade, level, or class of any such schedule to 6 percent.

(2) The schedules referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection are as follows: the General Schedule contained in section 5332 (a) of title 5, United States Code; the Postal Field Service Schedule and the Rural Carrier Schedule contained in sections 3542(a) and 3543(a), respectively, of title 39, United States Code; the schedules relating to certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration and contained in section 4107 of title 38, United States Code; and the Foreign Service schedules contained in sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

(b) Rates of basic pay, basic compensation, and salaries of officers and employees paid under the schedules referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall be increased initially under conversion rules prescribed by the President or by such agency as the President may designate.

(c) The increases made by the President under this section shall have the force and effect of law and shall be printed (1) in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as public laws, (2) the Federal Register, and (3) the Code of Federal Regulations.

"Sec. 3. (a) The rates of pay of personnel subject to sections 210 and 214 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 633, 635; Public Law 90-206), relating to Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Committee employees and to certain employees of the legislative branch of the Government, respectively, and any minimum or maximum rate, limitation, or allowance applicable to any such personnel, shall be adjusted, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date on which adjustments become effective under this section, by amounts which are identical, insofar as practicable, to the amounts of the adjustments under this section for corresponding rates of pay for employees subject to the General Schedule, by the following authorities—

"(1) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to individuals employed by the county committees established under section 590h (b) of title 16;

"(2) the Comptroller of the Senate, with respect to the United States Senate;

"(3) the Finance Clerk of the House of Representatives, with respect to the United States House of Representatives; and

"(4) the Architect of the Capitol, with respect to the Office of the Architect of the Capitol.

The provisions of this section shall not be construed to allow adjustments in the rates of pay of the following officers of the United States House of Representatives: Parliamentarian, Chaplain, Clerk, Minority Clerk,

Sergeant at Arms, Minority Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, Minority Doorkeeper, Postmaster, Minority Postmaster.

"(b) Notwithstanding section 665 of title 31, the rates of pay of employees in and under the judicial branch of the Government, whose rates of pay are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise adjusted under this section may be adjusted, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after December 27, 1969, by amounts not to exceed the amounts of the adjustments under section 2(a) of this Act for corresponding rates of pay. The limitations fixed by law with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges shall be adjusted, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date on which adjustments become effective under this section, by amounts not to exceed the amounts of the adjustments under this section for corresponding rates of pay.

"(c) The rates of pay of United States attorneys and assistant United States attorneys whose annual salaries are fixed pursuant to section 548 of title 28, United States Code, shall be increased, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after December 27, 1969, by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided pursuant to section 2 of this Act for corresponding rates of pay.

"(d) Notwithstanding section 665 of title 31, the rates of pay of employees of an executive agency and of the government of the District of Columbia whose rates of pay are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased pursuant to this section are hereby authorized to be increased, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after December 27, 1969, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided pursuant to section 2 of this Act for corresponding rates of pay in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

Sec. 4. (a) An increase in pay, compensation, or salary which becomes effective under section 2 of this Act is not an equivalent increase in pay within the meaning of section 5335 of title 5, United States Code, or section 3552 of title 39, United States Code.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall impair any authority pursuant to which rates of pay, compensation, or salary may be fixed by administrative action.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) any officer or employee of the United States Government receiving pay, compensation, or salary which is less than the basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule in section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, shall not have his pay, compensation, or salary increased, by reason of the enactment of this Act, to a rate in excess of the basic pay for such level V; and

(2) any officer or employee of the United States Government receiving pay, compensation, or salary equal to or in excess of the basic pay for such level V shall not have his pay, compensation, or salary increased.

Sec. 5. (a) Retroactive pay, compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive pay, compensation, or salary shall be paid—

(1) to an officer or employee who retired, during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after December 27, 1969, and ending on the

date of enactment of this Act, for services rendered during such period; and

(2) in accordance with subchapter VIII of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, relating to settlement of accounts, for services rendered, during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after December 27, 1969, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, by an officer or employee who died during such period.

Such retroactive pay, compensation, or salary shall not be considered as basic pay for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, or any other retirement law or retirement system, in the case of any such retired or deceased officer or employee.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the United States Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 6. (a) Section 11-702(d) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "\$29,000" and "\$28,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$36,500" and "\$36,000", respectively.

(b) Section 11-902(d) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "\$28,000" and "\$27,500", and inserting in lieu thereof "\$34,500" and "\$34,000", respectively.

(c) The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2402), is amended by striking out "\$27,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$34,000".

Sec. 7. The third sentence of subsection (b) of the first section of the Act of August 25, 1958, as amended (3 U.S.C. 102 note), is amended by striking out "\$80,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$96,000".

Sec. 8. Section 5545(c) (2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) an employee in a position in which the hours of duty cannot be controlled administratively, and which requires substantial amounts of irregular, unscheduled, overtime duty with the employee generally being responsible for recognizing, without supervision, circumstances which require him to remain on duty, shall receive premium pay for this duty on an annual basis instead of premium pay provided by other provisions of this subchapter, except for regularly scheduled overtime, night, and Sunday duty, and for holiday duty. Premium pay under this paragraph is determined as an appropriate percentage, not less than 10 per centum nor more than 25 per centum, of such part of the rate of basic pay for the position as does not exceed the minimum rate of basic pay for GS-10, by taking into consideration the frequency and duration of irregular unscheduled overtime duty required in the position."

Sec. 9. (a) Section 5942 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5942. Allowance based on duty at remote worksites

"Notwithstanding section 5536 of this title, an employee of an Executive department or independent establishment who is assigned to duty, except temporary duty, at a site so remote from the nearest established communities or suitable places of residence as to require an appreciable amount of expense, hardship, and inconvenience on the part of the employee in commuting to and from his residence and such worksite is entitled, in addition to pay otherwise due him, to an allowance of not to exceed \$10 a day. The allowance shall be paid under regulations prescribed by the President establishing the

rates at which the allowance will be paid and defining and designating those sites, areas, and groups of positions to which the rates apply."

(b) Notwithstanding section 5536 of title 5, United States Code, and the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section, and until the effective date of regulations prescribed by the President under such amendment—

(1) allowances may be paid to employees under section 5942 of title 5, United States Code, and the regulations prescribed by the President under such section (as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section; and

(2) such regulations may be amended or revoked in accordance with such section 5942 as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section.

(c) The table of content of subchapter IV of chapter 59 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"5942. Allowance based on duty on California offshore islands or at Nevada Test Site."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"5942. Allowance base on duty at remote worksite."

Sec. 10. (a) Subchapter IV of chapter 59 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at end thereof the following new section:

"§ 5947. Quarters, subsistence, and allowances for employees of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, engaged in floating plant operations

"(a) An employee of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, engaged in floating plant operations may be furnished quarters or subsistence, or both, on vessels, without charge, when the furnishing of the quarters or subsistence, or both, is determined to be equitable to the employee concerned, and necessary in the public interest in connection with such operations.

(b) Notwithstanding section 5536 of this title, an employee entitled to the benefits of subsection (a) of this section while on a vessel may be paid, in place of these benefits, an allowance for quarters or subsistence, or both, when—

"(1) adverse weather conditions or similar circumstances beyond the control of the employee or the Corps of Engineers prevent transportation of the employee from shore to the vessel; or

"(2) quarters or subsistence, or both, are not available on the vessel which it is undergoing repairs.

"(c) The quarters of subsistence, or both, or allowance in place thereof, may be furnished or paid only under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army."

(b) The table of sections of subchapter IV of chapter 59 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding—

"5947. Quarters subsistence, and allowances for employees of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, engaged in floating plant operations."

immediately below—

"5946. Membership fees; expenses of attendance at meetings; limitations."

(c) The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating plant operations", approved May 13, 1955 (69 Stat. 48; Public Law 35, Eighty-fourth Congress) is repealed.

Sec. 11. (a) Sections 1 through 6, inclusive, of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after December 27, 1969.

(b) This section and sections 7 to 10, in-

clusive, of this Act shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) For purposes of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, relating to group life insurance for Government employees, all changes in rates of pay, compensation, and salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to become effective as of the date of such enactment.

(d) Any deduction to be made as the result of the enactment of this Act from the pay, compensation, or salary of an officer or employee enrolled in a retirement system of the United States Government, and the contribution of the agency employing the officer or employee, shall be made at the rates of deductions and contributions in effect for that system on the date of such enactment.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 24, strike out the quotation marks.

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 3, lines 7 and 8, strike out "the date on which adjustments become effective under this section," and insert in lieu thereof "December 27, 1969."

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 3, line 13, strike out the quotation marks.

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 3, line 16, strike out the quotation marks.

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 3, line 18, strike out the quotation marks.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may rise in opposition to a committee amendment, but the other request is not in order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I hope we are not to be treated again soon to this kind of operation. Let me repeat that we got this bill for the first time before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee at 10 o'clock this morning. We started our discussions at 10:05—what discussions there were. A motion was promptly adopted to cut off all debate, discussion, amendment, or anything else, at 10:40. So we actually spent 35 minutes

on a bill which entails the spending of \$2.6 billion a year.

It is true that there were hearings on pay bills last year, but let me tell the House what you are asked to do here today, for better or for worse.

A little group of administration officials and union leaders fashioned a hoop down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue one week ago today, and you are now asked to jump through that hoop. You are answering the beck and call of the so-called negotiators at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, and you should know that not all the postal employees were permitted to enter into those negotiations. Not all of them were permitted to be represented in those so-called negotiations—negotiations which saw Members of the House, the chairman and other Members of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, especially those who represented the House at the conference on H.R. 13000, completely ignored.

So today you will be voting—perhaps I will vote with you—to jump through the hoop that was fashioned by a few people at the other end of the avenue.

I repeat that I hope to God I do not and you do not have to go through this kind of performance again, because it is repulsive to knuckle down spinelessly to an ultimatum that is served upon Congress by the executive branch of Government and a few union leaders.

I tried in the committee this morning to limit the bill, to cut out the extraneous provisions; to limit the bill to a 6-percent pay increase for those workers in the four statutory categories, and I was defeated. There are millions of dollars in pay increases and fringe benefits in this bill we ought not to have come before us.

I was interested this afternoon to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CORBETT) say that he is going to offer a motion to recommit the bill to strike out two or three sections of the bill. The gentleman voted for the bill including these provisions in committee this morning and he calls upon the Members of the House to support the bill. He says he himself supports it. But he is going to offer the motion to recommit.

I never cease to marvel at what goes on in this wonderland here in Washington, both in and out of Congress.

The gentleman from Arizona says he will not go along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania on his motion to recommit. The motion to recommit is being offered because Members of the Senate have served notice they will not accept the two or three provisions. They are again dictating to the House just as they were adamant in refusing to do anything with H.R. 13000, the salary increase bill which the House approved last October. The gentleman from Arizona well knows it, because he was a member of the conference. He was one of those who voted, as did I, for a motion on the part of the House conferees demanding that the Senate get down to business 2 weeks ago and bring out H.R. 13000.

The other body was adamant and refused to make any pretense of marking up that bill which might well have saved us from the sordid situation with which we are confronted.

That is why I cannot quite wade through the morass I am being confronted with by way of the verbal gymnastics here this afternoon.

At any rate, the gentleman from Arizona says he is going to be adamant in his position that the Senate cannot tell the House what to do this afternoon and I join him. Yes, when we get the motion to recommit it will be interesting to see just what transpires; whether the House will again bend the knee to the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to be able to support a bill increasing the pay of postal workers for they are at the bottom of the pay ladder, but this bill, applying to legislative employees and others who never should have been included, is much too costly. It provides for pay increases totaling more than \$2.6 billion a year and to this must be added an actuarial deficit in the retirement fund of some \$3.2 billion in the next 30 years. This is unacceptable. This will again fuel the flames of inflation.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, very briefly.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was just wondering which committee amendment the gentleman was speaking in opposition to.

Mr. GROSS. Which committee amendment?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman like now to ask for the regular order?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. For the regular order?

Mr. GROSS. Why does the gentleman not do it?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. I am all through. Why does the gentleman not do it?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

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 3, line 21, strike out the quotation marks.

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 3, line 25, strike out "Parliamen-" and all that follows down through the period in line 3 on page 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Parliamentarian, Chaplain, Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, Postmaster, and the four Floor Assistants to the Minority whose position titles formerly were Minority Clerk, Minority Sergeant at Arms, Minority Doorkeeper, and Minority Postmaster."

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 4, line 4, strike out the quotation marks.

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 4, line 19, strike out the quotation marks.

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 5, line 1, strike out the quotation marks.

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 5, line 2, strike out "an executive agency" and insert in lieu thereof "the Federal Government".

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 12, line 2, strike out "Decembr" and insert in lieu thereof "December".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further committee amendments?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. PRICE of Illinois, 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. 16844) to increase the pay of Federal employees, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 905, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CORBETT

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CORBETT. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CORBETT moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 16844, to increase the pay of Federal employees, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out sections 9 and 10, and renumber section 11 as section 9, and on line 3, on page 12, strike out "sections 7 to 10, inclusive," and insert in lieu thereof "sections 7 and 8".

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 261, nays 124, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]
YEAS—261

Abbutt	Eckhardt	Martin
Abernethy	Edmondson	Mathias
Adair	Edwards, Calif.	May
Adams	Eriensborn	Michel
Albert	Esch	Miller, Ohio
Anderson, Ill.	Eshleman	Mills
Andrews, Ala.	Evans, Colo.	Minish
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fallon	Minshall
Annunzio	Fascell	Mize
Arends	Feighan	Mizell
Ayres	Fish	Monagan
Beall, Md.	Fisher	Morton
Belcher	Ford, Gerald R.	Mosher
Bell, Calif.	Frelinghuysen	Myers
Berry	Frey	Nelsen
Betts	Friedel	O'Konski
Biaggi	Gallagher	O'Neill, Mass.
Blester	Garmatz	Ottinger
Blatnik	Gettys	Passman
Boggs	Gialmo	Patten
Boland	Goldwater	Pepper
Bow	Gonzalez	Pickle
Brademas	Gooding	Pike
Bray	Grover	Pirnie
Brinkley	Gubser	Poff
Brock	Gude	Preyer, N.C.
Brooks	Haley	Price, Ill.
Brotzman	Hamilton	Price, Tex.
Brown, Ohio	Hammer-	Pryor, Ark.
Broyhill, N.C.	schmidt	Pucinski
Broyhill, Va.	Hanley	Quie
Buchanan	Hansen, Wash.	Quillen
Burke, Mass.	Harrington	Railsback
Burleson, Tex.	Harsha	Rees
Burton, Calif.	Harvey	Reid, Ill.
Bush	Hastings	Reid, N.Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hays	Reifel
Camp	Hechler, W. Va.	Rhodes
Carey	Heckler, Mass.	Riegler
Carter	Helstoski	Robison
Casey	Hogan	Rodino
Cederberg	Hollifield	Roe
Celler	Horton	Rogers, Fla.
Chamberlain	Hosmer	Rooney, N.Y.
Chisholm	Hull	Rooney, Pa.
Clancy	Hunt	Roth
Clark	Ichord	Ruppe
Clausen,	Jacobs	Ruth
Don H.	Jarman	St Germain
Clawson, Del	Jonas	St. Onge
Cleveland	Jones, Ala.	Sandman
Cohelan	Kazen	Satterfield
Collier	King	Saylor
Collins	Kluczynski	Schadeberg
Conable	Kuykendall	Scherle
Conte	Kyl	Scheuer
Conyers	Kyros	Schneebell
Corbett	Landgrebe	Schwengel
Corman	Langen	Scott
Coughlin	Latta	Sebelius
Cowger	Leggett	Shriver
Cramer	Lloyd	Sikes
Crane	Long, La.	Skubitz
Daniel, Va.	Long, Md.	Smith, Calif.
Daniels, N.J.	Lukens	Smith, Iowa
Davis, Ga.	McCarthy	Smith, N.Y.
Davis, Wis.	McClary	Springer
de la Garza	McCloskey	Stafford
Delaney	McClure	Stanton
Dellenback	McCulloch	Steed
Denney	McDonald,	Steiger, Ariz.
Dennis	Mich.	Steiger, Wis.
Devine	McEwen	Stratton
Dickinson	McKneally	Stubblefield
Donohue	Macdonald,	Sullivan
Dowdy	Mass.	Talcott
Downing	MacGregor	Taylor
Dulski	Maillard	Teague, Tex.
Duncan	Mann	Thompson, N.J.
	Marsh	Thomson, Wis.

Tiernan
Tunney
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler

Watkins
Watts
Weicker
Whalley
Whitten
Windall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn

Wold
Wolf
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young
Zion

NAYS—124

Addabbo
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Bennett
Bevill
Bingham
Blanton
Bolling
Brasco
Broomfield
Burke, Fla.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Utah
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Caffery
Chappell
Colmer
Culver
Cunningham
Derwinski
Dingell
Dorn
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Evens, Tenn.
Farbstein
Findley
Flood
Flowers
Ford,
William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.

Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gaydos
Gibbons
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Hathaway
Hébert
Henderson
Hicks
Howard
Hungate
Hutchinson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Koch
Lennon
Lowenstein
McFall
McMillan
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Mikva
Mink
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.

Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Poage
Podell
Powell
Randall
Rarick
Reuss
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Snyder
Staggers
Stucky
Symington
Thompson, Ga.
Udall
Van Deerlin
Watson
Whalen
Whitehurst
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wright
Yates
Yatron
Zablocki
Zwach

NOT VOTING—45

Alexander
Ashley
Blackburn
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Cabell
Clay
Daddario
Dawson
Dent
Diggs
Edwards, La.
Flynt
Foley
Fulton, Pa.

Gilbert
Green, Ore.
Hagan
Hall
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hawkins
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Tenn.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Landrum
Lujan
McDade

Miller, Calif.
Mollohan
Patman
Philbin
Pollock
Purcell
Rivers
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Stephens
Stokes
Taft
Teague, Calif.
White
Wiggins

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. White with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Blackburn.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Kleppe.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Hogan with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Cabell.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. McDade.

Messrs. NIX, ANDERSON of Tennessee, TIERNAN, FULTON of Tennessee, McMILLAN, FLOOD, MADDEN, FUQUA, YATES, HUNGATE, FLOWERS, POWELL, KOCH, NICHOLS, FARBSTEIN, PELLY, MIKVA, FINDLEY, NATCHER, PERKINS, SNYDER, and Mrs. GRIFFITHS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. HAMILTON, ANNUNZIO, DONOHUE, and TIERNAN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened. The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI).

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, and on behalf of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report back the bill H.R. 16844 with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Strike out sections 9 and 10 and renumber section 11 as section 9; and in line 3 on page 12, strike out "sections 7 to 10, inclusive", and insert in lieu thereof "sections 7 and 8".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 372, nays 7, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]
YEAS—372

Abbutt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Blester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs

Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brook
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Caffery
Camp
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chappell
Chisholm

Clancy
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Coughlin
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell

Donohue	Koch	Reuss
Dorn	Kuykendall	Rhodes
Dowdy	Kyl	Riegels
Downing	Kyros	Roberts
Dulski	Langen	Robison
Duncan	Latta	Rodino
Dwyer	Leggett	Roe
Eckhardt	Lennon	Rogers, Colo.
Edmondson	Lloyd	Rogers, Fla.
Edwards, Ala.	Long, La.	Rooney, N.Y.
Edwards, Calif.	Lowenstein	Rooney, Pa.
Ellberg	Lukens	Rosenthal
Erlenborn	McCarthy	Roth
Esch	McClary	Roybal
Eshleman	McCloskey	Ruppe
Evans, Colo.	McClure	Ruth
Evins, Tenn.	McDonald, Mich.	Ryan
Fallon	McEwen	St Germain
Farbstein	McFall	St. Onge
Fascell	McKneally	Sandman
Findley	McMillan	Satterfield
Fish	Macdonald, Mass.	Saylor
Fisher	MacGregor	Schadeberg
Flood	Madden	Scherle
Flowers	Mahon	Scheuer
Foley	Mailliard	Schneebell
Ford, Gerald R.	Mann	Schwengel
Ford, William D.	Marsh	Scott
Foreman	Martin	Sebellus
Fountain	Mathias	Shipley
Fraser	Matsunaga	Shriver
Frelinghuysen	May	Sikes
Frey	Mayne	Sisk
Friedel	Meeds	Skubitiz
Fulton, Tenn.	Melcher	Slack
Fuqua	Meskill	Smith, Calif.
Gallifanakis	Michel	Smith, Iowa
Gallagher	Mikva	Smith, N.Y.
Garmatz	Miller, Ohio	Snyder
Gaydos	Mills	Springer
Gettys	Minish	Stafford
Gialimo	Mink	Stanton
Gibbons	Minshall	Steed
Goldwater	Mize	Steiger, Ariz.
Gonzalez	Mizell	Steiger, Wis.
Goodling	Monagan	Stratton
Green, Pa.	Montgomery	Stubblefield
Griffin	Moorhead	Stuckey
Griffiths	Morgan	Sullivan
Grover	Morse	Symington
Gubser	Mosher	Talcott
Gude	Moss	Taylor
Haley	Murphy, Ill.	Teague, Tex.
Hamilton	Murphy, N.Y.	Thompson, Ga.
Hammer-	Myers	Thompson, N.J.
schmidt	Natcher	Thomson, Wis.
Hanley	Nedzi	Tiernan
Hansen, Wash.	Nelsen	Tunney
Harrington	Nichols	Udall
Harsha	Nix	Ullman
Harvey	Obey	Van Deerlin
Hastings	O'Hara	Vander Jagt
Hathaway	O'Konski	Vanik
Hays	Olsen	Vigorito
Hébert	O'Neal, Ga.	Waggonner
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Neill, Mass.	Waldie
Heckler, Mass.	Ottinger	Wampler
Helstoski	Passman	Watkins
Henderson	Patten	Watts
Hicks	Pelly	Weicker
Hogan	Pepper	Whalen
Holifield	Perkins	Whalley
Horton	Pettis	Whitehurst
Hosmer	Pickle	Whitten
Howard	Pike	Widnall
Hull	Pirnie	Williams
Hungate	Podell	Wilson, Bob
Hunt	Poff	Wilson,
Ichord	Powell	Charles H.
Jacobs	Preyer, N.C.	Winn
Jarman	Price, Ill.	Wold
Johnson, Calif.	Pryor, Ark.	Wolf
Jonas	Quie	Wright
Jones, Ala.	Quillen	Wyatt
Jones, N.C.	Railsback	Wyder
Karth	Randall	Wylie
Kastenmeier	Rees	Wyman
Kazen	Reid, Ill.	Yates
Kee	Reid, N.Y.	Yatron
Keith	Reifel	Zablocki
King		Zion
Kluczynski		Zwach

NAYS—7

Burleson, Tex.	Landgrebe	Rarick
Gross	Poage	
Hutchinson	Price, Tex.	

NOT VOTING—51

Alexander	Brown, Mich.	Dawson
Ashley	Cabell	Dent
Blackburn	Clay	Diggs
Brown, Calif.	Daddario	Edwards, La.

Feighan	Jones, Tenn.	Pucinski
Flynt	Kirwan	Purcell
Fulton, Pa.	Kleppe	Rivers
Gilbert	Landrum	Rostenkowski
Gray	Long, Md.	Roudebush
Green, Oreg.	Lujan	Staggers
Hagan	McCulloch	Stevens
Hall	McDade	Stokes
Halpern	Miller, Calif.	Taft
Hanna	Mollohan	Teague, Calif.
Hansen, Idaho	Patman	White
Hawkins	Philbin	Wiggins
Johnson, Pa.	Pollock	Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Hawkins.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Feighan with Mr. McCulloch.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. Taft.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Teague of California.
 Mr. White with Mr. Hagan.
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Hall.
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Pollock.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. McDade.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mr. Young with Mr. Kleppe.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Lujan.
 Mr. Cabell with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Mollohan.
 Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Clay.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Long of Maryland.
 Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Staggers.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Stokes.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. LANDGREBE changed his vote "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of the House Resolution 905, I call up for immediate consideration the similar Senate bill (S. 3690) to increase the pay of Federal employees.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 3690

An act to increase the pay of Federal employees

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970".

SEC. 2. (a) (1) The President shall increase the rates of basic pay, basic compensation, and salaries (as such rates were increased by Executive Order Numbered 11474, dated June 16, 1969) contained in the schedules listed in paragraph (2) of this subsection by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable and with regard to maintaining approximately equal increments within any grade, level, or class of any such schedule, to 6 percent.

(2) The schedules referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection are as follows: the General Schedule contained in section 5332 (a) of title 5, United States Code; the Postal Field Service Schedule and the Rural Carrier Schedule contained in sections 3542(a) and 3543(a), respectively, of title 39, United States Code; the schedules relating to certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration and contained in section 4107 of title 38, United States Code; and the Foreign Serv-

ice schedules contained in sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

(b) Rates of basic pay, basic compensation, and salaries of officers and employees paid under the schedules referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall be increased initially under conversion rules prescribed by the President or by such agency as the President may designate.

(c) The increases made by the President under this section shall have the force and effect of law and shall be printed in (1) the Statutes at Large in the same volume as public laws, (2) the Federal Register, and (3) the Code of Federal Regulations.

(d) (1) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), the rates of pay of officers and employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of pay are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased by this section are hereby authorized to be increased by the agencies employing such officers and employees by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this section for corresponding rates of pay in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

(2) Nothing contained in this section shall be held or considered to authorize any increase in the rates of pay of officers and employees whose rates of pay are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

SEC. 3. The rates of pay of personnel in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, which rates of pay were adjusted under the third sentence of section 212 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and any minimum or maximum rate, limitation, or allowance applicable to any such personnel, shall be increased by amounts which are equal, insofar as practicable and under such rules as may be necessary to provide for the payment of retroactive pay and with such exceptions and modifications as may be necessary to provide for appropriate relationships between positions, to 6 percent by the following authorities:

- (1) The President pro tempore of the Senate, with respect to the Senate;
- (2) The Speaker of the House of Representatives, with respect to the House of Representatives;
- (3) The Architect of the Capitol, with respect to the Office of the Architect of the Capitol;
- (4) The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, with respect to the judicial branch of the Government; and
- (5) The Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)).

Such increases shall be made in such manner as the appropriate authority concerned deems advisable and shall have the force and effect of law.

SEC. 4. (a) An increase in pay, compensation, or salary which becomes effective under section 2(a) of this Act is not an equivalent increase in pay within the meaning of section 5335 of title 5, United States Code, or section 3552 of title 39, United States Code.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall impair any authority pursuant to which rates of pay, compensation, or salary may be fixed by administrative action.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) any officer or employee of the United States Government receiving pay, compensation, or salary which is less than the basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule in section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, in effect on the date of enactment of this

Act, shall not have his pay, compensation, or salary increased, by reason of the enactment of this Act, to a rate in excess of the basic pay for such level V; and

(2) any officer or employee of the United States Government receiving pay, compensation, or salary equal to or in excess of the basic pay for such level V shall not have his pay, compensation, or salary increased.

SEC. 5. (a) Retroactive pay, compensation, or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive pay, compensation, or salary shall be paid—

(1) to an officer or employee who retired, during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after December 27, 1969, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, for services rendered during such period; and

(2) in accordance with subchapter VIII of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, relating to settlement of accounts, for services rendered, during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after December 27, 1969, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, by an officer or employee who died during such period.

Such retroactive pay, compensation, or salary shall not be considered as basic pay for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, or any other retirement law or retirement system, in the case of any such retired or deceased officer or employee.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the United States Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. (a) Section 11-702(d) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "\$29,000" and "\$28,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$38,500" and "\$38,000", respectively.

(b) Section 11-902(d) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "\$28,000" and "\$27,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$37,500" and "\$37,000", respectively.

(c) The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2402), is amended by striking out "\$27,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$37,000".

SEC. 7. The third sentence of subsection (b) of the first section of the Act of August 25, 1953, as amended (3 U.S.C. 102 note), is amended by striking out "\$80,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$96,000".

SEC. 8. (a) The provisions of this Act (other than section 7) shall be effective as of December 27, 1969. The rate of pay, compensation, or salary of an officer or employee which is increased under this Act (other than under such section) shall be increased as of the first day of the first pay period for that officer or employee which commences on or after December 27, 1969.

(b) For purposes of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, relating to group life insurance for Government employees, all changes in rates of pay, compensation, and salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to become effective as of the date of such enactment.

(c) Any deduction to be made as the result of the enactment of this Act from the

pay, compensation, or salary of an officer or employee enrolled in a retirement system of the United States Government, and the contribution of the agency employing the officer or employee, shall be made at the rates of deductions and contributions in effect for that system on the date of such enactment.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. UDALL moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3690 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 16844, as passed, as follows:

That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970".

SEC. 2. (a) (1) The President shall increase the rates of basic pay, basic compensation, and salaries (as such rates were increased by Executive Order Numbered 11474, dated June 16, 1969) contained in the schedules listed in paragraph (2) of this subsection by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable and with regard to maintaining approximately equal increments within any grade, level, or class of any such schedule, to 6 percent.

(2) The schedules referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection are as follows: the General Schedule contained in section 5332(a) of title 5, United States Code; the Postal Field Service Schedule and the Rural Carrier Schedule contained in sections 3542 (a) and 3543(a), respectively, of title 39, United States Code; the schedules relating to certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration and contained in section 4107 of title 38, United States Code; and the Foreign Service schedules contained in sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

(b) Rates of basic pay, basic compensation, and salaries of officers and employees paid under the schedules referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall be increased initially under conversion rules prescribed by the President or by such agency as the President may designate.

(c) The increases made by the President under this section shall have the force and effect of law and shall be printed (1) in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as public laws, (2) the Federal Register, and (3) the Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 3. (a) The rates of pay of personnel subject to sections 210 and 214 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 633, 635; Public Law 90-206), relating to Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Committee employees and to certain employees of the legislative branch of the Government, respectively, and any minimum or maximum rate, limitation, or allowance applicable to any such personnel, shall be adjusted, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after December 27, 1969, by amounts which are identical, insofar as practicable, to the amounts of the adjustments under this section for corresponding rates of pay for employees subject to the General Schedule, by the following authorities—

(1) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to individuals employed by the county committees established under section 590h (b) of title 16;

(2) the Comptroller of the Senate, with respect to the United States Senate;

(3) the Finance Clerk of the House of Representatives, with respect to the United States House of Representatives; and

(4) the Architect of the Capitol, with respect to the Office of the Architect of the Capitol.

The provisions of this section shall not be construed to allow adjustments in the rates of pay of the following officers of the United States House of Representatives: Parlia-

mentarian, Chaplain, Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, Postmaster, and the four Floor Assistants to the Minority whose position titles formerly were Minority Clerk, Minority Sergeant at Arms, Minority Doorkeeper, and Minority Postmaster.

(b) Notwithstanding section 665 of title 31, the rates of pay of employees in and under the judicial branch of the Government, whose rates of pay are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise adjusted under this section may be adjusted, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after December 27, 1969, by amounts not to exceed the amounts of the adjustments under section 2(a) of this Act for corresponding rates of pay. The limitations fixed by law with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges shall be adjusted, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date on which adjustments become effective under this section, by amounts not to exceed the amounts of the adjustments under this section for corresponding rates of pay.

(c) The rates of pay of United States attorneys and assistant United States attorneys whose annual salaries are fixed pursuant to section 548 of title 28, United States Code, shall be increased, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after December 27, 1969, by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided pursuant to section 2 of this Act for corresponding rates of pay.

(d) Notwithstanding section 665 of title 31, the rates of pay of employees of the Federal Government, an executive agency and of the government of the District of Columbia whose rates of pay are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased pursuant to this section are hereby authorized to be increased, effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after December 27, 1969, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided pursuant to section 2 of this Act for corresponding rates of pay in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

SEC. 4. (a) An increase in pay, compensation, or salary which becomes effective under section 2 of this Act is not an equivalent increase in pay within the meaning of section 5335 of title 5, United States Code, or section 3552 of title 39, United States Code.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall impair any authority pursuant to which rates of pay, compensation, or salary may be fixed by administrative action.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) any officer or employee of the United States Government receiving pay, compensation, or salary which is less than the basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule in section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, shall not have his pay, compensation, or salary increased, by reason of the enactment of this Act, to a rate in excess of the basic pay for such level V; and

(2) any officer or employee of the United States Government receiving pay, compensation, or salary equal to or in excess of the basic pay for such level V shall not have his pay, compensation, or salary increased.

SEC. 5 (a) Retroactive pay, compensation, or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive pay, compensation, or salary shall be paid—

(1) to an officer or employee who retired, during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after December 27, 1969, and ending on

the date of enactment of this Act, for services rendered during such period; and

(2) in accordance with subchapter VIII of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, relating to settlement of accounts, for services rendered, during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after December 27, 1969, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, by an officer or employee who died during such period.

Such retroactive pay, compensation, or salary shall not be considered as basic pay for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, or any other retirement law or retirement system, in the case of any such retired or deceased officer or employee.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the United States Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. (a) Section 11-702(d) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "\$29,000" and "\$28,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$36,500" and "\$36,000", respectively.

(b) Section 11-902(d) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "\$28,000" and "\$27,500", and inserting in lieu thereof "\$34,500" and "\$34,000", respectively.

(c) The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2402), is amended by striking out "\$27,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$34,000".

SEC. 7. The third sentence of subsection (b) of the first section of the Act of August 25, 1958, as amended (3 U.S.C. 102 note), is amended by striking out "\$80,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$96,000".

SEC. 8. Section 5545(c)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "(2) an employee in a position in which the hours of duty cannot be controlled administratively, and which requires substantial amounts of irregular, unscheduled, overtime duty with the employee generally being responsible for recognizing, without supervision, circumstances which require him to remain on duty, shall receive premium pay for this duty on an annual basis instead of premium pay provided by other provisions of this subchapter, except for regularly scheduled overtime, night, and Sunday duty, and for holiday duty. Premium pay under this paragraph is determined as an appropriate percentage, not less than 10 per centum nor more than 25 per centum, of such part of the rate of basic pay for the position as does not exceed the minimum rate of basic pay for GS-10, by taking into consideration the frequency and duration of irregular unscheduled overtime duty required in the position."

SEC. 9. (a) Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after December 27, 1969.

(b) This section and sections 7 and 8 of this Act shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) For purposes of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, relating to group life insurance for Government employees, all changes in rates of pay, compensation, and salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to become effective as of the date of such enactment.

(d) Any deduction to be made as the result of the enactment of this Act from the pay, compensation, or salary of an officer or

employee enrolled in a retirement system of the United States Government, and the contribution of the agency employing the officer or employee, shall be made at the rates of deductions and contributions in effect for that system on the date of such enactment.

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 16344) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DULSKI. 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 by the House, H.R. 16844.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on the last rollcall vote, No. 71. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear immediately following the vote on H.R. 16844.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my office on rollcall No. 71. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear immediately following the vote on H.R. 16844.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my office on official business at the time of rollcall No. 71. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on rollcall No. 70. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

A TRIBUTE TO FATHER BARBATO

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday evening, some 1,000 parishioners of St. Anthony's Roman Catholic Church in Easton joined in paying tribute to their pastor, the Rev-

erend Francis J. Barbato, on the occasion of his 40th anniversary of ordination as a priest and his simultaneous retirement as parish administrator.

I was pleased and privileged to join with local and State government officials in the tribute to Father Barbato.

Although a clergyman's decision to retire may be generally considered a decision to put aside his career and to turn to a life of leisure, this is not Father Barbato's view of retirement. True, he plans to give up the duties of parish administrator but only to give him more time to devote to the priestly duties of work among his people.

Father Barbato assured the gathering:

My work among you will begin this week. I will have more time to spend with you. I intend to spend the rest of my life being a priest among my people.

The Reverend John V. Bartos, a former curate at St. Anthony's who is now an assistant principal at Cardinal Dougherty High School, Philadelphia, very accurately described Father Barbato when he referred to him simply as a "gentleman."

Father Bartos explained:

I could pay no higher tribute to any man. A gentleman is one who never hurts—a gentle man.

The Sunday evening tribute to Father Barbato climaxed Rev. Francis J. Barbato Day, in Easton, by proclamation of Easton's Mayor Fred L. Ashton.

Among those attending the testimonial dinner were three of the young men he helped develop into outstanding public officials, Judge Richard D. Grifo, Judge Michael V. Franciosa, and District Attorney Charles H. Spaziani.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to make note of this good man's service to his church for 40 years, and his plans to utilize his retirement for further service to his fellow man.

I would like to share with my colleagues an account of the tribute to Father Barbato as reported in the Easton, Pa., Express newspaper. The tribute follows:

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express, Apr. 6, 1970] BARBATO KEEPS DUTIES AS PRIEST, GIVES UP ADMINISTRATIVE WORK

(By Robert W. Jodon)

The Rev. Francis J. Barbato, pastor-administrator of St. Anthony's parish, Easton, took the occasion of a celebration in honor of the 40th anniversary of his ordination, to announce that his resignation as parish administrator has been accepted.

Father Barbato said he sent a letter to the Most Rev. Joseph McShea, bishop of Allentown, three weeks ago asking to be relieved of administrative duties. He will remain as spiritual leader of the parish.

Father Barbato said the bishop telephoned his congratulations yesterday and informed him that as of midnight yesterday he was relieved of his duties as administrator.

Father Barbato was honored last night by more than 1,000 parishioners and friends at a testimonial dinner at the George Washington Motor Lodge, Allentown.

Father Barbato said, "My work among you will begin this week. I will have more time to spend with you."

"I intend to spend the rest of my life being a priest among my people. Until now, 95 per cent of my time has been devoted to administration."

KEEP TOGETHER

"I can't stay idle. I have something in mind to keep us all together."

He said that beginning today he will be acting administrator of the parish until a successor is named. After that, he said he will be in the area to offer his assistance to his people.

In announcing his resignation, Father Barbato read the letter sent to the Bishop.

When he stated that his resignation was due to "advancing age" and "declining health," his parishioners laughed.

Father Barbato has been at St. Anthony's since 1934. He was ordained April 5, 1930.

GUEST SPEAKER

Guest speaker was the Rev. John V. Bartos, a former curate at St. Anthony's who is now an assistant principal at Cardinal Dougherty High School, Philadelphia.

Father Bartos described "his former boss" as a "gentleman."

He said, "I could pay no higher tribute to any man. A gentleman is one who never hurts—a gentle man."

He also said, "Service has been the hallmark of his (Father Barbato's) life."

Easton Mayor Fred L. Ashton Jr. read a proclamation declaring yesterday, "Rev. Francis J. Barbato Day" in the city. He also gave the priest a key to the city.

SENATE RESOLUTION

State Sen. Jeanette F. Reilman of Easton read a resolution passed unanimously by the State Senate in honor of Father Barbato's anniversary.

U.S. Rep. Fred B. Rooney of Bethlehem lauded the priest for his service and presented a crystal ashtray bearing the seal of the House of Representatives.

Other tributes were paid by Northampton County Judges Richard D. Grifo and Michael V. Franciosa; the Rev. John J. Busco, pastor of St. Donato's Church, Philadelphia, the first member of the church to join the priesthood, and the Rev. Amedeo Morello, pastor of St. Aloysius Church, Jackson, N.J., who read his address in Italian.

THE \$5,000 CHECK

Gifts from the parish were presented by Anthony F. Noto, general chairman of the event. They included a portrait and a check for \$5,000.

The present curates at St. Anthony's, the Revs. James J. Agosta and Paul Della Picca, read a blessing from Pope Paul VI.

Among the honored guests were the Rev. and Mrs. John F. Steinbruck, former pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church, Easton, now a pastor in Washington, D.C., and Mr. and Mrs. Herbert A. Snyder, representing Bnai Abraham Synagogue, Easton.

Toastmaster was Northampton County Dist. Atty. Charles H. Spaziani.

WHERE ARE THOSE "LAW AND ORDER" ADVOCATES NOW?

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, as we read that a Federal district court in Florida has enjoined the Governor of that State from interfering with constitutionally required school desegregation in Manatee County, Fla., and the Governor notwithstanding has defied the court and its orders, perhaps we may be forgiven some sense of irony in asking: "Where are those 'law and order' advocates now?"

Often during the 1968 presidential campaign we heard impassioned speeches about how the new administration would

guarantee vigorous law enforcement. Where is the President now when a Governor of his own political party openly and shamelessly flouts the orders of a Federal court interpreting the Constitution of the United States. I assume, like most public officials in this Nation, the Governor of Florida takes an oath to "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States." Some protection; some defense.

In the case of the President of the United States, there is no question of what oath he takes or what his clear responsibilities are. It is the President's clear responsibility to "faithfully execute" his office, which by the lights of even the strictest constructionist must include carrying out the mandate of the Constitution for equal protection of the laws. The President's oath includes that same pledge to "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution." Where is the President now when a Governor of his own political party attempts to interfere with and hinder the execution of the laws? The President is hiding behind his press secretary who yesterday told the press that he was "not in a position to express to you" President Nixon's position on the controversy.

And where, we might ask, was that flinty-eyed prosecutor, that hard-line Attorney General who sees his departments as "a law enforcement organization, not an agency for social improvement"? He was not in Florida enforcing equal protection of the laws. He was lecturing municipal officials on how to adjust their local parade ordinances to meet the threat of "large demonstrations," and praising the District of Columbia omnibus crime bill—one provision of which was declared unconstitutional before the bill could even be signed into law.

Even on the floor of this House, there have been many who have spoken long and loudly about the need for vigorous law enforcement. Some have deplored actions of civil disobedience even to laws which were ultimately declared unconstitutional—such as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s march in Birmingham. And, indeed, the Supreme Court held in *Walker v. City of Birmingham*, 388 U.S. 307 (1967), that such disobedience, even to an unconstitutional law, must be punished. But here there is no doubt. Here the Supreme Court has spoken. Here the mandate of the Constitution is clear. The schools of Manatee County, Fla., must be desegregated in order to satisfy the Constitution's equal protection guarantee.

With this clear constitutional mandate before us, after the Highest Court in the land has spoken, where are those "law and order" advocates to urge compliance with the law's requirement. Where is the President? Where is the Attorney General? Where are the Members of this House who have spoken out so often in the name of law and order?

THE NEED FOR CHANGE IN ECONOMIC POLICY

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

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the present state of the Nation's economy creates a great many problems which are troubling the American people. Problems which are troubling the people of the First Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent. Problems which cry out in need for immediate action.

In the best interests of the people I represent—in the best interests of all the people of this great Nation—there is a most urgent need to establish a list of national priorities.

While I do not believe that they can or should be listed in a particular order of importance—certain specific problems stand out calling for immediate, concerted action.

These problems are readily identified. They are, in my considered opinion: decent housing, particularly for families of low and moderate income; training and job opportunities; quality education for our youth; transportation for our hard-working people to get to their jobs; the safety of our people on the streets and in their homes; and pollution of our national resources and environment.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is and has been aware of these problem areas. In the majority of these areas we have already acted, providing specific legislation for the executive branch of our Government to deal with the problems. In the others, the legislative process is moving forward to give the administration the necessary tools to act.

Unfortunately, however, the tight money and high interest rate policies of the present administration are the major obstacles to solving these problems. These policies must be changed and they can only be changed by this administration.

It is these policies which have given us runaway inflation for the past 15 months, and present the growing threat of an economic recession.

The cost of living, reflecting the cost of food and services to the average household, saw the greatest rate of increase in 1969 in over a decade. The 1969 Consumer Price Index reflected the biggest 12-month rise in 15 years. Eggs, fruits, and vegetables, meat, poultry and fish—the "market basket" foods that make up the meals of Americans, averaged a 4.8-percent increase in 1969, and rose even faster in the first 2 months of 1970. Medical care was 7 percent higher and insurance and financial—credit—costs rose 11.5 percent reflecting the huge increase in profits for money lenders at the expense of the family who has to buy homes, cars, and other needs on credit. This all means that the wage earner, the retired person, the widow, the housewife, the millions who spend the bulk of their income on life's necessities, bear the higher costs. These facts bear witness to the tragic results of the economic policies being pursued by the present administration.

The present administration must change its economic policies. We must see to the proper distribution of funds to meet our national priorities. There is

an urgent need to solve the problems facing the people of my district and our Nation.

SUPPORTING LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE JUSTICE CENTER

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. POFF and I have today introduced a bill to fill a great and growing need of the Federal Government. Our bill H.R. 16885 would establish a Federal Administrative Justice Center with responsibility for encouraging and supporting the continuing legal education of lawyers in the service of the Federal Government.

There are about 10,000 lawyers in the Federal service. This includes some 600 hearing examiners appointed under the Administrative Act. They play a vital role in the administration and enforcement of the law. The Government has shown a keen interest in attracting capable young attorneys, and in making their posts attractive. But more attention should be given to measures which will induce the ablest to remain with the Government and enable all lawyers in Federal service to perform their duties more capably.

The measure we have introduced is also being introduced in the other body by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY. It is designed to fill a part of this gap by encouraging Government lawyers to develop their skills and to keep abreast of developments in Congress, the courts, the agencies, and in society, to the end that they may be prepared to perform their duties more competently and also to undertake effectively future challenges.

The bar has long recognized the desirability of continuing legal education. The First National Conference on the Continuing Education of the Bar which met at Arden House in 1958 emphasized this, saying:

American lawyers today are confronted with problems of vast and increasing complexity. No law school education can be expected to deal with all of these problems. A practicing lawyer has an obligation to continue his education throughout his professional life. This education not only must increase his professional competence but also better qualify him to meet his professional responsibilities to his clients and to the public.

What was there said of the lawyer in general applies with special force to the lawyer in Government service.

Some Government lawyers and hearing examiners now have access to continuing legal education courses provided by the agencies which employ them. Others have access to courses sponsored by the Civil Service Commission, the bar associations, and the law schools. However, what is available falls short of the need and remedial legislation seems indicated.

In 1962 the personnel committee of the Administrative Conference of the United States noted the lack of well-rounded

career development and training programs specially designed for lawyers in Federal service. In 1966 the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and in 1967 the Presidential Task Force on Career Advancement observed that this deficiency still existed. In 1969, the American Bar Association and the Administrative Conference of the United States, adopted resolutions again pointing to the need for improved continuing legal education in the Government, and recommended as a remedy the founding by the Government of a Center in Washington which would be responsible for this activity.

The proposed Center would be organized as a new agency. It does not appear feasible to assign the function to any existing Government organization. Policy will be determined by a Board of Visitors, with the Attorney General as Chairman. A majority of the Board would consist of persons in Government employ; an outside viewpoint would be provided by members chosen from the private bar and law schools.

The activities of the Center would be supervised by a staff of lawyers similar to the administration of a law school. The staff would be small. The Center's proposed budget of \$400,000 is a modest one. Students would be designated by the agencies of the Government employing them as lawyers. Fees covering the cost of a course would be paid out of funds available for training purposes by the agencies sending their lawyers to the courses organized by the Center.

The Center would work closely with the departments, agencies, and hearing examiners to identify education needs and to develop effective legal education programs, recruiting the expert faculty for each particular course as the need arises. This should avoid any necessity for the Center to employ a large permanent staff.

The Center is not intended to overlap the existing powers and responsibilities of any agency of the Government. Where training of lawyers is now done well within the Government, it would continue unimpaired. The Center would be expected to effect its role where a need for further education of lawyers is not adequately provided.

Continuing legal education could encourage more capable young lawyers to join the Government and help retain experienced attorneys of undoubted ability.

The Federal Administrative Justice Center is designed to fulfill a need for continuing legal education which will endure as long as there is an insistence that Government be administered with competence and justice. Continuing education is particularly essential to lawyers employed by the Federal Government during this time of rapid changes in our economy and society.

THE COMMUNICABLE DISEASE ACT

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the past decade, the United States

has devoted much of its energies and much of its resources to reaching the moon. And we have twice accomplished that goal. Four Americans have walked on the surface of the moon and the United States has reaped the glories of superior technological prowess.

Now, at Cape Kennedy, in Florida, the Apollo 13 rocket is pointed toward the heavens, ready to again carry Americans into another chapter in history. And to use a popular phrase, "The whole world is watching."

But now we find that all our technology, all our resources, and all planning have become frozen. Gravity has not locked the Apollo 13 spacecraft to its launching pad.

Our multibillion space program now sits questionably in waiting because of German measles—a common malady which, like gravity, man has the technology to overcome.

Yet, unlike our program to reach the stars and overcome gravity, our Nation has not yet set a sufficient priority of overcoming such common, simple, and yet dangerous items such as communicable diseases, such as German measles, common measles, mumps, smallpox, and tuberculosis.

A multi-billion-dollar project representing the world's greatest technology halted by German measles. If, indeed, the moon shot is postponed until May, the estimated cost of the delay will run more than \$800,000.

This is another, and possibly the most extreme example, of how this Nation has its head in the clouds while problems faced by millions of Americans are unattended.

NASA is now figuring out how much it will cost additionally if the Apollo 14 program is pushed back by the possible cancellation of Apollo 13. This, depending on how long it would delay Apollo 14, could run into the millions.

Yet the budget request for immunization from the Communicable Disease Center was for only \$528,000 for fiscal 1970 and the same is projected for fiscal 1971.

Because our efforts have become splintered because of inadequate funding, the Community Health Services has asked for \$16 million to attack the problem of German measles, or rubella, as it is sometimes called. But even this funding is inadequate and in fact, the Community Health Service is projecting appropriations of \$16 million for fiscal 1971.

Last year only 12 million children were immunized. In 1971, including all-out Federal programs and all the non-Federal programs, only 25 million will be protected against a killer disease.

But the need is twice that. Between 45 and 50 million children should receive immunization.

And what is disheartening is that when the HEW appropriations were passed for 1970, an additional \$10 million was voted to add to the \$16 million to fight rubella and that addition, the \$16 million, is now being held in reserve by the administration as part of the 2-percent discretionary authority which the administration has to cut back funding.

If Astronaut Thomas K. Mattingly had been in another vocation, he would have

German measles and probably no one except his family and neighbors would have known it nor cared.

And Mattingly would have been one among thousands of Americans who would be suffering for a disease that is preventable.

The point that I am making here today, Mr. Speaker, is that we can stop, we can prevent or detect many communicable diseases which annually plague thousands of Americans. We know how but we are not. Many of those who contact German measles, especially expectant mothers, suffer more than discomfort. Children die, many suffer mental retardation.

This not need be. The Apollo 13 mission is only a dramatic example of what is happening in the area of communicable diseases.

The moon shoot may cost this Nation millions if it is delayed by German measles.

But every year, in cities and towns across the Nation our people are forced to pay millions of dollars in hospital bills and many lose members of their families and because we are not using the scientific knowledge which we have to prevent these diseases.

The irony of the moon shot is indeed dramatic. But it is time that the Congress realize that we are not paying the attention to preventing such health hazards as German measles, common measles, mumps, small pox, and TB.

I hope that the exposure given the German measles through the moon shot will linger when we take up the Communicable Disease Act which we today passed out of subcommittee.

ANCHER NELSEN INTRODUCES BILL TO HELP END BOXCAR SHORTAGE

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, at this time a boxcar shortage which has become chronic in the Midwest and Far West threatens to cause great hardships to users of rail transportation.

One railroad company which serves Minnesota recently had orders for 1,422 cars to load grain, but had only 168 available. Another had orders for 5,035 boxcars and 2,943 covered hopper-cars, but none were available.

The grain elevators in the Midwest are blocked with grain that must be moved soon. There are millions of bushels of wet corn that must be moved before warm weather, and at this time rail transportation just does not meet the need. I have received word that 31 elevators in the upper Midwest have been blocked with grain.

It has been estimated that it costs approximately 2 cents per bushel per month to hold grain. The Minnesota Public Service Commission reports that there are 50 million bushels of grain "on the ground" in Nebraska alone. This amount results in costs of a million dollars a month to these farmers, cooperatives, elevators, and processors. This situation is repeated in many of our States, and thousands of individuals in

agriculture must bear this great, and primarily needless expense.

The major reason behind the shortage of boxcars is that cars are being kept by other railroads. At one point the Chicago & Northwestern Railroad reported having only 50 percent of its stock of boxcars on its lines. The Burlington Northern reported that only 63 percent of its grain and lumber cars were on its system.

The reason behind this situation is that eastern lines find it cheaper to use boxcars owned by others and incur minimal charges, than it is to build their own cars.

One Minnesota State Public Service Commissioner, Mr. P. K. Peterson, has been working on this problem for some time. He has appealed, as have hundreds of concerned businessmen, and government officials, to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Mostly to no avail. "You need an act of Congress," Commissioner Peterson announced recently, and I agree with him.

Today, I am joining the sponsorship of a bill which would amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to give the Interstate Commerce Commission additional authority to alleviate the freight car shortages. Under the bill's provisions, the ICC could remove the incentives for keeping cars, and restore incentives to return the cars to their owners. This proposal is a companion bill to S. 3223 which has been the subject of hearings in the Senate Commerce Committee.

Hopefully, the Senate will act speedily so that we can take up the issue and pass a bill which will restore this vital balance in our railroad system.

CURE AND CONTROL OF CANCER

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a resolution calling for a national commitment to cure and control cancer within this decade. I am delighted to report that over 40 distinguished colleagues of this House have joined with me as cosponsors of the legislation.

These cosponsors represent broad, bipartisan sentiment in this body that the time has now come to conquer mankind's deadliest enemy. It represents an acknowledgement that we can no longer sit by and allow a disease to continue which will take 30 American lives each hour in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution calls for annual appropriations of no less than \$650,000,000 until a cure and control for cancer are achieved. This is a small price to pay. Indeed, it is impossible to speak in terms of dollars and cents in the same breath as human existence.

But it would be useful to note that, if economic considerations are relevant, the price tag on my program is far less than the \$5 billion per year required to place a man on the moon. Moreover, the purpose of this program seems far more worth the funding than does the more

than \$1 billion project to construct a supersonic transport.

Even more, if we consider the number of people who would be working and paying income taxes instead of wasting away from cancer, then we find that the program could pay for itself in just a few short years.

Mr. Speaker, to help us fulfill the commitment proposed today, my resolution would require that no less than \$250 million be spent within the first 2 years of appropriation to construct five new cancer research institutes in the United States.

These are necessary in order to provide adequate facilities which would facilitate research into the many forms of cancer.

Those colleagues who have joined me today as well as this Representative, himself, are greatly encouraged by the great support my bill has received from eminent cancer specialists such as Dr. Solomon Garb, scientific director of the American Medical Center at Denver. We are also encouraged by expressions of support from officials of the American Cancer Society and the National Candlelighters organization which makes its home in California.

It is our belief that with this support, and with the support of people throughout the United States, we can accomplish our goal.

The many cancer specialists with whom I have been in contact are convinced with me, that if the recommended funds are made available, we can cure cancer.

So my call goes to this Congress—it is a call for support. But even more, our call today goes beyond this Chamber and out to the people of the United States.

I urge our fellow citizens to communicate their support for this program to the administration and to their elected officials. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I dispatched a message to the President in February discussing my intentions to propose a national cancer cure commitment.

With your permission I would insert a copy of this message, as well as the names of the distinguished cosponsors of the resolution, and the text of the resolution itself at this point in the RECORD:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Andrews of Alabama, Mr. Baring, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Boland, Mr. Brademas, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Chappell, Mr. Clausen, Mr. Clay, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Daniels, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Fulton of Tennessee, Mr. Gettys, Mr. Glaimo, Mr. Gray, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Howard, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Lowenstein, Mr. Lukens, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. McKneally, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Minish, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Podell, Mr. Preyer, Mr. Rees, Mr. Roe, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Sandman, and Mr. Stokes.

H. RES. 907

Whereas cancer takes the lives of more than 300,000 Americans each year; and

Whereas the death rate from cancer is steadily increasing as our population grows; and

Whereas more than 1,000,000 Americans are currently under treatment for this dread disease; and

Whereas it is clearly in the interests of mankind that this disease be cured and controlled; and

Whereas prominent medical authorities have indicated that cancer can be cured and controlled if the necessary funds are made available; and

Whereas current appropriations are inadequate to accomplish this task; and

Whereas it is both necessary and desirable that a national commitment be immediately undertaken to achieve a cure and control for cancer within this decade; It is hereby

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that no less than \$650,000,000 be appropriated annually over the next 10 fiscal years for the National Cancer Research Program; and, be it further

Resolved, That no less than \$250,000,000 of this appropriation be utilized to construct 5 new cancer research institutes in the United States during the first two years of the new appropriations.

TEXT OF GALLAGHER LETTER TO NIXON

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write on a matter of pressing concern to all Americans and, indeed, to all peoples of the world.

The ghost of cancer hangs like a grisly spectre over mankind. It is estimated that 33 million Americans alone are afflicted with this dread disease; cancer has tragically touched the lives of countless others, including those who are as yet not diagnosed.

However, medical science has clearly indicated that it can cure cancer with the proper financial support. Researchers and physicians alike believe that we now stand on the brink of discovery. It is no longer a question of "can we do it;" it is only a question of "will we do it" and "when." The answers should be obvious.

Therefore, Mr. President, I write to urge that this nation undertake a firm financial and moral commitment to curing cancer within this decade.

I further urge that you authorize our representatives at the United Nations to work towards a binding international agreement for pooling financial and medical resources in a grand global effort against this common enemy of mankind.

Mr. President, if this country could successfully organize a manned landing on the moon, and return to earth, within a short span of 10 years, then we could surely conquer cancer in at least a similar period of time. In fact, we are today closer to a cure for cancer than we were to a moon landing when the national commitment was first ordered. Surely, a mission against this great scourge is at least as integral to our survival as a mission to the moon; it demands no less dedication.

The voices of the American people have been lifted in unison on this issue. No one is immune to cancer; this disease knows no racial, national, religious, or class boundaries. Thus, I am certain that you will have the full support of our people and the Congress if you embark upon the course proposed here.

Questions of cost are important; but they should not at all be determinative here. We pay greater costs in terms of lives and human suffering by permitting cancer to continue its killing pace than we could ever pay in terms of dollars. Indeed, the equities do not even approach a balance.

Nobody will ever forget the day upon which a preventive vaccine for polio was announced to the world. Similarly, who would ever cease to remember the day upon which we can state that the ghost of cancer has at last been exorcised from the earth.

Mr. President, you have dedicated your administration to the cause of human decency, and human survival. You have called for the preservation of our environment. Now, let us call for the preservation of our most precious resources: human lives.

I respectfully submit this proposal for your consideration. The American people are ready to stand with you, and work with you to make a cancer cure commitment work.

Thank you for your consideration.

With warmest regards.

Sincerely,

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Member of Congress.

TAX FREE ARISTOCRACY FINANCING REVOLUTIONARIES

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today's business has to do with pay increases for Federal employees. It is apparent that at some future date the Congress, which did not negotiate the pay increases, will be called upon to provide the funds from which to pay them. I again renew a suggestion which I have previously made, that we reexamine carefully the highly privileged situation into which we have seen our tax-free aristocracy maneuver itself while financing the destruction of the very system which provided their wealth.

I include in my remarks the text of H.R. 9460 which will provide a partial solution to this problem, together with a letter written last week by the national director of a citizens' group, the Families Opposing Revolutionary Donations—F.O.R.D.—in which a citizens' solution is proposed.

The material referred to follows:

H.R. 9460

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that tax-exempt organizations which voluntarily engage in litigation for the benefit of third parties, or commit other prohibited acts, shall lose their exemption from tax

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) (1) (A) of section 503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to loss of exemption from taxation) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "or if it has engaged in barratry, maintenance, or champerty, voluntarily provided legal assistance to, or participated or sought to participate by intervention, as amicus curiae, or otherwise, for the benefit of any person or class other than itself, in any judicial proceeding after the date of enactment of this Act."

FAMILIES OPPOSING REVOLUTIONARY DONATIONS,

Hollywood, Calif., April 3, 1970.

MR. HENRY FORD II,
Ford Motor Co.,
Dearborn, Mich.

DEAR MR. FORD: I would like to bring to your attention the accompanying article by Robert C. Maynard wherein Mr. McGeorge Bundy pledged to maintain the same Ford Foundation policies in the 1970's that were followed in the '60's.

If this is the case I would like to humbly submit that if the foundation continues funding the radical, anti-American, social-action, revolutionary groups, your troubles

and Mr. Bundy's troubles will have only begun. The chaos and turmoil that your foundation has dealt this nation during the 1960's (and 1950's) will most certainly result in the most severe public reaction including the strong possibility of a Congressional investigation of the foundation's nefarious activities and of every person who was responsible for them—including the Trustees.

In the article Mr. Bundy said the foundation's officials would not "align themselves with those who believe there is no crisis in our society."

This infers that the starry-eyed, impractical, liberals, the embittered social action do-gooders and the militant revolutionaries are in the sole position of solving the problems of a society that many of them do not like and would like to change!

For example, many of the prominent liberals that Mr. Bundy has worked with through the years are admitted Socialists. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Kenneth Galbraith and many top men in the Kennedy administration advocated and taught various forms of Socialism for years. Arthur Goldberg, who was given \$70,000 of Ford money to see if our police and government were persecuting the Black Panthers, did not join and associate himself with a number of Communist fronts because he championed the free enterprise system.

Mr. Ford, have you ever worked with professional social workers? I have, and I have found that most of those I've met are deeply embittered against our system and our society. Many of them lean heavy toward alien concepts and they often find that their social work provides a fertile field for them to organize the disenchanting and create unrest and turmoil.

The militants that Mr. Bundy insists on helping are often advocates of revolution, and funds from your Ford Foundation provides them the resources to spread their violence in many areas and directions.

These are the types that your foundation's Presidents and administrators have given hundreds of millions of dollars to for twenty-five years.

If you had a financial crisis in the Ford Motor Company would you hire men who did not have business experience? Would you hire people whose integrity was questionable, who might deceive you? Would you hire men to design an engine who hated mechanics and engineering?

When Mr. Bundy says he will not align himself (or the Foundation) "with those who believe there is no crisis," he is probably referring to Conservative, pro-Americans, for it is their groups and their noble projects that Mr. Bundy and all of his liberal predecessors (going clear back to Robert Hutchins) have studiously and consistently shunned since your grandfather, Henry Ford, Sr., passed away.

As a Conservative who is devoting his life to the problems that face this nation, I can confidently say that millions of concerned, conservative Americans are fully aware that this nation is consumed with many grave crises. We know that there are crises that involve violent turmoil, destructive anti-American demonstrations, bombings, murder and threats of revolution; and we know that Ford Foundation money, much of which was derived from the sale of Ford products, filtered down to many of these various "crises" that have torn and divided this great nation.

And we Conservatives also know there are other problems. Problems in housing, education, unemployment, etc., etc. But it is inconceivable that we would work with militants and social activists who profess alien philosophies, who would not use our aid to solve but to destroy. It is the conservative, pro-American, spiritually oriented people (like your grandfather) that understood and appreciated our unique and revered American concepts and worked to solve the millions of economic, political and social prob-

lems that have contributed to this nation's success.

Who could train or help the hard core unemployed best: a Marxist or militant who does not understand our system and would like to see the problems mount until a revolution emerges to destroy this system? Or, could the problem best be solved by a Conservative businessman who knows the technical fundamentals that must be taught? A man who knows that understanding, motivation, inspiration and ambition are all a part of the necessary ingredients to make a man succeed?

The Ford-type liberal-left, \$500,000,000 solutions that started pouring into our educational institutions 25 years ago are now reaping their harvests. Socialist-oriented teachers and professors are now openly indoctrinating the students against their country, and the cries of revolution are echoing loudly through the campuses and the streets.

Ford-type, liberal-left, Bundy-conceived, social solutions turned the New York schools into chaos and did more to embitter and polarize the races than any one thing.

Ford-Bundy-type social solutions poured \$120,000,000 into a Socialistic type Public Broadcasting System which is leftist oriented, directed by a very extreme leftwinger and is in direct competition with the very free enterprise system which provides funds to the Ford Foundation and the Ford Motor Company and the Ford dealers!

Bundy-type social, poverty and political problems have been financed with hundreds of millions of Ford dollars. This means that well heeled militant minorities are able to agitate among their Negro, Mexican and Indian brothers with the results that many many good, loyal Americans are turned against their country. Once they become embittered they join forces with those who are dedicated to destruction and revolution. Not to the solving of their social problems.

Yes, Mr. Ford, there are many of us who are well aware that this nation has problems, but we seriously doubt that you, Mr. Bundy and your Trustees understand where the real problems are located.

It was typical that the Ford-Bundy type solution favored a \$75,000 grant to CASE (Community for Awareness and Social Action) and its sister offspring, HENAC (see enclosed material). This Marxist Center is decorated with the photographs of Eldridge Cleaver and glorifies such revolutionaries as Che Guevero and Molvan Djilas. HENAC shares its office with the Black Panther Information Service and it was a strong supporter of the Chicago 7 conspiracy.

The Ford-Bundy-type \$1,930,000 solution to La Raza has helped foster a stormy hate "gringo" (white American) revolution across three states!

Mr. Ford, our Free Enterprise System is under severe attack by the liberal educators, students, ministers, unions, minority groups, radicals, and revolutionaries. Patriotism and loyalty have become dirty words. Immorality, crime and the weakening of our spiritual values become increasingly apparent, and there is less and less understanding and appreciation of our cherished heritage and concepts.

Many Conservative leaders recognize this dangerous erosion that is often encouraged by liberal-leftist concepts that are opposed to our system. It presents a very grave crisis that will require all of the ingenuity, skill, talent, dedication and organizational ability that we can muster. The challenge is so great, and the time may be so late, that we may not succeed. To fail could mean the downfall of this free nation.

But there is one distinguishing factor. You, Mr. Ford, Mr. Bundy and your Trustees "do not believe that this nation faces a grave crisis from which it might never recover." All of you stand high in the public knowledge that a vast portion of your millions and

billions have gone to the very elements who would destroy our system, and little or none of it has gone to strengthen our free enterprise, or our moral, spiritual and economic concepts.

In behalf of millions of concerned Americans, I would like to ask you, Mr. Ford, "What do you have against America? What do you have against the traditional principles and concepts that provided the foundation for your own Ford Motor Company and for America's fabulous achievements?"

Mr. Ford, why do you permit the Foundation's tax-exempt funds, which were derived (in part) from the sale of Ford, Mercury and Lincoln cars, to go to aid the Black Panthers, the militant ("hate gringo"), Brown Berets, the revolutionary student groups, the Socialist-oriented social action groups, the immoral, racist and anti-American films and plays, the leftwing educational and religious institutions, the pro-Communist radio stations, the leftleaning television systems, the most extreme and despicable sex education programs and countless other Bundy-type "Social" problems, too numerous to mention.

The ominous pattern is so staggeringly clear it can no longer be refuted by evasions and excuses that have been skillfully spoon-fed to the public for 25 years.

As violence and revolution threatens our cherished freedoms an enraged "silenced majority" will do what is necessary to stop it. Thousands of your own fine dealers deplore what you and the Ford Foundation are doing to this nation. Your calloused indifference is jeopardizing their very security and the country they love.

We have asked you to meet with us. You have refused. We have asked you to listen to our proposals that would help you, your foundation, your Ford Motor Company, your dealers and your country. You have refused. Let me repeat: "What do you have against America?"

Mr. Bundy has been negotiating so that the Soviet Union and the Ford Foundation can work on projects together. This means that America's tax-exempt funds, derived from the sale of Ford products, are now working directly with the Communist leaders of Russia!

And you are going to meet with the Communist leaders to discuss the building of an automobile assembly plant in the Soviet Union! As if your dealers didn't have enough foreign competition as it is!

Mr. Ford, I, many of your own dealers, and many concerned citizens really want to know: "What do you have against America?"

As we observe you and Mr. Bundy and study the Foundation's record since 1945 we sincerely ask: "Which side are you on, gentlemen?"

Our invitation for you to meet with us is still open.

Faithfully,

HURST B. AMYX,
National Director.

CBS DOCUMENTARY ON VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1970, Columbia Broadcasting System—CBS—presented a documentary on the subject of medical care in veterans' hospitals.

The program portrayed only a minuscule segment of the hospital care afforded by our Veterans' Administration hospitals. The network program was apparently carefully preplanned to dra-

matically promote a point of view rather than to convey facts or to portray an accurate or full picture of the quantity or quality of medical care for veterans by our Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The patients, the hospital wards, and the incidents were carefully selected and staged by CBS to present a derogatory picture of the best, most effective, and most highly funded hospital, outpatient, research, and nursing home program ever provided by any nation at any time in history for veterans or non-veterans.

Because several of my constituents wrote to me expressing shock about the CBS presentation and concern for the wounded and ill veterans, I asked Mr. Donald E. Johnson, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, for an explanation and for his comments concerning the CBS documentary.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the reply to me from Mr. Johnson.

We want to provide the best possible care for our veterans. The national networks should have the responsibility to be fair, objective, and accurate in their presentations.

The letter follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE
OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS
AFFAIRS,

Washington, D.C., April 8, 1970.

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TALCOTT: In response to your request at the Veterans Administration supplemental appropriation hearings the morning of April 7, I am glad to provide the following comment on the CBS-TV news presentation of March 2, 1970.

It is most unfortunate that the telecast left an impression in millions of American homes that Veterans Administration hospitals are giving totally inadequate care, and that the chief victims of this alleged inadequacy are our younger veterans returning from Vietnam.

Aside from a fairly lengthy taped interview with me, which in the process of editing by CBS-TV was reduced to a fleeting 30 seconds actual exposure on the screen, just one sentence in the entire program is given to the overall VA position and the positive side of VA medicine.

I do want to emphasize the verity of that one sentence when the announcer said, "The head of the VA, Donald Johnson, says there is no danger that any war wounded veteran will receive slow or second-rate care."

We could take issue with a number of specifics in the newscast such as the statement, "One budget cut forced the removal of orange juice from the daily menu. Now, it's given only with doctor's prescription." Or the claim that, "A few weeks ago, this hospital dropped 65 employees. It didn't have the money to pay them." Or, "Now there is only one therapist in this hospital for 25 patients." There is not an iota of truth in any of these statements.

What concerns me most, however, is what was not reported on the program. The network apparently chose not to clutter the minds of viewers with such facts as these—which were provided to CBS nearly two weeks in advance of the actual broadcast:

The VA appropriation for medical care for the current fiscal year, approved by the President on November 26, 1969, is the highest in history. This sum of \$1,541,701,000 is the full amount recommended by the prior President and by Congress, and is available in full to the VA.

Then, on February 2, 1970, the President submitted to Congress for Fiscal Year 1971 a budget that included \$1,702,200,000 for VA medical care. This is \$160,499,000 in excess of the previous record budget request, and is \$281,936,000 over the request for Fiscal Year 1969.

VA's 166 hospitals do have the capacity to care for Vietnam era veterans requiring hospitalization. During the past fiscal year, only some 44,000—or slightly over five-per cent—of the total VA patients treated were Vietnam era veterans. That number is expected to reach about 60,000 this fiscal year. The numbers will increase, but so has VA's ability to treat more and more veterans.

VA is treating more sick and disabled veterans than ever before in history. This fiscal year VA will treat in its hospitals more than 780,000 veteran-patients, and this figure will be exceeded next year. The 780,000 figure is 172,000 above VA's patient capacity as recently as 1958.

VA hospital staffs have been augmented. Six months ago, at a time when he was reducing employment elsewhere in the government by about 50,000 jobs, the President authorized an increase of 1,500 employees for VA with the vast majority earmarked for the medical program. The new budget for the next fiscal year calls for another increase of 2,123 VA medical employees.

The ratio of VA hospital staffs to patients has increased steadily. The ratio in VA general hospitals was 146.2 employees per 100 patients last year; is 150.2 this year, and will go up to 156.8 in the new budget.

Contrary to charges that young Vietnam veterans are doomed to a life-long stay in VA mental hospitals for lack of proper treatment is the fact that VA has pioneered in cooperative research that has scientifically established the value of psychotropic drugs, and helped to nearly double the patient turnover in mental hospitals throughout the nation. The hospital discharge rate each month for VA mental patients has grown from only 5.3-per cent in 1950 to 10.6-per cent by F. Y. 1966; to 12.7-per cent in F. Y. 1967; to 15.4-per cent in F. Y. 1968, and to 18.4-per cent last year.

Helping VA to maintain the quality of medical care are 79 of America's leading medical schools—which are closely affiliated with 93 VA hospitals—as well as leaders in American medicine who serve as program advisors and as consultants at VA hospitals.

As a member of the appropriations subcommittee concerned with VA funding, you are, of course, fully aware that since the mentioned appropriation information was given to CBS last February, the President has asked Congress for even more medical care money for the VA . . . an extra \$15,000,000 for the last three months of this fiscal year, and an additional \$50,000,000 for Fiscal Year 1971.

What concerns me most about the CBS presentation is that the public and our veterans might reasonably conclude that VA is giving inferior care, and that the Vietnam veteran, in particular, will suffer for lack of proper VA medical attention.

Such a conclusion would be erroneous, and would reflect unfairly on the many thousands of dedicated physicians, nurses and other employees who are working hard to serve our hospitalized veterans.

Considering the constant shortage of personnel in the health fields, and the continual climb in the cost of delivering health services, it is probably true that there is no hospital in the United States, including those in the VA system, that could not effectively use more funds or more staff.

Like other medical programs, the VA program is always subject to improvement. It always has been, and always will be.

I assure you that VA will strive constantly for improvement, because the best possible

medical care for the nation's war veterans has been the continuing and common desire of the American people as well as each President and each Congress.

As we all work together to achieve these improvements, I do feel it is very important for our veterans, and especially the young men disabled in Vietnam, to know that their medical needs will be met.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. JOHNSON,
Administrator.

"JUNC": THE JUNK UNWANTED NUISANCE-MAIL CRUSADE

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters urging the formation in Washington of an organization to campaign against junk mail. Perhaps for want of a better term, this organization could be named something like JUNC and could be called the "Junk Unwanted Nuisance-mail Crusade".

Of course, this organization has been inspired by the President's outrageous proposal to raise first-class postage rates to 10 cents while raising third-class bulk mail rates from 4 cents to only 4.2 cents. Actually, President Nixon hopes to realize \$53 million from raising bulk third-class mail rates which is one-fortieth the amount—\$2.3 billion to be realized from a whopping first-class mail rate increase.

Also I am strongly in favor of raising second-class rates. I sponsored an amendment which passed the House on October 11, 1967, to place a three-tenths of 1 cent surcharge on every piece of second-class mail mailed by any newspaper or magazine publishing over 500,000 copies.

So I think that second- and third-class rates both should be raised before we even talk about raising first-class rates.

I also am very grateful for the column by Mr. Art Buchwald in the Washington Post this morning on the subject, which follows my remarks.

I hope the wave of outrageous protests will cause this Congress to raise third-class mail rates before it proceeds to raise first-class rates.

The American people are fed up with having their mail boxes crammed full of junk every day. They pay through the nose in higher first-class rates in order to carry this junk, which gums up the postal service. Millions of trees are cut down to produce this junk, and millions of dollars are spent trying to clean it up and cart it away.

"JUNC" is a spontaneous, grassroots campaign to tell the President and the Congress that the people are sick and tired of the waste and nuisance caused by junk mail. It is bad enough to have to wade through all this junk every day, but it adds insult to injury to pay higher taxes to subsidize the low rates which junk mail pays.

"JUNC" will work not only for higher rates on junk mail, but will also campaign for an actual reduction of the flow of junk mail. It is an invasion of privacy to be forced to receive all this un-

wanted junk. "JUNC" will foster new ideas for private citizens to use in warring on junk mail, such as the following:

First. Marking all occupant mail as follows: "Nobody named O. C. Cupant lives here."

Second. Bundle up all junk mail and send it back without postage, to force the sender to pay through the nose for invading privacy.

Third. Pass legislation allowing any mailbox holder to have a star placed on his box announcing he does not want to receive any third-class mail, with the exception of license plates or other essential items sent by State agencies.

I include a newspaper article at this point:

JUNK MAIL SAVED IN POSTAGE RISE

In order to pay for wage increases for postal employees, President Nixon has asked that the cost of a first class letter be increased 66½ per cent, a second class piece of mail 12 per cent, parcel post 15 per cent and bulk or junk mail only five per cent.

This was a big victory for the "Citizens to Protect Junk Mail," a nonprofit organization set up to see that everybody in this country got his fair share of junk mail. The President of the CPJM was elated when he read President Nixon's message.

"This is a triumph for the little fellow," he said.

"How's that?" I asked.

"The American citizen will now be assured that no matter what happens to the rest of his correspondence, his junk mail will get through."

"Then you're not disturbed by junk mail going up five per cent?"

"We're not happy with it, of course, but we can live with it. We may have to adjust our prices accordingly, but the President has shown great courage in keeping junk mail within range of all the people."

"Why do you think he gave you the break?"

"Because he knows that the cornerstone of the free enterprise system is junk mail. When a mother writes to her son, or a girl writes to her boy friend, it produces no commerce for the country.

"First class letters are luxuries and if people want to keep writing to each other for pleasure, they should pay for it."

"But," I said, "some people in this country would prefer to get a letter from somebody they knew, before they got one which was addressed 'Resident.'"

"That's ridiculous. Everyone knows the joy that junk mail brings to the American home. Show me a man who would rather receive a letter from his mother than a catalogue from a gift company, and I'll show you a very unhealthy mother-son relationship."

"Would you advocate doing away with all first class mail as a method of lightening the burden of the post office?"

"Not at this moment. There are times when someone must communicate with another person by first class mail, and there probably are certain people in the country who enjoy hearing from their friends and loved ones. So we're not arbitrary about it. All we say is that as long as first class mail doesn't interfere with the delivery of junk mail, then it should be kept as an added postal service."

"But," I said, "if the time comes when the government must choose, then first class mail has to go?"

"Correct. You see, at one time this nation could afford the luxury of having every kind of mail. But as the public has demanded more junk mail, the Post Office has been forced to slow down on other classes of mail.

Ten years ago, the American citizen was content to receive three pounds of junk mail a year. But today he is demanding 10 pounds per year, and he gets very upset if he doesn't get his quota."

"Would you say your citizens group was instrumental in defending the sanctity of junk mail?" I asked him.

"I wouldn't say that," he said modestly. "President Nixon knew what he was doing when he put most of the financial burden on first class mail. Had he raised the rates more than 5 per cent on junk mail, you would have had citizens all over the country storming the post offices. You don't mess around with peoples junk mail during an election year."

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2601, TO REORGANIZE THE COURTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2601) to reorganize the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendments thereto, disagree with the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McMILLAN, ABERNETHY, DOWDY, CABELL, NELSEN, HARSHA, BROYHILL of Virginia, and HOGAN.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A MICRONESIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

(Mr. GALLAGHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include pertinent material.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, by request, a joint resolution to authorize an ex gratia contribution to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages during the Second World War, and to establish a Micronesian Claims Commission.

The Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements which I have the honor to chair, plans to hold hearings in the very near future on this legislation.

The text of the joint resolution and of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, together with other memoranda in support of this legislation, follows:

H.J. RES. 1161

A joint resolution to authorize an ex gratia contribution to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages during the Second World War, and to establish a Micronesian Claims Commission.

Whereas, certain Micronesian inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, formerly under League of Nations Mandate to Japan, suffered from the hostilities of the Second World War;

Whereas, the United States, while not liable for wartime suffering of the Micronesians, has responsibility for the welfare of the Micronesian people as the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

Whereas, the Governments of Japan and the United States entered into an agreement on April 18, 1969, to contribute ex gratia the equivalent of \$10,000,000 to certain Micronesian inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in view of the suffering caused by the hostilities of the Second World War, each Government contributing the equivalent of \$5,000,000, Japan's contribution to take the form of products and services;

Whereas, payment of these ex gratia contributions to certain Micronesian inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands will meet a long-standing Micronesian grievance and will promote the welfare of the Micronesian people: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the United States should make an ex gratia contribution of \$5,000,000 matching an equivalent contribution of the Government of Japan, to Micronesian inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who are determined by the Micronesian Claims Commission to be meritorious claimants, in particular amounts to be awarded by the Micronesian Claims Commission, and that the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, hereinafter referred to as the High Commissioner, or his designee, shall pay to said Micronesian claimants as soon as possible following his receipt of the final report of the Micronesian Claims Commission on the claims allowed, such amounts as are finally certified pursuant to section 4 hereof.

(b) A "Micronesian inhabitant of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" is defined for the purposes of this joint resolution as a person who:

(1) became a citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands on July 18, 1947, and who remains a citizen as of the date of filing a claim; or

(2) if then living, would have been eligible for citizenship on July 18, 1947; or

(3) is the successor, heir or assign of a person eligible under subsections (1) or (2) and who is a citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands as of the date of filing a claim.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands \$5,000,000, in addition to the normal budgetary expenditures for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and in addition to the appropriations authorized by section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, to be paid into a "Micronesian Claims Fund". The High Commissioner is hereby authorized to create and manage said Micronesian Claims Fund.

(b) Funds approximating \$5 million appropriated to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for supplies or capital improvements in accordance with the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, shall be paid into a Micronesian Claims Fund as the products of Japan and the services of the Japanese people in the amount of one billion eight hundred million yen (currently computed at \$5,000,000) are provided by Japan pursuant to Article I of the "Agreement between the United States of America and Japan", signed April 18, 1969. These funds together with the sum authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) of this section shall constitute the whole of the Micronesian Claims Fund.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a Micronesian Claims Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, such Commission to be under the control and direction of the chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. The Commission shall be composed of five members, who shall be appointed, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, by the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, one of whom he shall designate as Chairman. Two mem-

bers shall be selected from a list of Micronesian citizens nominated by the Congress of Micronesia. Any vacancy that may occur in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment. The members of the Commission shall serve at the pleasure of the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. No commissioner shall hold other public office or engage in any other employment during the period of his service on the Commission, except as an employee of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission shall receive compensation and allowances as determined by the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission by application of the rules and regulations which apply to officers and employees of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, but in no event shall traveling and other expenses incurred in connection with their duties as members, or a per diem allowance in lieu thereof, exceed that prescribed in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 1 of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code. The term of office of the members of the Commission shall expire at the time fixed in subsection (e) for winding up the affairs of the Commission.

(c) The Commission may, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, appoint and fix the compensation and allowances of such officers, attorneys, and employees of the Commission as may be reasonably necessary for its proper functioning, which employees shall be in addition to those who may be assigned by the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its functions. The compensation and allowances of employees appointed pursuant to this section shall be within the rules and regulations which apply to officers and employees of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands but in no event to exceed the amount of allowances prescribed in subchapter 1 of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code. In addition, the Commission, with the approval of the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, may make such expenditures as may be reasonably necessary to carry out its proper functioning. Officers and employees of any other department or agency of the Government of the United States or the Government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may, with the consent of the head of such department or agency, with or without reimbursement, be assigned to assist the Commission in carrying out its functions. The Commission may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the Government of the United States or the Government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, utilize, with or without reimbursement, the facilities and services of such department or agency in carrying out the functions of the Commission.

(d) The Commission shall, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, prescribe such rules and regulations as are necessary for carrying out its functions. As expeditiously as possible and, in any event, within three months of its appointment, the Commission shall give public notice in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands of the time when, and the limit of time within which, claims may be filed, which notice shall be given in such manner as the Commission shall prescribe: *Provided*, That the final date for the filing of claims shall not be more than one year after the appointment of the full membership of the Commission. A majority of the membership of the Commission shall be necessary to transact business; *Provided, however*, That an affirmative vote of at least three members shall be required for the promulgation of rules and regulations, and for the final adjudication of any claim.

(e) The Commission shall wind up its affairs as expeditiously as possible and in any event not later than two years after the expiration of the time for filing claims under this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall have authority to receive, examine, adjudicate, and render final decisions, in accordance with the laws of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and international law, with respect to claims of the Micronesian inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for the compensation of those Micronesian inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered loss of life, physical injury, and property damage directly resulting from the hostilities between the Governments of Japan and the United States between December 7, 1941, and the dates of the securing of the various islands of Micronesia by United States Armed Forces. When all claims have been adjudicated, the Commission shall certify them to the High Commissioner for payment from the Micronesian Claims Fund, except that as to claims based on death, up to \$1,000 shall be paid immediately upon adjudication.

(b) Not later than six months after its organization, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall make a report, through the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, to the Congress of the United States concerning its operations under this Act. The Commission shall, upon winding up its work, certify to the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Congress of the United States the following:

- (1) a list of all claims allowed, in whole or in part, together with the amount of each claim and the amount awarded thereon;
- (2) a list of all claims disallowed;
- (3) a copy of the decision rendered in each case.

(c) In the event that funds remain in the Micronesian Claims Fund after all allowable and adjudicated claims are paid, such remaining funds shall be transferred from the Micronesian Claims Fund to the Treasury of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for appropriation by the Congress of Micronesia for the welfare of the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. In the event that allowable and adjudicated claims exceed a total of \$10 million, the High Commissioner shall make prorata payments.

(d) No payment shall be made on an award of the Commission unless the claimant shall first execute a full release to the United States and Japan in respect to any alleged liability of the United States or Japan, or both, arising before the dates of the securing of the various islands of Micronesia by the United States Armed Forces.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the operation and administrative expenses of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, to the extent needed to cover activity connected with this Act and of the Commission in order to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. The Agreement for the payment of the Micronesian claims having been reached by negotiators of the Governments of the United States and Japan, and personnel to be appointed by the High Commissioner or the Commission being available to assist the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands insofar as may be necessary in filing claims, no remuneration on account of services rendered on behalf of any claimant, or any association of claimants, in connection with any claim or claims shall exceed, in total, one per centum of the amount paid on such claim or claims, pursuant to the provisions of this Act. Fees already paid for such services shall be deducted from the amounts authorized by this Act. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the United States or elsewhere,

demands or receives, on account of services so rendered, any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 12 months, or both.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C. March 26, 1970.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed herewith is a proposed joint resolution "To authorize an *ex gratia* contribution to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages during the Second World War, and to establish a Micronesian Claims Commission."

We recommend that this joint resolution be referred to the appropriate committee for its consideration and strongly urge its prompt enactment.

Enactment of this joint resolution is necessary to implement an Executive Agreement of April 18, 1969, between the Governments of Japan and the United States entered into pursuant to the Treaty of Peace with Japan, which provides for the compensation of inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages during the second World War. A copy of the Agreement is enclosed. The Agreement essentially provides that the two Governments will make equal, *ex gratia* contributions for the welfare of the inhabitants of Micronesia, such contributions to have a total value equivalent to \$10 million.

The contribution by Japan will take the form of products and services having a value of 1.8 billion yen which, at present conversion rates, is computed at \$5 million. The contribution of the United States, subject to the appropriation of funds by the Congress, is to take the form of \$5 million in cash.

The Agreement between the Governments of Japan and the United States is responsive to the fact that, after 25 years, an innocent people whose islands were fought over by two Great Powers remain uncompensated for wartime suffering, while they have seen their kin in Guam and their neighbors in Asia benefit from grants of the United States and reparations of Japan. The Treaty of Peace with Japan provides that claims of the inhabitants of Micronesia against Japan, and claims of Japan and its nationals against the Administering Authority of Micronesia, shall be the subject of special arrangements. In negotiating those arrangements, the United States has pressed the claims of the Micronesians, while Japan has pressed the claims of its nationals—some 100,000 Japanese—*for* property left by them when they were evacuated to Japan after the War. The Agreement treats all Japanese claims against the Administering Authority as fully and finally settled, and makes no payment on them. It commits both Governments, subject to the appropriation of funds, to a joint, *ex gratia* grant to the Micronesians which, without any suggestion of liability on the part of either Government, should meet a Micronesian grievance which has gone unmet too long. Thus, when implemented, the Agreement will dispose of a long-standing irritant in relations between Japan and the United States, and do justice to the Micronesians.

That Agreement represents the successful conclusion of protracted and difficult negotiations pursuant to Article 4(a) of the Treaty of Peace with Japan concerning the disposition of property of Japan and of its nationals in the Trust Territory, and their claims, including debts, against the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory and the residents thereof, and the disposition in Japan of the property of the Administering Authority and residents of the Trust Terri-

tory, and of their claims, including debts, against Japan and its nationals.

This joint resolution, if enacted, will establish a five-member Micronesian Claims Commission which shall receive, examine, adjudicate, and render final decisions with respect to claims of Micronesian inhabitants of the Trust Territory resulting from the hostilities of the Governments of the United States and Japan during World War II. It will establish also a Micronesian Claims Fund, the whole of which Fund will be \$10 million, and authorize the appropriation of \$5 million to be paid into this Fund by the United States as its share of the Fund.

More specifically, Section 1 of the joint resolution, following the introductory paragraphs summarizing the foregoing, expresses agreement that the United States shall make an *ex gratia* contribution of \$5 million, matching the equivalent contribution of Japan, and that the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory shall pay such meritorious claims as are adjudicated by the Micronesian Claims Commission. Section 1 also defines the term "Micronesian inhabitant of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" as a person who:

- (1) became a citizen of the Trust Territory on July 18, 1947, and who remains a citizen as of the date of filing a claim; or
- (2) if then living would have been eligible for citizenship on July 18, 1947; or
- (3) is the successor, heir, or assign of a person eligible under (1) or (2) above, and who is a citizen of the Trust Territory as of the date of filing a claim.

This definition, while requiring citizenship, does not require residency in the Trust Territory as a prerequisite to filing a claim.

Section 2 authorizes the appropriation to the Trust Territory of \$5 million to be paid into a "Micronesian Claims Fund." That sum is to be in addition to the appropriations authorized by section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, for the civil administration of the Trust Territory and, as such, shall not be included in the computation of funds appropriated and subject to the limitation on appropriations contained in section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended. The High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to create and manage the Micronesian Claims Fund.

Section 2 provides further that as the products of Japan and the services of the Japanese people, having an aggregate value of 1.8 billion yen, are made available to the Government of the Trust Territory, the cash equivalent of such products and services to the extent of approximately \$5 million shall be transferred by the High Commissioner from the funds regularly appropriated to the Trust Territory for supplies or capital improvements to the Micronesian Claims Fund. These funds so transferred, together with the funds authorized to be appropriated, shall constitute the whole of the Micronesian Claims Fund.

Section 3 establishes a Micronesian Claims Commission to be composed of five members such Commission to be under the control and direction of the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. The five members shall be appointed, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, by the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, who shall designate one member as chairman. Two of the members shall be selected from a list of Micronesian citizens nominated by the Congress of Micronesia. The other three members will be selected from the staff of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Subsections (b) and (c) of section 3 provide for the fixing of compensation and allowances of the members and for the appointment, compensation, and allowances of such staff personnel as the Commission may reasonably require for its proper functioning. We visualize the pay of the Com-

missioners as not exceeding the equivalent of a G.S. 15 in the General Salary Schedule.

Subsection (d) of section 3 authorizes the promulgation by the Commission with the approval of the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, of necessary rules and regulations and provide that the final date of filing claims shall not be more than one year after the appointment of the Commission.

Subsection (e) requires that the Commission shall proceed as expeditiously as possible and shall wind up its affairs no later than two years after the expiration of the time for filing claims.

Section 4 provides that the Commission shall have authority to receive and adjudicate, in accordance with the laws of the Trust Territory and international law, claims of the Micronesian inhabitants of the Trust Territory who suffered loss of life, physical injury, and loss of or damage to personal property directly resulting from the hostilities between the Governments of Japan and the United States between December 7, 1941, and the dates of the securing of the various islands of Micronesia by the Armed Forces of the United States.

Subsection (b) of Section 4 requires that six months after its organization, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall report through the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to the Congress concerning its operations, and that upon completion of its work it shall certify to the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Congress a list of all claims allowed, in whole or in part, together with the amount of each claim and the amount awarded thereon; a list of all claims disallowed; and a copy of the decision rendered in each case.

Subsection (c) of Section 4 provides that in the event funds remain in the claim fund after all adjudicated claims are paid, such balance shall be paid into the treasury of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for appropriation by the Congress of Micronesia for the welfare of the people of the Trust Territory. In the event that amounts payable on adjudicated claims exceed the total of \$10 million, the High Commissioner shall determine the necessary proration and make payments in accordance therewith.

Subsection (d) of Section 4 requires that a full release to the United States and Japan in respect to the liability of either or both shall be a prerequisite to the making of a payment to a claimant.

Section 5 authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for the operation and administrative expenditures of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and the Micronesian Claims Commission.

Section 6 provides free assistance in the filing of claims authorized by this resolution and imposes a limitation upon attorney's fees in connection with payments made under the terms of the resolution.

As we have indicated, the enactment of this joint resolution, the subsequent appropriation of the funds authorized thereby, and the performance by the Micronesian Claims Commission of the functions vested in its by this resolution, will result in the final resolution of a difficult matter which has been of substantial concern to the people of Micronesia, the United States, Japan, and the United Nations for almost 25 years. We believe that this joint resolution provides a fair and wholly justified settlement. The sum of \$10 million to be provided as an *ex gratia* contribution in compensation for the losses experienced by the Micronesians is, in our view, sufficient to satisfy the claims which we anticipate will be considered by the Commission. It is likely that the settlement in connection with the death claims will draw most heavily upon the Fund. Since, even though it represents a most difficult task, the

claims will need to be adjudicated in terms of the values of the early 1940's, we have noted the record of claim settlements made in Guam for occurrences paralleling those which give rise to the claims to be adjudicated in the Trust Territory. While such earlier settlements are not seen as binding precedents, the record indicates that the amount typically claimed for a death was \$5,000, or less, with the amounts awarded ranging between \$1,000 and \$4,000, the former being the most frequent award and the latter being untypically high. Based upon our consideration of this matter and having regard to the lapse of time and the effects of inflation, we do not foresee individual death claim settlements in connection with the Trust Territory claims as exceeding \$5,000. It is expected that approximately 1,500 claims arising out of the death of individuals will be the subject of claims presented to the Commission.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed joint resolution and its enactment would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. HICKEL,
Secretary of the Interior.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND JAPAN CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

The United States of America and Japan, Desirous of expressing their common sympathies for the suffering caused by the hostilities of the Second World War to the inhabitants of the Pacific Islands formerly under League of Nations Mandate to Japan and now administered by the United States of America under the United Nations Trusteeship System, as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,

Desirous of making an *ex gratia* contribution to the welfare of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory,

Desirous of concluding a special arrangement, as envisaged in Article 4(a) of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, concerning the disposition of property of Japan and of its nationals in the Trust Territory and their claims, including debts, against the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory and the residents thereof, and the disposition in Japan of property of the Administering Authority and residents of the Trust Territory, and of their claims, including debts, against Japan and its nationals,

Have agreed as follows:

"ARTICLE I

"1. Japan will make available in grants to the United States of America, in its capacity as Administering Authority of the Trust Territory, one billion and eight hundred million yen (¥1,800,000,000), currently computed at five million United States dollars (\$5,000,000), for the purchase in Japan by the Administering Authority of the products of Japan and the services of the Japanese people, to be used for the welfare of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory.

"2. The provision of these products and services shall, unless otherwise agreed upon by the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Japan, be made over a period of three years from the date on which the Japanese budget for the fiscal year 1970 is approved by the Diet, or the date of the appropriation of funds by the Congress of the United States of America under Article II of this Agreement, whichever date is later. The provision of products and services by Japan shall, subject to detailed arrangements to be concluded pursuant to paragraph 3 of this Article, be made in a reasonably even manner during the period.

"3. The Government of the United States of America, as Administering Authority, and

the Government of Japan shall conclude detailed arrangements for the implementation of this Article.

"ARTICLE II

"The Government of the United States of America shall, subject to the appropriation of funds by the Congress of the United States, establish a fund in the amount of five million United States dollars (\$5,000,000), aside from its normal budgetary expenditures for the Trust Territory, to be used for the welfare of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory.

"ARTICLE III

"The United States of America, as Administering Authority, and Japan agree that all questions encompassed by Article 4(a) of the Treaty of Peace with Japan concerning the disposition of property of Japan and its nationals in the Trust Territory, and their claims, including debts, against the Administering Authority and the residents of the Trust Territory, and the disposition in Japan of property of the Administering Authority and the residents of the Trust Territory, and their claims, including debts, against Japan and its nationals, are fully and finally settled.

"ARTICLE IV

"This Agreement shall enter into force on the date of receipt by the Government of the United States of America of a note from the Government of Japan stating that Japan has approved the Agreement in accordance with its legal procedures.

"In witness whereof, the undersigned, being duly authorized by their respective Governments, have signed this Agreement.

"Done at Tokyo, this eighteenth day of April, 1969, in duplicate in the English and Japanese languages, both being equally authentic.

"For the United States of America: _____

"For Japan: _____

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

(Mr. GALLAGHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include pertinent material.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, by request, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to Public Law 403 of the 80th Congress, which provides for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission.

This subject matter comes under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements which will hold early hearings on this legislation.

The executive communication and supporting memoranda are submitted herewith, together with the text of the Joint resolution:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1970.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I submit herewith a proposed draft of an amendment to Public Law 403, Eightieth Congress, which provides for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission.

This amendment would replace the present authorization for appropriations in amounts not exceeding \$200,000 per fiscal year by authorization for appropriations in

amounts not exceeding \$325,000 per fiscal year. It would, thereby, permit the United States to continue to play its international role more effectively in this strategic area of the world.

A detailed description of the Commission's work program and our reasons for proposing this amendment are contained in the enclosed memorandum. The Department of the Interior, which administers the United States territories within the area of the Commission's operations, concurs in this request.

I hope that the Congress can give favorable consideration to the amendment at its earliest convenience.

A similar communication is being sent to the President of the Senate.

The Department of State has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

H. G. TORBERT, Jr.,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

DRAFT OF PROPOSED JOINT RESOLUTION ON SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

Joint resolution to amend Public Law 403, 80th Congress, of January 28, 1948 providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that Section 3(a) of Public Law 403, 80th Congress, entitled "Joint Resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor" as amended (22 U.S.C. 280b) is hereby amended to read as follows:

(a) such sums as may be required annually not to exceed \$325,000 per fiscal year for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the Commission and its auxiliary and subsidiary bodies, in accordance with Article XIV of the Agreement establishing the South Pacific Commission, as amended.

MEMORANDUM

(Justification of Proposed Amendment to Raise Statutory Ceiling on United States Contributions to the South Pacific Commission.)

The proposed draft of an amendment to Public Law 403, Eightieth Congress, would replace current legislation by an authorization for appropriations in an amount not to exceed \$325,000 per fiscal year. Present legislation restricts authority to make appropriations to the South Pacific Commission to \$200,000 annually.

The South Pacific Commission is composed of the Governments of Australia, France, Nauru, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, the United States and Western Samoa. These Governments (excluding Nauru and Western Samoa) administer some 15 non-self-governing and trust territories scattered over an ocean area which encompasses about one-fifth of the earth's surface. The United States-administered territories which benefit from the Commission's activities are American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Micronesia).

The Commission's role is consultative and advisory; it has no political authority and no responsibility for administration of any territory. The Commission specializes in the broad fields of economic, social, and health development and each territory coming within the scope of the Commission has programs in these fields. The work of the Commission is to supplement and assist the

territories in defining problems, particularly those common to the Pacific, mobilizing resources from within and from outside the area where it is not otherwise available. The Commission carries out its work largely through a program of research, technical advice, demonstration, training, and by the collection, publication and distribution of scientific and technical information.

The major part of the funds available annually to the Commission is contributed by the seven participating Governments in the following proportions agreed to in accordance with Article XIV of the Agreement Establishing the South Pacific Commission, as amended: Australia—31%; United States—20%; United Kingdom—17%; Nauru—1%; New Zealand—16%; France—14%, and Western Samoa—1%. The total amount required for the Commission's calendar year 1970 program amounts to \$996,800 of which the United States share will be \$199,360. This amount is to be funded from U.S. fiscal year 1971 appropriation and is under the statutory limitation of \$200,000. To develop fully the important projects listed below, it is estimated that by fiscal year 1972 the U.S. share of the organization's budget will rise above the \$200,000 ceiling. The Department of State anticipates that the new ceiling will permit the United States to continue to play a meaningful role over the next five years.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The limited natural resources and the rapid increase of population in these islands make such economic development as is possible imperative. The Commission's activities in 1970 are concentrated on animal and plant production and protection, and on demonstration, training and research. Projects planned include research and experimentation on reef and lagoon fisheries to determine the reasons for the decrease in useful reef and lagoon fish and plant resources, the methods of increasing such resources, and methods of propagating species which do not become toxic; the continued research into methods of controlling the most serious pest of the area—the rhinoceros beetle which destroys the coconut tree; a demonstration and training program on rat control; the training of Pacific Islands people in economics and business methods; and the introduction of useful commercial crops including tropical pasture and fodder crops.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Current emphasis of the Commission's program in the social development fields is on community education, youth work and language training. Projects for the next few years include: (1) expansion of the program in teaching of English as an introduced language. Specialists on the Commission's staff would continue to provide practical assistance and technical advice to English-language teachers and to prepare reading material for students and instruction material for teachers; and (2) establishment of youth organizations in urban centers to help the territories in combating juvenile delinquency.

HEALTH

The aims of the Commission's health program are to provide medical advice and information, including family planning, to assist in the training of health workers and to conduct research into regional health problems. Projects which the Commission is undertaking in 1970 include special training courses and seminars on dental health, fish poisoning and Hansen's disease.

All of these projects have been formulated in consultation with the territorial governments. They were formally recommended to the Commission by the delegates to the South Pacific Conference held in October

1969 under the auspices of the Commission. They have been carefully developed by the Commission to make the best use of its own funds and, wherever possible, to cooperate with other international organizations in joint programs to avoid duplication of funds and efforts. The Department of State believes that they are practical in nature and will bring direct benefit to the peoples of the area, including those in U.S. administered territories.

The Department of State does not believe that the increase in the ceiling will result in sudden or sharp increases in the Commission's budget since unanimous consent of the participating governments is required on decisions involving the financial assessment of each for the annual budget. The total budget is carefully determined by the member governments in an annual budget session. Individual projects are developed with the advice of territorial delegates and a budgetary figure worked out for each project. These six governments have over the years demonstrated their responsible concern for the work program and for the economical operation of the Commission. Further, the regular annual review by the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate offers the Congress opportunities to review the work of the Commission and the manner of its expenditure of funds.

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 have requested this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the balance of this week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have finished the business for the week and I shall ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday next upon the announcement of the program for next week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day but there are no District bills for consideration.

However, on Monday two appropriation bills will be called up as follows:

Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office appropriation bill, fiscal year 1971. Legislative branch appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971.

Tuesday is Pan American Day and remarks appropriate for the occasion will be in order.

Also on Tuesday there will be for the consideration of the House the Office of Education appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week the program is as follows:

H.R. 16311, the Family Assistance Act of 1970, subject to a rule being granted.

H.R. 16516, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1971, under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

And, if we reach it, H.R. 14385, to provide authority for subsidized trans-

portation for Public Health Service employees to Rockville, Md., under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Of course, I am sure that the Members are aware of the fact that H.R. 4249, the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 might be brought up next week for the purpose of agreeing to the Senate amendments. This is, as all Members know, a very important bill, and we will advise Members further concerning the scheduling of this matter as soon as it is possible to do so.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1970

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday Rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RE- CEIVE MESSAGES AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE LEONARD GEORGE WOLF

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House of the passing last week of my personal friend and our former colleague, Leonard Wolf.

Born in Mazomanie, Wis., and educated at the University of Wisconsin, he served in this body from 1959-61, representing the Second District of Iowa.

While here he showed himself to be a humane and devoted man, and championed in particular a cause to which he was to dedicate the rest of his life, that of alleviating the hunger which afflicts such a large portion of the world's population. He also showed himself to be a far-sighted legislator in championing draft reform a full decade before congressional action was finally begun to correct the inequities of our Selective Service System.

Following his service in this body he was appointed director of the "food for peace" program in Brazil, and subsequently coordinated famine relief in India, and headed the Agency for International Development's war on hunger in Latin America.

In June of 1968, he became director of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, a post which he ably filled until his death. Throughout his career he exhibited the greatest concern for the plight of the hungry and the starving, and worked to enlist the support of the American people in solving the international food problem.

In recent years he had been instrumental in establishing a program of Walks for Development across the Nation, a project which actively involves the young people of America in contributing to the welfare of the poor people both in this country and abroad. These walks, which are the product of local student initiative, give the young people an opportunity to publicly demonstrate their concern and to translate it into positive action. The students enlist the support and interest of all groups in the community behind their efforts, and contribute the money they earn to projects chosen by themselves after careful research.

Due largely to "Len's" tireless enthusiasm and energy, the first 15 months of the program witnessed over 129,000 walkers raise more than a million dollars. In this short time, his idea had captured the imagination of the entire Nation, and had grown so rapidly that at the time of his death, over 150 separate walks had been scheduled for the coming spring. I know he must have felt a great deal of personal satisfaction in seeing the youth join in this great humane cause.

It is a great loss to the Nation that this dedicated, imaginative, and productive life was ended at the most untimely age of 44.

My wife, Ann, joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his lovely and courageous wife, Marilyn, and their fine children, Ann Marilyn, Jennifer Elizabeth, and Steven Michael.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I came to the Congress in the same year as Leonard Wolf. We were elected to the Congress in the same election from Iowa and we came here in 1959.

As the gentleman now in the well has said, from the very beginning he was very much interested in food and in helping to alleviate hunger for people not only of

the United States but also of the world. His accomplishments in this field were many and proved him to be a friend of millions of people.

He spent the balance of his life on these kinds of projects and demonstrated great compassion for his fellow man.

Then, he was taken as a young man by that dreaded disease that respects no age.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will not repeat all the things that the gentleman in the well has said, but my wife and I join in expressing our sincere condolences to his family in their grave hour of adjustment and sorrow.

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

Mr. CULVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Iowa for having taken this time in paying tribute to our late colleague, Leonard Wolf.

Having come to Congress at the same time as Leonard Wolf, I came to know him not only as a fellow legislator but as a good friend.

Mr. Speaker, Len Wolf's qualities were many, but I particularly recall his great sense of humor and his real sense of compassion for those in great need. He expressed this sense of compassion in his life by dedicating his energies and talent to encouraging efforts to cope with the problems of hunger both in our country and in less developed parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to have been a friend and colleague of Len Wolf and I, too, would like to join in expressing my tribute to his memory and my profound sympathy to his wife and to their children.

Mr. CULVER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I join in commending the gentleman in the well for taking this time today to pay tribute to our former colleague, Leonard Wolf.

It was my privilege to come to Congress in the 86th Congress together with several of the other Members who have spoken here today. Surely we can all agree that Len Wolf had great qualities of leadership and dedication. He gave living meaning to the spirit of democracy. He believed in the nobility of man. He believed in the nobility of our system of government.

In the 2 brief years he was here, I remember the projects that he started and the ideas that he introduced. He was a prophet before his time. A decade ago he realized that the whole world would have to become committed to eradicating hunger and the resulting suffering of millions of our fellow men.

Surely today as we look around the world and the greater awareness of this problem, we will recall the many speeches, efforts and programs that he introduced in this Congress because of his deep compassion for humanity.

It was a privilege to serve in the Congress even for 2 fleeting years with a man like Len Wolf, simply because, in

every experience with him, you could see the great humility that he had, and yet feel his confidence in the future. He inspired men. He gave all of us a large measure of confidence because of his enthusiasm.

The gentleman who spoke before me spoke of his good humor. He knew how to ease tensions when people got uptight with their problems. It seems to me we were all very fortunate to have been able to serve with him.

Mrs. Pucinski joins me in extending to the family of our departed colleague our most deep and sincere condolences. I can only say that surely, when we look at the great record that he wrote here, his epithet may well be "Len Wolf dared to be different." He was not one to sit around and bemoan circumstances. He was a young fellow who created, dared to suggest new ideas at a time when they were perhaps not appreciated immediately, as deserved to be. But they challenged the imagination, they all came to fruition.

I congratulate my colleague for taking this time so we can pay tribute to him today.

Mr. CULVER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in 1958 a great many new Members were elected to the Congress of the United States. I don't think such a large number of a new breed had ever before been elected to Congress. This new group was intelligent, articulate, idealistic, tough, and dedicated to the proposition of improving the lot of all of the people of the United States.

Of these Members, none was more intelligent, none was more articulate, none was more idealistic, none tougher, and certainly none more dedicated than my very great and good friend, Len Wolf.

If I remember correctly, the Members of the 86th Congress Club elected him one of our officers. In the 1960 election the Congress and the Nation suffered a great loss in the defeat of Leonard Wolf. This year we all suffered a greater loss because the United States of America needs leaders like Leonard Wolf.

The Congress and the Nation shares the loss of the Wolf family, and we extend to them our deepest and our great sympathy. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CULVER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. CULVER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to commend my colleague from Iowa for caring enough to take this time to express his admiration for and sorrow over the untimely death of Leonard Wolf. I was not privileged to know Leonard Wolf quite so long as some of our colleagues, including the gentleman in the well. About 1 year ago, by chance I participated in one of the walks that have been described by my colleague in the well.

I can see Len Wolf now, standing there, speaking to the huge throng—mostly of young people, although not exclusively—and from the very edge of the crowd one could detect unmistakably the dedication and deeply felt belief in the project that he was giving his life to. Then I spoke to Len Wolf on several occasions after that and never once did I fail to sense that inner glow of dedication that has been described here.

So I express my sorrow to his family. I recall the cartoon that appeared in the Pogo strip after the death of President Kennedy. It showed two little characters in a rowboat which said "JFK." It was Christmastime. One said to the other, "It just does not seem like Christmas." The other said, "Yes, it has been a year when we have lost so much."

The other one said, "No, we did not lose it. We just gave it back after using it a while." So our sorrow is because the gift to mankind that was Len Wolf was with us for so brief a time.

My sorrow goes to his family, and my gratitude goes to them for sharing him with the country and with all those who share in his ideals.

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

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues. It was also my privilege to come to Washington, D.C., in 1959 as one of the freshman Congressmen, and to serve with Leonard Wolf. He immediately made a great impression upon all of us because of his dedication and devotion to public service.

I watched Leonard Wolf throughout the years. It seems only a few weeks ago that we had a special order commemorating the work of Leonard Wolf who inspired so many people to do something about hunger in the world.

I spoke to Leonard Wolf in the House lobby a little while later, and he seemed to be in such good health that it was a shock to me to hear of his passing.

Leonard Wolf was an inspiring young man and he was an idealist, but he was also realistic. The youngsters had their hunger march in my district, and they numbered in the thousands. That was a result of the work that a young man like Leonard Wolf was doing.

We all go through life and, as someone once said, in everyone's life a little rain must fall, but with—the sadness of the passing of Leonard Wolf we also have the consolation that here was a man who came amongst us and did, as so well expressed in the immortal words of Daniel Webster.

Let us see also whether we in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Leonard Wolf did just that.

Mrs. Burke joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to his beloved wife and family.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULVER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this tribute to a great man, to the late Congressman Leonard Wolf. Having come in the 86th Congress at the same time as Leonard did, I got to know him very intimately. He served on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, where he performed very constructive service. He participated actively and vigorously in all committee sessions and deliberations.

Several months after Leonard arrived here in 1959, during the spring recess, a distinguished reporter from the New York Times, Cabell Phillips, accompanied Leonard on a tour of his district in Iowa and wrote a very interesting article about the observations that Congressman Wolf made, and in addition to that the reaction of his constituents. I would like to quote a few sentences from this article, which indicates that on the night before the tour started, over coffee late on the night of their arrival in Dubuque, Congressman Wolf told the New York Times reporter the following:

My outlook is frankly internationalist. I stressed it in my campaign and I've taken as active a part as I could in foreign policy matters in the three months I've been in Congress.

My feeling is that there's nothing more important for humanity today than seeing to it we don't destroy ourselves and everything else in another war. This country has got to lead the way in that—nobody else can do it.

That epitomized what Leonard Wolf tried to do both in the House of Representatives and in his subsequent work which he carried on so effectively during his lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this entire article by Cabell Phillips, which was printed in the New York Times Magazine about 10 years ago today, on April 12, 1959, be printed as a part of my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

A CONGRESSMAN AT HOME
(By Cabell Phillips)

Congressmen are back in their offices in Washington this week after the ten-day Eastern recess, which provided many of them with the first opportunity for serious fence-mending and pulse-taking among their constituents since the session began last January. One such is Representative Leonard G. Wolf of the Second Iowa Congressional District.

An exuberant 32-year-old, Len Wolf is the first Democrat to serve his staunchly Republican district in more than twenty years, and a devout internationalist who paid his own way on a fact-finding tour of Europe and Russia last year. I went along on his visit home to see the fence-mending process and—particularly—to learn what the people in a presumably typical slice of the Middle West feel about the current state of our foreign affairs.

"You'll find that I'm a pretty controversial fellow out here," he told me over coffee late

on the night of our arrival in Dubuque, where his tour was to start. "Years ago this used to be isolationist country. That label doesn't mean much any more. But my predecessor, who represented this district for five straight terms, generally took a pretty dim view of such things as foreign aid and co-operation with other nations through the U. N.

"My outlook is frankly internationalist. I stressed it in my campaign and I've taken as active a part as I could in foreign policy matters in the three months I've been in Congress.

"My feeling is," he went on earnestly, "that there's nothing more important for humanity today than seeing to it we don't destroy ourselves and everything else in another war. This country has got to lead the way in that—nobody else can do it. And that means that we have got to do a hell of a lot more than we have done in resisting Communist expansion and in helping the emerging new nations of Asia and Africa to stand on their own feet.

"I can't say I got any clear 'mandate' on that in the election. My margin of victory was just barely over 1 per cent, and I'm still breathing hard. I think most of my people are with me, but I can't be sure. Anyway, that's what I'm here to find out."

Congressman Wolf's district, with a population of 414,000, comprises twelve counties in the northeast corner of the state, stretching about 150 miles southward from the Minnesota border and, at its widest, some 100 miles westward from the Mississippi River. Its only cities are Dubuque, Cedar Rapids and Clinton, but industrially it is the most important district in the state, with manufactures valued at \$303,000,000 annually.

Beyond the cities the landscape stretches in limitless vistas of rolling prairie dotted here and there by villages and small towns, with occasional clumps of trees on the high land and with rivers and streams snaking through the valleys. This is corn-hog country, among the best anywhere in the world. These incredibly fertile stretches of black glacial loam yield annual harvests of up to 100 bushels of corn per acre. Town and country, the impression you get is of substantial middle-class well being.

To keep in touch with his constituents, Congressman Wolf has converted a house trailer into a mobile Congressional office, with a private conference room in one end, a waiting room in the other. At regular intervals his resident administrative assistant, Al Link, a former Dubuque newspaper man, hauls the trailer around the district, setting up shop in one small town after another.

The trailer was our portable headquarters for the pulse-taking tour. After a 6:30 factory gate appearance at the John Deere works on the morning after our arrival in Dubuque, we set off westward for Manchester, a county seat of about 5,000 population. Our itinerary had been announced in the weekly paper a few days earlier and when we pulled up to the parking space reserved for us before the courthouse a little after 9 o'clock a score of men and women, most of them farmers, to judge by their mud-stained galoshes and striped overalls, were waiting for us.

The Congressman greeted them generally, shaking hands all around, calling most of them by name, asking about their crops, their infirmities, their families. His natty attire and brisk youthfulness were in sharp contrast to the stolid, weatherbeaten appearance of his visitors, but they seemed to respond warmly to his presence.

"Come on in out of the cold, folks," he said, leading the way to the trailer, "and let's get this show on the road. Al, you be sure to get everybody to sign the guest book so we can make certain they are on our mailing list . . . Now, who's first?"

For the next three hours Len Wolf took the political pulse of some forty of his constituents. Singly and in groups, often a husband and wife with their brood of children, they filed through the doors and sat for a few minutes or as much as half an hour.

Some just wanted to say a friendly "hello" and to assure their young Congressman that he was "doing fine." Some came by for no better reason than to salve their self importance. Some came to complain and to criticize. But mostly they came with problems, real or imagined, that involved them in some way with the great, distant bureaucracy in Washington.

"Congressman, there's four of us families on his mail route that have to go as much as half a mile to our boxes. We've talked to the postmaster about it, but he says . . ."

"I'm a Purple Heart veteran from the First World War, Congressman. Now, I just got this letter from the Veterans Administration . . ."

"My boy, here, Mr. Wolf, wants to go to the Naval Academy next year . . ."

"I hope you'll vote against that bill to make us pay a dollar and a quarter an hour for farm labor . . ."

"I had a heart attack last winter, Congressman, and if my boy has to go up for the draft I just don't know how we are going to make out . . ."

From early morning to late at night, in one small town after another, the routine often interspersed with a Lions Club luncheon or an impromptu stop at a farm home, we heard hundreds of such observations and petitions as these during the week we were on the road. Rarely did a visitor broach a subject touching on foreign policy, but frequently the Congressman would bring the matter up himself, and we were often surprised by the intensity of the response.

"A summit conference? Sure, why the hell not? What have we got to lose? The cold war don't get any colder as long as we and the Russians sit and glare at each other there in Berlin and sort of dare each other to make the first move."

This was from a small town auto dealer, who added that his information was "pretty skimpy, because there's not much to read about these things in our papers, you know."

Often, discussion of the Berlin crisis elicited a note of skepticism: "I just wonder if it's worth going to war over," a gray-haired farmer with two draft-age sons observed. But most frequently we were told such things as: "We can't afford to back up one inch there, that's for certain"; or, "If we let the Russians push us around in Berlin they'll wind up pushing us out of Germany and everywhere else"; or, "I'm glad to see Eisenhower has got his mad up enough to stand his ground at last. I thought he'd never get around to it."

Strangely, to me at least, there seemed very little apprehension about the prospect of another war. In the district there are many German, Czech and Scandinavian families with strong roots in Europe and each has had at least one close kinsman soldiering somewhere in the world during the last ten or fifteen years. Yet, while their political esteem for President Eisenhower runs the gamut from active dislike to high praise, they all seem to have faith in his ability to keep us out of war.

"I think those Russians are just pulling a bluff in all this war talk," said Joe Holt-haus, who raises hogs and beef cattle on 220 acres just outside of Oelwein, and with whom we had an impromptu 7 o'clock breakfast one morning.

"Look what the paper says this morning." He held up a copy of the Oelwein Daily Register with an eight-column banner proclaiming: "McElroy says U.S. is invincible."

"Well, I figure that's just about right, and that the Russians know it. We've got bases all around them—eighty-seven I think I read somewhere. If they send up a plane or a rocket against us we can loose planes or rockets against them from all those bases.

"They won't want a war as long as we keep strong ourselves. I think Ike is handling it just about right."

The topic on which they were most articulate was foreign aid, for this is something they can translate into terms of their own experience. In general, they are opposed to the idea of the Government handing out large sums in grants to foreign powers—"You give a man something, he doesn't appreciate it; but if you sell it to him, or make him a loan, he respects you. We gave Nehru \$100,000,000 around Christmas time, and I can't see that we have made any better friends of the Indians."

On the other hand, they seemed generally to accept the obligation of the United States, or even of the United Nations, to help the underdeveloped nations of the world to get on their feet; this country, they said, was once a struggling colonial nation itself.

But why, many of them asked, could not our vast and so-far useless food surplus be used instead of dollars to further our mutual aid program?

"Why can't we send them corn and wheat and dried milk and even processed meat instead of money?" one asked. "Most of those people over there can't do a decent day's work because they are hungry all the time. And here we sit with more than we know what to do with. If they had enough food in their bellies they could build the roads and the dams and the things they need instead of our building them for them."

They were keenly interested in the Congressman's plan to introduce legislation to expand the operations of Public Law 480, which provides for a limited use of agricultural surpluses in the foreign aid program. Many, it turned out, had written to him in Washington about this. For this is a subject that has been much discussed in farm organization bulletins.

More often than not, the Congressman's visitors protested embarrassedly that they just didn't keep up very much with what went on in the world beyond their own farm gates. But occasionally his probing would strike an unexpectedly sensitive nerve, as it did one night in the little city of Vinton. His visitor at the moment was a stolid, leather-complexioned farmer he called Emil. When the business at hand was concluded the Congressman tilted his chair back and asked speculatively:

"How do you think we are doing in the field of foreign affairs, Emil? Do you have any special thoughts or worries about that?"

The older man's forehead was furrowed momentarily in thought, then he said:

"You want to know what I'm worried about, Len? It's that we ain't getting anywhere with the Russians on this atom bomb testing. I'm as sure as we are setting right here that if we keep it up—and they keep it up—all that fall-out is going to affect our land. It's going to get into the crops we grow and it's going to get into our hogs and cattle, and God knows what it will do."

The Congressman's chair came down with a bang.

"Say, that's an interesting viewpoint, Emil. How much are other people around here worried about this? . . . Let's call in some of these other folks waiting in the other room there and let's kick it around some."

He opened the door to the waiting room of his trailer, where a dozen men and women were awaiting their turn to see him.

"Some of you folks crowd in here," he called. "Emil was just telling me that one of the things he's most concerned about is what the fall-out from atomic explosions

might do to a farmer's crops and his cattle. Any of the rest of you been thinking about that?"

"You danged right we have over in my neighborhood," an overalled farmer said belligerently. "We were talking about it at the Farmers Union meeting just the other night. 'Course, you can't see where its done any harm now. But the thing about this stuff, as I read it, is it creeps up on you, and once you've got it, or once it gets into your soil, its there for good."

"I read in the paper the other day," a woman broke in, "that Iowa and Minnesota get more of this strontium 90 than any other states in the union. It gets into the milk . . ."

"Looks to me," said another, "that the Russians are willing to call a halt but that our people ain't. Why should that be?"

"You know you can't trust the Russians. Look what they are trying to do in Berlin right now * * *"

"All right; but if they sign an agreement not to fire off any more bombs, and then they do fire one, we've got ways of finding out about it * * *"

"One thing for sure, the United States ought not to be the one to back away from trying to get an agreement on this thing."

After about ten minutes of this lively colloquy the Congressman held up his hands for quiet.

"Okay, okay," he said. "This is real news to me, to find out how you feel about this. I agree with you that it's a terribly important problem. Now what can I, as a freshman Congressman, do about it? What do you think I ought to try to do about it? * * * Emil?"

"Well, I don't hardly know, Len. If we could just get to some sort of understanding with the Russians . . ."

In a week of such give and take as this, repeated many times a day in communities all over his district, Congressman Wolf did not pick up many usable ideas on what to do about the nation's ills, but he got a vivid picture of which of those ills are closest to the hearts and minds of his constituents. Price supports, mounting surpluses of corn and wheat, the price of hogs and milk, unemployment and inflation, how to get a job as a mail carrier—these are universal concerns.

But a great many of those who came to see him—one in four or five, perhaps—voiced more cosmic worries. Volubly sometimes, haltingly at others, rarely with sharp insight and definition, they talked feelingly of things beyond the limits of their own creek bottoms and townships.

"What they want," Representative Wolf said at the end of his visit, "is more information about these things than they are getting from their local newspapers and radio and television stations. They have begun to see that the problems of Berlin, of the underdeveloped nations, of international control of atomic energy all have meaning for them as farmers and businessmen.

"I'm going to give very serious thought in the next few weeks to trying to set up a series of foreign affairs forums for them, bring out some experts from Washington. I believe it would go over big."

These people's range of interests has expanded substantially in the past ten years—since, say, an oldest boy came home from Korea or since they have become aware of the brutal paradox of their bulging grain bins and the starving masses of Asia.

They may not be attuned to the subtler nuances of the international power struggle, but they firmly believe that American abundance is a good currency with which to buy world peace. Food, they have been told, is our greatest natural resource, and the only one that is replenishable year after year.

Some way, somehow, they believe, the answer to the cold war lies in their hands.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my other colleagues in paying tribute to a very dedicated man we shall sorely miss and the Nation will miss.

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

Mr. CULVER. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, after consultation early last week with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER), I, on his behalf, announced for the first time the passing of our friend and former colleague Leonard Wolf.

He was a very close friend of mine, and there is little I can add, I fear, to the eloquence and the warm and thoughtful comments of my colleagues on his life, times, and the meaning and the dedication of his service to human kind.

I was glad that my colleague who just preceded me suggested, in addition to his deep and lasting concern for the poor and hungry, that he had a very deep and lasting concern also for the cause of world peace.

When he left the Congress, many of us did not see him very often, because for years he was in the remote areas of Brazil attending to one of the most needful areas of the world in terms of food and hunger. He was the one who, more than anyone else was responsible for a program called "Ninos," a program serving the needs of children so that they might live rather than die from malnutrition and hunger.

His work at home in this country, in Brazil, and in India—all these things—I believe are already in the public record and are well known. Less well known, perhaps, is that he loved the Congress so well. He spearheaded, with one or two others, the very recent formation of the Association of Former Congressmen. I hope that, along with organizations like the Freedom from Hunger Foundation, this association will live and prosper, for it, in a very real sense, will be a monument and a testimonial to Leonard Wolf.

Leonard meant a great deal to me. He was from the very area of the country I am from. He was born in my district, and on last Wednesday he was returned, and his remains were laid to rest there for the last time, at the age of 44.

I believe that all who knew him and were aware of what he did for this country and for the causes in which he believed, know that his spirit will live very much longer.

My wife, Dorothy, and I would like to extend our sympathy to his wife, Lyn, to his beautiful children, to his brothers, and sisters, and a really great group of people, his relatives, his friends, and close working associates, all of whom mourn his passing and miss the inspiration of his living.

At this point, I would ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD two items

that have been sent to me, which speak of the kind of man Len was and the kind of work he did. The first—a more personal statement—was sent to me by Mr. Frank Wallick, editor of the UAW Washington Report. Mr. Wallick worked with Len on Young World Development activities, and, upon learning of Len's death, wrote the following letter to the editor of the Madison, Wis., Capital Times. The second is an editorial which appeared, also in the Capital Times, commenting on Len.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 31, 1970.

EDITOR,
The Capital Times,
Madison, Wis.

DEAR SIR: The death of Leonard Wolf was a tragic loss for the nation for many reasons, but there is one aspect to his death which I hope many of the people in the Madison area will recall. Len Wolf, as the prime organizer of the hunger marches, did much to galvanize the energy and enthusiasm of young people in this country. He reached into the political boondocks with an idea which gave young people something to do. He had boundless energy and zest for life himself and much of this he managed to transfer to others.

I sat in many meetings with Len as a representative for the UAW on the Freedom from Hunger Foundation, which Len brought back to life. There are meetings that drone on for hours and rarely accomplish anything worthwhile, but there was never a dull moment when Len was present. He was beside himself with joy and excitement as he saw the youth marches grow and catch on. And there were something. Such a simple idea, but what a marvelous way to use and build on the idealism of young people. My own 15 year old daughter marched in Washington and collected over \$100 and it was for her the high point of an otherwise dreary year for a bewildered adolescent. I am sure that thousands upon thousands of other American young people must have had the same experience.

If there is any one monument we can raise for Len Wolf, it is to continue the youth marches as a practical way to give outlets to young people who yearn to do something.

Sincerely,

FRANK WALLICK,
Editor, UAW Washington Report.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times,
Mar. 30, 1970]

LEN WOLF: A GOOD MAN DIES

Mazomanie-born Leonard Wolf died Saturday in a Washington hospital after a lengthy battle with cancer. Death at 44 is untimely for any man, but in the case of Mr. Wolf it cut short a unique career of service to this his fellow men.

Len Wolf was one of the several thousand young World War II GI's who flooded the University of Wisconsin campus after the war and gave Wisconsin an elan and a yeasty air of intellectual challenge. He served as a representative of Iowa's Second Congressional District in 1959-61. President Kennedy appointed him to head the Food For Peace Program in Brazil, and served from 1961-65.

At the time of his death he was the executive director of the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, and supervised the "Hunger Walk" here and elsewhere in 1968 and 1969.

He came to Madison to personally take part the first 31-mile hike and walked more than one-third of the route, in a driving rain.

The world is poorer because of the death of Len Wolf.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY).

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wolf visited our office on several occasions and I remember him as a pleasant and good man. He brightened our office considerably with his thoughtfulness and was held in high respect by all of us and in particular by my caseworker, Mrs. Ruth Witte, who was a former and devoted staff member of his.

We are all saddened over his untimely loss and extend to his family our sincere sympathy.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I learned with shock and sorrow of the passing of our former colleague, the Honorable Leonard Wolf, who represented the Second District of Iowa during the 86th Congress. At the age of 44, he was at the height of his powers. His death is a great and genuine loss to the people and causes he served.

Leonard represented a great agricultural district. He was born on a farm and graduated from the University of Wisconsin with a degree in agricultural economics. Leonard and I shared an interest and concern with rural problems. He was acutely aware of the unmet basic needs of much of the world's population and determined to do what he could to help alleviate such deprivation.

Although his service was brief, Leonard loved this House. His dedication was expressed in his zealous efforts and his spirit of cooperativeness which won him the respect and affection of his colleagues.

Subsequent to his service in the House, Leonard was appointed special assistant to the International Cooperation Administration Mission in Brazil. He devoted 9 years to helping alleviate hunger and starvation in remote areas of Brazil in the food-for-peace program. He also worked in the food program for India and in our own country for the Freedom from Hunger Foundation.

Leonard Wolf's death was untimely but the brief years of his life were spent fruitfully. His work stands as a monument not only to himself but to the cause of mankind. May this knowledge comfort his widow and their three children, to whom I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of sadness that I learned of the tragic and untimely passing of my good friend and former colleague, Congressman Len Wolf of Iowa.

The State of Iowa—and indeed this country and the world—lost an able and devoted leader with the passing of Len Wolf.

A native of Wisconsin, a graduate of agricultural economics of the University of Wisconsin, Len Wolf spent most of his adult life in the great farm belt of the United States.

It was his background and his training and most importantly, his compassion, which led him to devote most of his life in the effort to eradicate world hunger. As

a Congressman and, later as Director of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, the elimination of world hunger was the single most important goal of Len Wolf's life.

I think it appropriate that we remember Len Wolf for what he was: a gifted and compassionate human being who devoted his life to the service of his fellow man to alleviating that most ancient of human miseries—hunger.

Mrs. Boggs joins me in mourning the loss of a good friend and a remarkable man.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness in learning of the passing of my dear friend and former colleague Len Wolf. It was a real privilege to know and to serve in this great body with Len. He was a fine and gentle person. He had a great compassion for his fellow man. His work in the food-for-peace program was a great testimony to his personal desire to help people, poor people. He was an important Member of Congress in many other ways. He contributed much to the space program. He was an outstanding spokesman for our needed domestic programs. He was a wonderful father and husband. I hope his family will take great comfort in the fact that Len was loved and respected by all who knew him. I want to thank my friend Mr. CULVER for taking this time to pay tribute to the life and memory of Len Wolf and to extend deepest sympathy to all the members of his family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the passing of the late Leonard Wolf.

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

There was no objection.

EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, earlier today our Appropriation Committee voted out the education portion of the regular HEW bill approximating \$4 billion. This funds all the activities directly connected with and administered by the U.S. Office of Education.

This is by no means the extent to which the Federal Government is funding activities in the field of education. There is a good deal more.

Earlier this year I read into the record a compilation of all Federal expenditures for research and on another occasion all those Federal expenditures for health.

Now today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to do the same for education. The Federal budget for fiscal year 1971 provides for a total expenditure of \$7,343,487,000 broken down as follows:

THE JUDICIARY

(In thousands)

	Fiscal 1969 actual	Fiscal 1970 esti- mated	Fiscal 1971 esti- mated
Federal Judicial Center, salaries and expenses: Education and training.....	\$36	\$120	\$165

The Center is charged with the responsibility for furthering the development and adoption of improved judicial administration in the courts of the United States.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

	1969 actual	1970 esti- mated	1971 esti- mated
Appalachian regional de- velopment programs: Vo- cational education facilities.....	\$13,990	\$25,138	\$25,000

Grants are made to States and local districts within the Appalachian region for the construction and equipment of vocational education facilities in Appalachia. Vocational education facilities are key elements for the training and upgrading of potential and existing labor force entrants in skills required in commercial and other vocations. Grants are administered through the Office of Education.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

(In thousands)

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Economic Opportunity Pro- gram: Child development programs (delegated to Department of Health, Education, and Welfare):			
Headstart.....	\$338,200	\$328,200	\$332,400
Follow Through.....	14,300	32,200	38,600
Total.....	352,500	360,400	371,000

Headstart. Operated under delegation agreement by the Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this program is a major element of the administration's emphasis on child development during the first 5 years of life. Funding for experimental programs will permit expansion of testing and evaluation of different program models and some locally developed experimentation.

Follow Through. This program is designed to develop more effective educational techniques for poor children in the early elementary years. Follow Through is delegated to the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Under an amendment to the Philippine war damage legislation of 1963, a special fund for education derived from the Philippine war damage claims fund has been established to be used as jointly determined by the two Presidents for the purpose of furthering educational pro-

grams to the mutual advantage of both countries.

PEACE CORPS
[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Gifts and donations, school partnership program.....	\$342	\$375	\$400
Philippine education program: Assistance to secondary education project.....	6,154		
Science high school project.....		951	
Projects being negotiated.....			1,886
Total obligations.....	6,154	951	1,886

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—EXTENSION SERVICE
[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses: Payments to States and Puerto Rico: Payments for cooperative agricultural extension work under Smith-Lever Act.....	\$79,212	\$111,269	\$147,141
Payments and contracts under the Agricultural Marketing Act.....	1,501	1,462	1,451
Payments for cooperative extension work under the District of Columbia Public Education Act.....	72	360	672
Retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents.....	9,478	10,240	13,515
Penalty mail.....	3,299	3,400	3,617
Federal Extension Service.....	3,483	4,923	5,252
Total program costs, funded.....	97,045	131,654	171,648
Change in selected resources.....	40	80	3
Total obligations.....	97,085	131,734	171,651

The primary function of the nationwide system of cooperative extension work is out-of-school applied education in agriculture, home economics, and related subjects. This educational work takes research results, technological advancements, and situation and program facts of the Department, the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations, and incorporates them into a national educational program for action. In its educational role, the Service interprets, disseminates, and encourages practical use of knowledge. It transmits information from researchers to the people.

Payments to States and Puerto Rico. Funds appropriated under the Smith-Lever Act for payments to States and Puerto Rico are distributed primarily on the basis of farm and rural population and to a limited degree on the basis of special problems and needs. Funds appropriated under the Agricultural Marketing Act for educational work in marketing are distributed to the States and Puerto Rico on a matching basis under approved projects and on the basis of contracts. Funds are used primarily for the employment of State and county extension workers who work with rural families, marketing concerns, and others by providing advice and assistance in the application of improved methods involved in production, marketing, and family living. They assist local leadership to de-

termine extension programs of work. Work with youth is accomplished largely through 4-H clubs. Funds also provide for Federal program support. Extension agents are paid from Federal, State, and county sources. The increase in this item will be used: to expand the nutrition education program for the poor, to expand extension services for State and multi-county rural development activities, to strengthen extension services in the District of Columbia for nutrition education and family living, and to provide for increased costs of program operations.

Federal Extension Service. The Service provides leadership, counsel, and assistance to the States and Puerto Rico in developing extension programs, improved teaching methods, efficient use of available resources, evaluation of programs, inservice training for extension personnel, and administrative services. The Service also coordinates the educational activities of other agencies of the Department. The increase provides for evaluation and pilot studies related to the nutrition and rural development programs and support of a cooperative agreement needed in carrying out the extension program in the District of Columbia.

ADVANCES AND REIMBURSEMENTS

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Cooperation with Bureau of Indian Affairs on extension program with Indians.....	\$32	\$36	\$36
Cooperation with Department of Defense on extension program work in rural defense information and education program.....	268	298	266
Teaching materials developed and Provided State extension services under cooperative agreement on a cost-sharing basis.....	21	78	78

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Ocean Shipping, Maritime Administration—maritime training: Merchant marine cadet training.....	\$5,583	\$6,415	\$6,800
Property transferred in without charge.....	-39		
Total program costs, funded.....	5,544	6,415	6,800
Change in selected resources.....	-204	-46	
Total obligations.....	5,339	6,369	6,000

The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., trains cadets for service as officers in the U.S. merchant marine. A 4-year course is provided, including 1 year of sea duty, designed to qualify graduates for licenses as deck or engine officers.

The Academy provides subsistence, quarters, tuition, uniform, and textbook allowances, and medical and dental care for the cadets in attendance at the Academy. A small cadet training liaison

group in Washington, D.C., provides staff assistance to the Maritime Administrator on training matters and assists in the selection and appointment of cadets.

STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Grants to State marine schools	\$375	\$375	\$375
Uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence of cadets.....	924	1,021	1,058
Maintenance and repair of vessels.....	821	625	977
Total operating costs.....	2,120	2,021	2,410
Property transferred in without charge.....	-160		
Total program costs, funded.....	1,959	2,021	2,410
Change in selected resources.....	29	-66	
Total obligations.....	1,989	1,955	2,410

The States of California, Maine, Massachusetts, New York, and Texas maintain schools for the training of merchant marine officers with Federal assistance given in the form of: direct grants of \$75,000, if matched by State appropriations and if out-of-State students are enrolled; allowance to cadets for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence; and repairs to Federal training vessels on loan to the schools.

The Maritime Academy Act of 1958 provides contract authority for the Secretary of Commerce to enter into agreements with States to provide the grants and allowances over a 4-year period. This act provides contract authority without limit as to the amount or fiscal year. The new budget authority includes the estimated obligations to be incurred under this authority. Maintenance and repair of training vessels are accomplished through annual appropriations.

STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Maintenance and repair of vessels.....		\$145	

A supplemental appropriation will be required for unanticipated repairs of damage to a training vessel for use in connection with the State marine school program.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
The Panama Canal, Canal Zone Government operating expenses, education.....	\$13,005	\$13,805	\$14,956

This provides for the operation of schools, kindergarten through college, for the dependents of Canal Zone residents, the dependents of U.S.-citizen Government employees residing in the Republic of Panama, and on a space available basis, certain other residents of the Republic of Panama. There are two school systems, one for U.S. citizens,

the other, which is conducted in the Spanish language, for Panamanians and other non-U.S. citizens. There also are specialized facilities for the handicapped.

CAPITAL OUTLAY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS—EDUCATION

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Improvements and replacements to educational facilities.....	\$450	\$606	\$242

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Health Services and Mental Health Administration: St. Elizabeths Hospital: Training and education.....	\$1,179		

During 1969, a portion of the financial support for the National Center's Division of Intramural Training was derived from this activity, with the remainder of the program funded under the manpower development activity of the mental health appropriation. The function of the division is to provide multidisciplinary clinical training for professional and ancillary personnel engaged in or interested in mental health activities. Effective in 1970, all of the funding for the Division of Intramural Training is being derived from the mental health appropriation.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
National Cancer Institute—Grants:			
Fellowships.....	\$4,366	\$3,610	\$3,348
Training.....	11,636	10,774	10,747

Postdoctoral and special fellowships and career award and career development fellowships will be supported.

Grants are awarded to accredited schools for the improvement of instruction in the curriculum; clinical training grants are awarded for training in such fields as surgery, pathology, radiobiology, radiotherapy, and internal medicine; and grants are awarded to research training centers for individual traineeships.

NATIONAL HEART AND LUNG INSTITUTE—GRANTS

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Fellowships.....	\$6,933	\$6,563	\$6,195
Training.....	18,800	16,943	17,643

Note: Fellowship awards will be supported.

For undergraduate training, funds will provide assistance to schools of medicine, osteopathy, and public health. Funds will also provide for grants for graduate research and clinical training.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH—GRANTS

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Fellowships.....	\$1,765	\$1,529	\$1,367
Training.....	5,492	5,206	5,206

Funds for fellowships are used for support of clinical and basic research training. Applications under this program are for special fellowships, predoctoral and postdoctoral fellowships, and career development and career awards.

Training funds are the principal means of meeting the need for dental research and academic personnel in the dental schools to teach clinical and basic sciences and to conduct research.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND METABOLIC DISEASES—GRANTS

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Fellowships.....	\$6,737	\$5,482	\$5,094
Training.....	16,109	15,072	15,072

Fellowships will be supported and grants will be awarded to accredited schools for the improvement of instruction.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES AND STROKE—GRANTS

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Fellowships.....	\$3,630	\$2,657	\$2,595
Training.....	19,502	14,300	14,300

Fellowships and graduate training grants will be supported. The latter are made to training institutions to establish and improve programs to train teachers and clinical investigators in neurology, ophthalmology, and otology. Traineeships will be awarded to individuals for specialized postgraduate training.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES—GRANTS

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Fellowships.....	\$4,035	\$3,581	\$3,504
Training.....	9,463	8,972	8,972

Fellowship awards will be made and funds will be provided for grants to train individuals in allergy and immunology, tropical medicine, infectious diseases, parasitology, mycology, and rickettsiology.

Postdoctoral and special fellowships, career awards and career development fellowships, and training grants will be supported.

Fellowships and graduate training grants will be supported. The latter are made to training institutions to establish and improve programs to prepare clinical

investigators and laboratory scientists for research and academic careers in disorders of the eye and visual system.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES—GRANTS

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Fellowships.....	\$21,373	\$17,626	\$17,142
Training.....	46,901	44,477	43,746

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT—GRANTS

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Fellowships.....	\$4,192	\$3,616	\$3,653
Training.....	10,012	9,392	10,142

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE—GRANTS

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Fellowships.....		\$876	\$876
Training.....		2,998	2,998

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES—GRANTS

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Fellowships.....	\$194	\$164	\$264
Training.....	3,650	3,617	3,117

Under the fellowship program, predoctoral, postdoctoral, special, and research career development awards are made to graduate students and scientists for training in the field of environmental health sciences.

The graduate research training program supports the availability of high quality training opportunities in environmental health. It has a threefold goal: to increase the number of highly qualified scientists primarily concerned with environmental health, to enable training institutions to strengthen and to enrich the research training capabilities, and to expand opportunities for environmental health research training in a greater number of graduate institutions throughout the United States.

Institutional support. The principal agents of this activity are grant programs directed toward enhancing the educational experience of students entering the health and allied health professions resulting ultimately in better health service to the Nation. Schools use these funds to support and enlarge faculty staffs, expand library holdings, modify existing and add new curricula, modernize teaching laboratories, and purchase educational aids and equipment. A substantial increase is requested in 1971 for these activities, of which \$5 million is for the physician augmentation program initiated in 1970.

Improving the utilization of limited resources of health professionals requires appraisal of the various types of personnel needed and the identification of new categories of allied health professionals and technicians for more effective team

practice. In 1971, allied health new methods grants will support projects to develop curricula to produce personnel requiring newly identified skills.

Student assistance is of two kinds: graduate and specialized, comprising traineeships and research fellowships; and undergraduate, comprising scholarships and student loans. Research fellowships support candidates at the predoctoral and postdoctoral levels for research training in special fields related to studies for improving nursing care. Traineeships support the graduate and specialized preparation of teachers needed to expand and improve curriculum offerings, and the advanced training needed by supervisors, administrators, and other specialists in nursing, public health, and the allied health professions. Allied health short-term training will be provided for the first time in 1971.

HEALTH MANPOWER

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Institutional support:			
Medical, dental, and related.....	\$56,288	\$101,400	\$113,650
Nursing.....	5,657	7,000	11,000
Public health.....	8,429	9,471	9,071
Allied health professions.....	8,598	10,988	14,245
Student assistance:			
Traineeships.....	19,381	30,027	23,220
Scholarships and opportunity grants.....	20,071	34,857	37,000
Loans.....	30,602	22,473	21,610
Manpower requirements and utilizations:			
Grants.....	3,895	4,082	4,082
Direct operations.....	9,046	11,003	12,508
Program direction and management services.....	1,297	1,668	1,798
Total program costs, funded.....	163,263	232,969	248,184
Change in selected resources.....	23,420		
Total obligations.....	186,683	232,969	248,184

Nursing and health professions scholarships enable deserving students from low-income families to pursue their education. Students of veterinary medicine became eligible for scholarships for the first time in 1970. Schools make scholarship awards to students who, in the judgment of the school, have an exceptional financial need. The student loan programs for the health professions, including nurses, are also designed to help provide an adequate supply of health manpower and to assure that the needed supply of health professions and nursing manpower is drawn from the most capable individuals, but particularly to assure that students from low-income families can enroll for health professions training. The 1971 program, as did the program in 1970, concentrates on making these loans to students from lower income families. Loans from the revolving funds are not planned for 1971.

Pursuant to authority contained in the appropriation language, under certain conditions sums may be obligated for student assistance programs in advance of their being appropriated in order to facilitate the enrollment of students in health profession and related schools. The timing of these obligations, which is

reflected in the schedules, does not affect the actual training of the students which is by academic year. Increases in appropriations for allied health traineeships and for nurse scholarships are requested.

Manpower requirements and utilization. Grants. Research grants support studies in the areas of physician methods and techniques, continuing physician education, effective use of health manpower, nursing care, and methods to deliver nursing care to patients. Research training grants enable institutions to establish training programs in fields where there is unusual demand for researchers having skills in nursing specialties and in the field of educational research.

Direct operations. Funds are provided for programs to assess requirements, availability, and quality of health discipline education; provide professional guidance and leadership to meet the goals of nursing care by means of research, consultation, application of research findings, and administration of grants; develop, administer, and support grant and operational programs to increase the supply and improve the education, utilization, and effectiveness of manpower in the health occupations; for servicing training and construction grants, student loans, scholarships, and operational programs for training of personnel. The budget for 1971 includes increases for services and technical assistance related to expanded grant programs; continuing education and other physician manpower programs; nurse recruitment and refresher training contracts; and initiation of a program to encourage returning veterans to enter the health field.

Program direction and management services. The Bureau of Health Professions Education and Manpower Training provides a national focus for health manpower activities. The Bureau guides and supports health manpower programs, designs proposals to meet needs for new or revised health manpower programs, coordinates research and program reporting activities, and provides technical guidance and coordination to Bureau activities.

DENTAL HEALTH—GRANTS

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Fellowships.....	\$63	\$150	\$150
Training.....	1	4,301	4,301

Research fellowships support candidates for advanced degrees to prepare them to conduct research to help improve dental health in the area of dental education, preventive dentistry, organization and delivery of dental services, and dental diseases.

Funds are provided to dental schools to support programs to train students to use dental auxiliaries. Research training grants support programs for training researchers in the applied dental sciences to produce high-quality investigators. Projects to provide continuing education for dental practitioners will be supported.

Teaching facilities. Federal grants are provided on an individual project basis

to assist in the construction of medical, dental, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, veterinary, osteopathy, and public health teaching facilities, schools of nursing, and for training centers for allied health personnel.

Allied health professions personnel. Matching grants are made to public and other nonprofit schools for construction, expansion, and rehabilitation of teaching facilities as training centers for technical and other allied health personnel.

CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH EDUCATIONAL, RESEARCH, AND LIBRARY FACILITIES

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Grants for construction of teaching facilities:			
Medical, dental, and other health personnel.....	\$130,073	\$141,122	\$118,100
Nurses.....	18,644	8,137	8,000
Allied health professions personnel.....	3,008		

HEALTH EDUCATION LOANS—HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATION FUND

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Loans to health professions schools:			
Loans.....	\$12,197	\$6,088	
Interest.....	1,567	2,365	\$3,595
Total obligations.....	\$13,764	\$8,453	3,595

The Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966 amended title VII, part C, of the Public Health Service Act to establish a revolving fund from which schools may obtain loans to provide loans to health professions students.

In 1971 no new loans will be made as the fund will be depleted.

NURSE TRAINING FUND

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Loans to schools of nursing:			
Loans.....	\$5,113	\$4,040	
Interest.....	449	1,188	\$2,116
Total obligations.....	5,562	5,228	2,116

The Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966 amended section 827 of the Public Health Service Act to establish a revolving fund to provide loans to nursing students.

In 1971 no new loans will be made as the fund will be depleted.

Aid to school districts. Educationally deprived children. Grants are made to schools to expand services for children from low-income families; for handicapped children, dependent and neglected children, and orphans and juvenile delinquents in State institutions; and for children of migratory workers.

Supplementary services. The administration has submitted legislation to consolidate the separate authorities for all supplementary services grants under titles II and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and titles III-A and V-A of the National Defense Edu-

education Act. Under this consolidated authority grants will be made to States for: development of programs which serve as models for improving and supplementing the regular school curriculum; school library resources; guidance, counseling, and testing; and equipment and minor remodeling. In 1971, States will be encouraged to use these grants to fund "start-up" costs associated with new education models, especially in connection with the "right to read" program.

ADVANCES AND REIMBURSEMENTS

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Health manpower.....	\$1,747	\$2,129	\$2,175
Office of Education: Elementary and Secondary Education: Aid to school districts: Educationally de- prived children....	1,122,843	1,226,000	1,300,000
Supplementary services.....	309,629	116,393	116,393
Federally affected areas: Maintenance and operation....	505,899	187,000	-----
Construction....	52,753	14,416	21,049
Dropout prevention....	4,997	15,000	15,000
Bilingual education....	7,500	10,000	10,000
Strengthening State departments of education.....	29,691	29,750	29,750
Planning and evalua- tion.....	199	8,825	9,250
Early childhood pro- grams.....	1,000	-----	-----
Total obligations....	2,034,511	1,607,384	1,501,442

Federally affected areas. Maintenance and operations. Payments are made to assist schools in areas where enrollments are affected by Federal activities. The eligible districts are located in all States, Puerto Rico, various outlying areas, and the District of Columbia. Under certain circumstances, payments are made to other Federal agencies to make arrangements for education of children where local school districts do not assume the responsibility. The 1970 estimate is based on the amount necessary to make payments to districts on behalf of students whose parents both live and work on Federal property and therefore do not contribute to the financial support of local schools. For 1971, legislation will be proposed to revise the authorizations for support of schools in areas where Federal installations affect school attendance. A study has been undertaken to examine the inequities of the present provisions and to suggest some alternative courses of action which would authorize Federal grants consistent with the fiscal problems of school districts involved. On the basis of this study and other relevant concerns, the proposed legislation will concentrate payments for those districts where Federal impact is greatest, allowing for local tax effort and fiscal capacity.

Construction. Payments are made to assist in construction of schools in areas where enrollments are affected by Federal activities.

Dropout prevention. Grants are made to local school districts for innovative projects in poverty area schools leading to new methods and techniques for re-

ducing the incidence of dropouts. Dropout prevention through "performance contracting," special methods of diagnosing individual needs, and a variety of means for increasing the relevance of education to potential dropouts are being tested during 1970.

Bilingual education. Grants are made to local educational agencies to develop, establish, and operate programs for bilingual education of children from homes where English is not the native language. Federal funds also support pre-service and inservice training for professional personnel participating in such programs.

Strengthening State departments of education. The leadership ability of State educational agencies is improved by grants to assist them in developing systematic and technically proficient planning and evaluation activities, and in stimulating and supporting research and statistical and technical assistance for local school systems.

Planning and evaluation. Funds are made available for planning succeeding year programs or projects and evaluation of such programs and projects. Funds may also be made available to the State and local educational agencies so that they may systematically plan for the effective use of Federal support.

EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
State grant programs.....	\$29,237	\$29,250	\$31,900
Early childhood projects.....	-----	2,850	4,000
Teacher education and recruitment.....	30,149	30,475	32,100
Research and innovation.....	19,328	21,530	26,500
Planning and evaluation.....	-----	-----	500
Total obligations.....	78,714	84,105	95,000

State grant programs. Grants are made to States to assist in the initiation, expansion, and improvement of programs and projects for education of handicapped children at the preschool, elementary, and secondary school levels.

Early childhood projects. Grants are made for planning and for operational support for centers to provide educational, diagnostic, and consultative services for preschool handicapped children and their parents.

Teacher education and recruitment. Grants are awarded to support training of teachers, supervisors, speech correctionists, researchers, and other professional and subprofessional personnel in fields related to the education of the handicapped.

Research and innovation. Grants and contracts are awarded for the development of new curricular materials, teaching techniques, research and development centers, and other research and demonstration projects. In 1971 large programmatic efforts will replace many of the small awards of previous years. More awards will be continued, providing intensive research in critical areas. As a result, fewer new awards will be made.

Grants and contracts are awarded for the establishment and operation of re-

gional resource centers to develop and apply the methods of appraising the special educational needs of handicapped children. Grants are also made for model centers to provide diagnostic, educational, and related services to deaf-blind children and for research in the field of physical education and recreation for handicapped children. Contracts are made for the acquisition, captioning, production, and distribution of films and other educational media, for conducting research in the use of educational media, and the training of persons in the use of the materials for the handicapped.

Planning and evaluation. Funds are made available for grants, contacts, or other payments for planning succeeding year activities or projects and for conducting evaluation studies.

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Basic vocational education grants: Annual.....	\$248,102	\$249,216	\$247,346
Permanent.....	7,161	7,161	7,161
Cooperative work education.....	-----	14,000	24,000
Vocational research and innovation.....	-----	14,150	25,650
Adult basic education.....	-----	-----	55,000
Planning and evaluation.....	-----	900	1,000
Insured loans.....	3,765	-----	-----
Total obligations.....	259,028	285,427	360,157

Basic vocational education grants. Matching grants are made to the States for vocational education programs, including the construction and remodeling of facilities. The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 require that at least two-fifths of these grants be used for programs for children from low-income families, the physically and mentally handicapped, and postsecondary courses. In 1971, the States will be encouraged to use more than the required minimum of 15 percent of basic grants for disadvantaged students. Funds are also used to support the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education and the State advisory councils. Matching grants to States for consumer and homemaking education are also included in this program activity; at least one-third of these funds are to be used in economically depressed areas.

Cooperative work education. Grants are made to States for support of cooperative work education programs which combine work experience with formal education. Funds are used for supervisory and other costs of instruction. Local school districts arrange with private industry or public agencies for employment related to student vocational objectives; employers pay wages equal to the value of work produced. In 1971 a proposal will be made to combine the separate authorities for work-study and cooperative education programs.

Vocational research and innovation. Grants are made to States, colleges, universities, and other institutions to develop new models for upgrading vocational education programs and for stimulating new ways to create a bridge between school and earning a living for school dropouts and youth who graduate from

high school lacking employable skills. Grants are also made for the development of curriculums for new and changing occupations. In 1971, a proposal will be made to expand the authority for exemplary projects to incorporate complementary provisions now contained in separate authorities for curriculum development and research activities.

Adult basic education. Grants are made to the States for support of basic educational programs attended by adult 16 years and older who wish to overcome English language limitations, prepare for occupational training and more profitable employment, and participate more effectively in our modern society. This program, previously carried under community education, has been transferred to this account for 1971.

Planning and evaluation. Funds are made available for grants, contracts, or other payments for planning succeeding year activities or projects and for conducting evaluation studies in vocational and adult education.

HIGHER EDUCATION
[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Student assistance:			
Educational opportunity grants.....	\$145,929	\$176,033	\$185,600
Work-study grants.....	143,434	156,611	160,000
Direct loans.....	185,878	161,900	141,900
Insured loans.....	60,133	113,952	149,841
Special programs for disadvantaged students.....	3,998	44,601	50,000
Institutional assistance:			
Aid to land-grant colleges.....	14,550	21,961	2,600
Strengthening developing institutions.....	30,000	30,000	33,850
Language training and area studies.....	15,696	18,000	6,000
Construction:			
Grants.....	247,811	45,244	-----
Subsidized loans.....	-----	11,750	24,920
State administration and planning.....	6,965	6,000	6,000
Federal administration.....	3,607	5,439	5,100
Undergraduate instructional equipment.....	14,478	-----	-----
College personnel development.....	-----	66,163	57,350
Planning and evaluation.....	-----	900	1,000
Total obligations.....	872,479	858,554	824,161

Student assistance. Funds are allotted to colleges and universities to provide: educational opportunity grants for financially needy undergraduate students, work-study grants for part-time jobs during the school year and full-time summer jobs for students in need of financial assistance to continue their education, and capital contributions to National Defense Education Act student loan funds. Advances are made on a matching basis to State and nonprofit private loan insurance funds to guarantee loans to college and vocational students, and payments are made to reduce interest costs for students in college whose adjusted family incomes fall below \$15,000. A special allowance is provided to lenders when money market conditions make payments essential to the purposes of the program. For disadvantaged students, grants and contracts are supported for the upward bound program to motivate high school students to attend college and improve their academic preparation, the talent search program to identify youths with exceptional potential for a college edu-

cation and publicize available sources of financial aid, and special remedial and other services for enrolled college students to encourage and assist them in continuing their higher education.

Institutional assistance. Grants are made to raise the academic quality of developing colleges, to aid land-grant colleges, to encourage language and area studies, and to facilitate construction of academic facilities. Those predominantly negro colleges which previously received funds under the discontinued annual land-grant college program will now receive equivalent support from the developing colleges program. The permanent appropriation colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts is consolidated with the higher education appropriation in this budget. The 1970 level includes a one-time endowment for Federal City College of the District of Columbia. The appropriation Education in foreign languages and world affairs is consolidated with higher education in this budget. The funds support establishment and development of institutional programs of research and study in modern languages, area studies and world affairs, and the training of individuals in those fields.

Annual interest grants, which reduce the costs of loans from non-Federal sources for the construction of academic facilities, are awarded to colleges, universities, junior colleges, and technical institutes. These grants have replaced direct Federal loans and grants for construction. Grants are made to assist State commissions in administering undergraduate construction grants and in comprehensive planning of future higher education construction. Technical engineering and other review services are provided for construction projects.

College personnel development. Grants are made to universities for fellowships leading to a doctorate for prospective college teachers. Grants and contracts provide full costs of institutes and other training programs to train college teachers, administrators, and educational specialists, especially at 2- and 4-year colleges.

Planning and evaluation. Funds provide for long-range planning of higher education programs and for program evaluation, particularly in the areas of student aid, graduate education, and developing colleges.

EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT
[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
State grants.....	\$14,960	\$15,000	\$15,000
Personnel development programs.....	77,919	80,000	89,000
Teacher Corps.....	20,814	24,737	30,800
College personnel development.....	76,900	-----	-----
Planning and evaluation.....	-----	-----	1,300
Total obligations.....	190,593	119,737	136,100

State grants. Grants are made to States to recruit and train persons for careers as elementary and secondary teachers and teacher aides.

Personnel development programs. Grants are made to higher education in-

stitutions, to educational agencies in every State, and to local school systems to help meet critical shortages of educational personnel, to improve the quality of teaching at the preschool through postsecondary vocational levels, for developing and strengthening teacher education programs, for disseminating new educational techniques, and for improving teacher utilization.

Under the Career opportunities program, grants are made to local school districts to help attract persons from low-income backgrounds, veterans, and college graduates into education careers in schools serving low-income populations. Grants to institutions of higher education are made to retrain experienced teachers in desegregating schools and to support graduate level training programs in critical manpower shortage areas.

Teacher Corps. Teams of experienced teachers and teaching interns are made available to serve, upon request, in schools located in neighborhoods with concentrations of low-income families. Federal grants in 1971 will be made to institutions of higher education for training of interns which will lead to an advanced degree, and to local school districts for payment of a portion of the salaries of both interns and experienced teachers during their periods of service.

College personnel development. This program is transferred to higher education in 1970 and 1971.

Planning and evaluation. Funds are available for grants, contracts, or other payments for planning succeeding year activities or projects and for conducting evaluation in education professions development.

COMMUNITY EDUCATION
[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Public libraries:			
Services.....	\$40,288	\$23,209	\$22,949
Construction.....	22,257	1,726	-----
College library resources.....	24,998	12,500	9,900
Librarian training.....	8,162	4,000	3,900
Cataloging by the Library of Congress.....	5,500	4,800	4,803
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	-----	1,774	6,226
University community service programs.....	9,474	9,500	-----
Adult basic education.....	44,993	50,000	-----
Planning and evaluation.....	-----	-----	460
Total obligations.....	155,672	107,509	48,238

Public libraries. Services. Grants are made to the States on a matching basis for the promotion, development, and extension of public library services; inter-library cooperation; State hospital, prison, and other institutional library services; and services for the physically handicapped.

Construction. Grants were made to the States on a matching basis for construction of library buildings. No new funds are requested in 1970 and 1971.

College library resources. Grants are made to institutions of higher education for acquisition of library books and materials. In 1971, grants will be made only to institutions with special needs because of outdated collections, growing student enrollments, or financial need.

Librarian training. Grants are made to higher education institutions for training and upgrading libraries to staff school, public, and academic libraries. In 1971, fellowships will be awarded only at the doctoral level and institute training will be increased with priorities for training librarians and paraprofessionals working in school and public libraries in poverty areas.

Cataloging by the Library of Congress. Funds are transferred to the Librarian of Congress for comprehensive cataloging of scholarly materials, providing an aid to the efficient management of college and university libraries.

Educational broadcasting facilities. Grants are provided under the Public Broadcasting Act for the establishment and expansion of educational television and radio facilities covering all phases of education from preschool through adult.

University community service programs. In 1971, this program will be terminated in its present form.

Adult basic education. This program is transferred to vocational and adult education in 1971.

Planning and evaluation. Funds are available for grants, contracts, or other payments for planning succeeding year activities or projects and for conducting evaluation studies in community education.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Research and development.....	\$77,572	\$65,135	\$71,339
Major demonstrations.....	1,000	4,725	5,000
Experimental schools.....	3,966	12,500	25,000
Dissemination.....	6,709	6,740	6,740
Training.....	6,709	6,350	6,250
Statistics.....	1,900	1,900	4,000
Construction.....	18,874		11,291
Total obligations.....	108,121	97,350	129,620

Research and development. These funds support a variety of research and development activities. In 1971, priority will be placed on reading, early childhood development, and evaluation of educational programs. A total of \$4,500,000 is included for continuation of a national study of the educational attainment of the population under the administration of the Education Commission of the States. An amount of \$5 million is provided for program evaluation studies. Research and development centers and educational laboratories will study specific problem areas and develop instructional programs for use in the Nation's schools.

Major demonstrations. Support will be provided for the demonstration of two model approaches to urban education—one, stressing community participation in school program planning and execution, in the Anacostia section of Washington, D.C., and the other in 1971 in the "new town" setting of Fort Lincoln community, also in the District of Columbia.

Experimental schools. Support will be provided to test, develop, and demon-

strate comprehensive new approaches to increasing the achievement of students in actual school situations. The most promising research results already available—including, for example, curricular materials, different types of school organization and scheduling and new patterns of staffing—will be integrated and used in one school setting. A variety of educational approaches are under consideration, such as the community school, compensatory education, preschool programs, school and work programs, teacher "career ladders," and youth-tutoring-youth.

Dissemination. A network of clearinghouses is supported to transfer information from research and experimental projects in education to teachers, administrators, scholars, and research personnel. These clearinghouses select, evaluate, index, abstract, and disseminate information in important areas of education. In 1971, support will be provided for traveling expositions and seminars to acquaint educators with new developments in educational practices.

Training. Grants are awarded for the training of manpower to carry out educational research, development, evaluation, and related activities. Awards are also made to develop materials for use in such training programs. During 1970, the research training program will be reviewed to determine which efforts are producing the best results. New projects awarded in 1971 will be based on the outcome of the current review.

Statistics. Contracted studies and related services support the responsibilities of the National Center for Educational Statistics. These responsibilities involve the measurement of progress and of the status of education in the Nation. The work includes: the collection, compilation, analysis, and dissemination of statistics; work on standard educational terminology; and continued research in statistical survey methods and in the development of more efficient sampling techniques.

Construction. In 1971 grants will be made to procure program equipment items and to support facility needs for educational research and development laboratories and centers.

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Grants to American institutions—obligations.....	\$1,058	\$1,029	\$3,000

Foreign currencies which are in excess of the normal requirements of the United States are used to support projects which will add to educational and scientific knowledge in the United States. The funds support overseas research, training, and study activities of American institutions of education. These activities help improve the knowledge and abilities of U.S. educators and provide information on foreign educational developments that will be of value to American educational system.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
School systems.....	\$11,093	\$12,678	\$13,168
Higher education.....	8,238	7,915	8,312
Instructional resources.....	4,776	5,064	5,284
Planning, research, and evaluation.....	7,691	7,644	8,498
Executive direction and administration.....	10,659	11,376	11,471
Total obligations.....	42,457	44,677	46,733

The Office of Education administers grants-in-aid and provides technical assistance and statistical services to State education agencies, institutions of higher education, and libraries. It also supports training and recruitment of educational personnel, experimentation and development to improve education, and planning and evaluation of educational programs. This appropriation provides for management, staff services, and related expenses required in accomplishing the mission of the Office.

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATION

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Training and advisory services.....	\$9,239	\$12,000	\$18,300
Technical assistance and administration.....	1,440	2,000	5,700
Total obligations.....	10,679	14,000	24,000

Training and advisory services. Support is provided through university centers, State education agencies, and grants to local school boards for dealing with the problems arising from the desegregation of schools. Contracts and grants are made on the basis of relative need and the feasibility of proposals submitted to the Office of Education.

Technical assistance and administration. Federal staff provides technical assistance and consultative services to local school boards in the development and implementation of desegregation plans and administers grants and contracts described above.

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATION

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Training and advisory services.....		\$8,657	
Technical assistance and administration.....		1,343	
Total obligations.....		10,000	

A supplementary request is anticipated to provide additional support for activities carried out under title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Under recent court orders, and as a result of the Supreme Court ruling of October 30, 1969, there is a sharp increase in requests for technical assistance from the Office of Education staff. In addition, requests are increasing for contracts to universities for advisory services to local schools and

training of school staff, and for grants directly to local schools for training to facilitate desegregation.

EXPIRED ACCOUNTS

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Educational broadcasting:			
Facilities grants.....	\$3,211	\$1,082	
Administration.....	338		
Total obligations.....	3,549	1,082	

Grants and loans for educational broadcasting facilities, defense educational activities, and arts and humanities educational activities have been transferred to other Office of Education appropriations.

STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE FUND

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Operating costs, funded:			
Loss on insured loans.....	\$109	\$5,496	\$6,177
Capital outlay, funded:			
Student loans purchased upon default by student borrowers.....	86	9,071	12,269
Total program costs, funded.....	195	14,567	18,446
Change in selected resources.....	243	1,821	-264
Total obligations.....	438	16,388	18,182

Under the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, the Office of Education received authority to insure loans to students in eligible institutions who do not have reasonable access to State or private nonprofit programs of student loan insurance.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1968 merged the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act into the Higher Education Act insured loan program, and, in addition to extending the Federal insurance program to June 30, 1971, authorizes the Office of Education to reinsure loans guaranteed by State and nonprofit private agencies at 80 percent of default by student borrowers.

Upon default by the student borrowers, the Office of Education will pay to the beneficiary the amount of the loss sustained by the insured upon federally insured loans and 80 percent of the loss sustained on reinsured loans guaranteed by State and nonprofit private agencies.

The fund takes over loans on which it pays insurance claims and seeks to collect on them. Loans which are deemed uncollectable are written off as "loss on insured loans."

The Higher Education Facilities Act authorizes loans for construction of academic facilities in higher education institutions.

The Participation Sales Act of 1966 established a revolving fund for these loans and authorizes the sales of such loans to the private credit market, the proceeds of which are deposited into the fund to be used for new loans to colleges and universities. The Government Na-

tional Mortgage Association is authorized to serve as trustee for these sales.

In 1970, loans under this program have been replaced by the interest subsidy grant program under the higher education appropriation.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES LOAN FUND

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Commission on sales of participation certificates.....	\$42		
Interest expenses.....	11,323	\$31,648	\$25,290
Administrative expenses.....	3	5	5
Total operating costs, funded.....	11,368	31,653	25,295
Change in selected resources.....	-2	-2	-2
Total operating costs.....	11,366	31,651	25,293
Higher education construction:			
Loans to higher education institutions.....	80,046	77,158	100,000
Change in selected resources.....	-76,809	-77,158	-100,000
Adjustments in selected resources (loan obligations).....	4,562	15,000	10,000
Total capital outlays.....	7,779	15,000	10,000
Total obligations.....	19,165	46,651	35,293

ADVANCES AND REIMBURSEMENTS

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
School systems.....	\$2,264	\$2,328	\$2,328
Higher education.....	2,550	4,032	4,069
Planning, research, and evaluation.....	422	160	160
Executive direction and administration.....	79	113	113
Total obligations.....	5,315	6,633	6,670

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE—WORK INCENTIVES

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Training and incentives:			
On-the-job training.....	\$791	\$900	\$1,800
Institutional training.....	21,740	66,400	99,400
Work experience and orientation.....	5,037	9,150	12,960

Each activity below includes costs of training, incentives, and related program services.

On-the-job training. This activity provides costs of on-the-job training both regular and full cost. Included in this activity are supervision, counseling, vocational training, and all other manpower services required to rehabilitate welfare clients through on-the-job training.

Institutional training. This activity provides for classroom training, vocational education, and workshop training in clerical, service, and semiskilled to skilled occupations, vestibule training, and employment preparation. In addition, remedial education is provided to many participants.

Work experience and orientation. This activity includes work sampling and internship, paraprofessional training, and orientation. The emphasis of work experience programs is on the development

of basic work habits, exploration of various occupational fields, and gaining knowledge of the world of work. Orientation provides training in basic employment skills along with vocational counseling and testing. During the orientation period, an employability plan is developed for each person which is designed to lead that individual to permanent employment. Upon completion of the orientation period, some persons will go directly into employment and others will go into some phase of institutional or on-the-job training.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION AND CONTROL

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Training.....	\$1,730	\$2,600	\$2,600

Funds are for the purpose of training 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. This training will be accomplished through curriculum development, short-term institutes, and traineeship grants and projects.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Training.....	\$31,683	\$27,700	\$27,700

Grants and contracts support the training of personnel in professional and technical fields relating to vocational rehabilitation, including teaching grants and traineeship grants to educational institutions, and research fellowships to individuals.

ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES

[In thousands]

	1966 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Education.....	\$18,780	\$20,261	\$27,126

Selected training is provided to equip the refugees for employment and resettlement. Also, provision is made for Federal payments to help meet part of the added cost related to refugee children in certain public school systems where the number of such children represents a sizable portion of total enrollments. Loans are also made to needy college students.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—CONSUMER CREDIT TRAINING

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Training in credit management—obligations.....		\$300	\$500

The Federal Credit Union Act Amendments of 1968 gives the Bureau of Fed-

eral Credit Union's authority to use Federal funds in 1971 to further consumer education. This appropriation will provide funds for conducting training sessions in 1971 on consumer education in credit management by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions and will also provide funds for awarding grants in this area.

OPERATING FUND, BUREAU OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS¹

	[In thousands]		
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Consumer credit training.....	\$112	\$274	\$310
Special institutions: American Printing House for the Blind educational material.....	\$1,265	\$1,329	\$1,401

¹ The Bureau finances its activities out of fees for services performed.

Grants are made to this nonprofit institution to, among other things, support the manufacture of special books and teaching materials which are distributed to all public educational institutions for the blind, as well as to regular public schools in which blind children are enrolled.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

	[In thousands]		
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Operations:			
Academic program.....	\$822	\$1,978	\$2,407
Administration and support services.....	1,083	1,196	1,260
Construction:			
Planning and site develop- ment.....	392	1,295	549
Buildings.....			15,900
Total obligations.....	2,297	4,433	20,116

As authorized by Public Law 89-36, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare entered into an agreement with the Rochester Institute of Technology for the establishment, construction, and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf. Its purpose is to provide a residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for successful employment.

MODEL SECONDARY SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

	[In thousands]		
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Operations:			
Academic program.....	\$439	\$324	\$1,384
Administration and sup- port services.....	72	173	798
Construction:			
Planning and site develop- ment.....		821	350
Total obligations.....	511	1,318	2,532

As provided under Public Law 89-694, an agreement between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Gallaudet College was signed on May 16, 1969, authorizing the establishment, construction, equipping, and operation of a model secondary school for the deaf lo-

cated on the campus of Gallaudet College and serving the National Capital region—including the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Delaware.

Operations. In 1971, the first full year of operation, administrative procedures will be refined, and the instructional program will be further developed with the introduction of new curricular materials and methods. Further, the research, development, and evaluation programs, and the role of supporting services will be expanded in proportion to the increased student enrollment, and funds will be provided for the lease of temporary facilities which will house the instruction program.

Construction. The 1971 appropriation will provide funds for the completion of planning.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE

	[In thousands]		
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Operations:			
Academic program.....	\$2,916	\$3,481	\$4,093
Administration and support services.....	2,494	2,845	3,291
Construction:			
Planning and site devel- opment.....	81	457	730
Buildings.....	1,605	535	707
Total obligations.....	7,096	7,318	8,821

Operations. Gallaudet College is a private, nonprofit institution providing an undergraduate higher education for the deaf, a graduate school providing advance studies for students in the field of deafness, and a research program to provide information about the deaf. It operates the Kendall School for the deaf children—primarily from the District of Columbia—and a preschool for very young deaf children which serves as the laboratory facilities for the college graduate program. Federal funds provide approximately three-fourths of the operating cost.

Construction. The construction program is designed to replace aging buildings and provide modern facilities to accommodate increased enrollments. Full financial support for the erection of a number of new buildings and alterations and repairs to the existing physical plant has been provided by the Federal Government. The estimates for 1971 provide for the continuation of this support primarily for dormitories and utilities.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

	[In thousands]		
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Operations:			
Academic program.....	\$22,463	\$25,775	\$28,425
Freedmen's Hospital.....	13,443	14,425	15,735
Administration and sup- port services.....	9,814	11,232	11,473
Subtotal.....	45,720	51,432	55,633
Construction:			
Planning and site devel- opment.....	173	939	611
Buildings.....	3,837	27,952	7,743
Total obligations.....	49,730	80,323	63,987

The university is a private nonprofit institution consisting of an undergraduate college, a graduate school offering the master's degree and the degree of doctor of philosophy—in English, history, chemistry, physics, zoology, government, pharmacology, physiology, and African studies—and nine professional schools. Federal funds provide 60.2 percent of the total operating costs.

The dormitories, food service, bookstores, and intramural athletic programs are intended to be self-supporting and render service at the lowest possible cost.

Freedmen's Hospital furnishes inpatient and outpatient care and a facility for training of physicians and nurses and other professional and technical health personnel. Operation of the hospital is financed by direct appropriation and income derived from charges for medical and hospital services from patients other than medicare, medicare patients, the District of Columbia, and other jurisdictions. Federal funds provide 71 percent of the total operating costs.

The Federal Government has undertaken to finance a major construction program at Howard University, including the erection of a number of new buildings and alterations and repairs to the existing physical plant.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

	[In thousands]		
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Hospital construction— obligations.....	\$7,700		

The 1970 budget request for construction of the Howard University teaching hospital is based on 1967 cost levels. Since the original estimate was made, construction costs have been rising in the Washington, D.C., area. The proposed supplemental appropriation would compensate for the higher costs and permit the General Services Administration to advertise for bids on the hospital facility.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

	[In thousands]		
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Elementary and secondary education: aid to school districts in federally affected areas.....			\$425,000

Legislation will be proposed to revise the authorizations for payments to school districts in federally affected areas. These revisions will be based on a study of the present provisions made over the past several months and other relevant concerns, and will make Federal grants for this program more consistent with the fiscal problems of the school districts involved. The proposed legislation will concentrate payments for those districts where Federal impact is greatest, allowing for local tax effort and fiscal capacity.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—
RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
College housing—college housing fund:			
College housing loans, college service facility loans, and loans for housing of student nurses and interns.....	\$191,935	\$210,000	\$120,000
Changes in selected resources.....	15,810	-110,000	-20,000
Total capital outlay obligations.....	207,745	100,000	100,000
Debt service grants.....	2,500	2,500	2,500
Interest on borrowings.....	24,170	28,100	32,700
Interest accrued on participation certificates.....	125,816	125,868	123,339
Commissions on sales of participation certificates.....	1,669	300	1,310
Administrative expenses.....	1,218	1,179	1,000
Inspection expense.....	331	300	200
Other expenses.....	305	303	295
Total operating costs, funded.....	153,509	158,550	161,344
Total obligations.....	361,254	258,550	261,344

Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, authorizes financial assistance to colleges and eligible hospitals for the construction or acquisition of housing and essential housing-related facilities such as student centers, dining facilities, and infirmaries. This assistance may take one of two forms—debt service grants to reduce the cost of borrowing on the private market, or direct Federal loans. The debt service grant program was authorized by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. Since 1969, emphasis has been placed on this type of assistance with direct Federal lending used as an adjunct.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Payment to Administrative operations fund.....	\$1,218	\$1,179	\$1,000

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Bureau of Indian Affairs— Education and Welfare Services: Educational assistance, facilities, and services.....	\$99,523	\$119,759	\$137,122

The Bureau operates Federal school facilities where public schools are not available or cannot meet the special needs of Indian children. Financial assistance is extended to public schools enrolling Indian children where tax-free Indian lands result in financial problems for the local districts and where other special problems exist that are not covered by Federal impact legislation, administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The level of this assistance will be increased to meet the needs of the public schools

for increased costs and increased enrollments. Grants are made to Indian students attending college. These grants will be increased to meet the needs of additional students. Federal school plans include increased enrollment in boarding schools and dormitories housing public school students, additional kindergartens, adequate base funding of the Bureau school program, junior college accreditation of Haskell Institute, and expansion of Indian school board and research and evaluation activities.

Funds for the adult education program provide educational opportunities and services across the total range of human educational needs in order to help the adult Indian become a more effective and efficient functioning human resource in the modern society and help him realize his potential as an individual.

Funds for the community development thrust provide programs and services in the development of social skills necessary for a community's assumption of initiative and responsibility in the setting of community goals and the solving of community problems.

ADVANCES AND REIMBURSEMENTS

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Manpower development and training activities (Department of Labor).....	\$500	\$825	\$825
Indian education for the disadvantaged.....	8,977	8,100
Indian education, library service.....	72
Indian education, supplementary centers.....	161
Indian education, Teacher Corps.....	139
National Defense Education Act.....	69

FISH AND WILDLIFE, PARKS, AND MARINE RESOURCES

National Park Service— Miscellaneous Permanent Appropriations: Educational expenses, children of employees, Yellowstone National Park.....	\$92	\$114	\$114
--	------	-------	-------

Revenues received from the collection of short-term recreation fees to the park are used to provide educational facilities to pupils who are dependents of persons engaged in the administration, operation, and maintenance of Yellowstone National Park.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Federal Prison Industries Fund (Inc.): Vocational training expenses.....	\$2,378	\$2,850	\$4,350

The vocational training expense limitation finances the vocational training program within the prison system. Advances in vocational education that have proved successful outside the prison system have been installed within prison institutions. They include the use of an integrated curriculum, fusing academic

and vocational education, and skill cluster training, with special emphasis on fields of emerging job opportunities. Shifts are continually being made in industrial and vocational training programs to reflect changing demands in the labor market, thus providing inmates with the best chance to secure post-release employment. Employment placement service is also an active part of the vocational training activity.

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Salaries and expenses: Student loans and tuition aid.....	\$3,202	\$18,279	\$24,000

Under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is charged with responsibility for assisting State and local governments in controlling crime, violence, riots and other serious disorders, and improving the quality of criminal justice. The program includes, among other things, funds for institutions of higher education for grants and loans to law enforcement officers and other students enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in an approved program leading to a degree.

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Salaries and expenses: Drug abuse prevention— Public education.....	\$177	\$579	\$813

This activity includes the Bureau's responsibility to communicate factual information to the public. This objective is accomplished by developing and disseminating facts on drug abuse to State and local agencies, the regulated drug industry, educational institutions, and private groups and organizations. In addition, in conjunction with the Departments of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Bureau is supporting a 3-year program, coordinated by the National Advertising Council, to utilize mass media facilities to reach private individuals. Both electronic and printed media will be employed.

Training and allowance payments. Direct program costs for occupational and basic education training programs are provided to equip the Nation's unemployed and underemployed workers with skills that will enable them to participate in productive employment. Institutional training projects are conducted by State and local vocational education agencies and on-the-job training projects are conducted by employers and other organizations. This activity provides for the costs of conducting the training and for the payment of trainee allowances to those trainees who are entitled to them under provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended. The concen-

trated employment program concentrates manpower resources in selected urban and rural target areas and is designed to insure that disadvantaged individuals receive training and manpower supportive services, enabling them to obtain permanent employment. Job opportunities in the business sector is operated in conjunction with the National Alliance of Businessmen and is a cooperative business-Government venture to hire and train disadvantaged individuals for private sector jobs. The public service careers program is designed to secure within merit principles permanent employment for disadvantaged persons in public service agencies.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Manpower development and training activities:			
Training and allowance payments:			
Job opportunities in the business sector/on-the-job training.....	\$75,791	\$94,000	\$222,900
Concentrated employment program.....	34,565	39,100	70,000
Public service careers.....			4,000
Institutional training.....	194,084	200,010	205,000
Part-time and other training.....	3,267	5,000	7,000
Disadvantaged youth program.....	12,985	10,000	23,900
Program services:			
State institutional training services.....	6,810	8,000	8,000
On-the-job training services.....	2,741	1,000	800
Federal institutional training service.....		145	

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Federal institutional training service.....	\$2,549	\$2,430	\$2,573

This activity provides for the program development and administration of institutional training programs by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY, SALARIES AND EXPENSES (GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATION)

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Manpower development and training activities.....	\$2,418		

DEPARTMENT OF STATE—EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities:			
Aid to American-sponsored schools abroad.....	\$1,484	\$1,500	\$1,850
English language teaching program in Poland (special foreign currency program):			
English language teaching program.....			800

This appropriation will finance a U.S. Government program to develop English teaching with U.S.-owned currencies in excess of the normal requirements of the United States. The program would involve teacher retraining, creation of centers, and adaptation of materials. The requested amount will finance the first year of the program.

CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Operating expenses.....	\$1,941	\$1,941	\$2,155
Scholarships and grants.....	3,319	3,319	3,319
Total obligations.....	5,260	5,260	5,474

The operation of a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific is being carried out through a grant to the University of Hawaii. The university operates the center which provides grants, fellowships, and scholarships to qualified persons to engage in study or training at the center.

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Educational exchange fund, payments by Finland, World War I debt—obligations.....	\$374	\$377	\$377

Any sums paid by the Republic of Finland to the United States as interest on, or principal of, the debt incurred under the act of February 25, 1919, are credited to this fund to finance programs authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 in relation to Finland and the people of Finland.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY—BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS—EISENHOWER COLLEGE GRANTS

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Grants to Eisenhower College, obligations.....	\$1,001	\$3,999	

Public Law 90-563 authorized an appropriation for grants to Eisenhower College to match gifts and other voluntary donations made to the college. These grants shall be used for the construction of education facilities at Eisenhower College.

Education and training. Post-Korean war veterans whose education plans were interrupted or impeded by active service in the Armed Forces since February 1, 1955, are provided an educational assistance allowance under the provisions of the Veterans Readjustment Benefit Act of 1966, as amended.

Prior to the enactment of Public Law 90-631, only the sons and daughters of veterans were eligible for educational assistance. Wives and widows who are eli-

gible are now entitled to educational assistance.

Special assistance to disabled veterans. Disabled veterans requiring vocational rehabilitation receive assistance to cover costs of tuition, books, supplies, and equipment.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Education and training:			
Post-Korean War veterans.....	\$622,352	\$695,665	\$990,415
Sons and daughters.....	39,682	41,545	42,065
Wives and widows.....	1,123	11,600	21,000
Korean War veterans.....	83		
World War II education.....	1		
Total education and training.....	663,241	748,810	1,053,480
Special assistance to disabled veterans:			
Vocational rehabilitation....	9,923	13,175	14,240

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Post-Korean war veterans.....		\$196,000	

This provides for the increase due to post-Korean war veterans entering training in greater numbers than originally estimated.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Post-Korean War veterans.....		\$22,100	\$80,000
Sons and daughters.....		1,500	6,000
Wives and widows.....		400	2,000
Total obligations.....		24,000	88,000

Legislation proposed to increase educational assistance allowance rates will result in an increase in budget authority.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
General fund loans:			
Higher education facilities.....	\$5,000	\$8,900	\$3,000

Appropriations for 30-year interest-bearing loans from the U.S. Treasury are made available for financing construction of the general public works program of the District of Columbia, including school construction, and, among other things, for education facilities for the Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands]			
	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Science education support....	\$115,297	\$121,700	\$96,900

The budget provides for a wide variety of programs to support the training and development of scientific manpower including the following programs:

Traineeships and fellowships to graduate students in the various fields of science, mathematics, and engineering; and fellowships to college and university faculty and foreign senior specialists.

Institutes for the training of secondary school and college teachers of science and mathematics. Emphasis will be placed on short-term and summer institutes.

Projects directed toward the improvement of secondary school and undergraduate science and mathematics curriculums; and supplementary programs to stimulate interest in and secure improvement of teaching and training in the sciences at secondary school and undergraduate levels.

Initiation of education programs designed to train science and engineering technologists.

Advances and Reimbursements

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Science education program.....	\$850	\$350

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Education of the public.....	\$4,528	\$5,192	\$5,257

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Assistance for financing capital outlay program.....			
Capital grants for higher education facilities.....			\$20,000

Legislation will be proposed to provide financial assistance to the District government by authorizing, among other things, capital grants for higher education facilities. The Federal Government would make direct grants for construction of the physical facilities for the Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute and the District government would continue to pay for operating expenses out of the general revenues of the District of Columbia.

TOTAL

[In thousands]

	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Grand total.....	\$6,587,090	\$6,551,669	\$7,343,487

THE AMERICAN HOUSING CRISIS TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss some aspects of the Nation's current housing crisis.

I do not foresee a speedy improvement in the current housing situation. I feel that if we think the housing crisis is bad now, it is likely to get worse before it gets better. We seem to know more about how to get men on the moon than how to provide housing here on earth. We have beaten the Russians to the moon twice, but in terms of number of housing starts the Russians are doing considerably better than we are. Russian apartments may be spartan by our standards, but they are certainly an improvement over the slum conditions in many of our decaying center cities. Even if we discount the housing effort of the Soviet Union, we still should recognize that almost every country in Western Europe now outproduces us, in terms of number of housing units per thousand population.

Housing is by no means a crisis confined to the cities. Half the standard housing in this country is located in rural areas. Housing is an extremely important factor affecting most of us. It accounts for the largest single amount of the average family's living costs in this country, about 25 percent after taxes. Poor and lower middle income families sometimes spend almost all their cash income just for shelter. What makes this even worse is that housing costs have been rising twice as fast as other costs of living. Probably one-half, and some estimates indicate even more, American families cannot now afford the price of the average new home that is built.

Our national housing goals, enunciated in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, call for the construction of 26 million dwelling units by 1978. This means we need to produce more than 2,600,000 units of housing per year for the next 10 years. In 1969 housing starts fell to about 1,300,000—less than one-half of the required number of units to meet this goal. It has been estimated that over the next 30 years we will need to build almost as many new housing units as now exist in the entire country. Why are we failing so badly in meeting our own housing goals? What is the nature of the crisis that has beset the housing industry? Let me discuss some of the factors that I believe are most important and try to point out some of the factual errors that have become all too prevalent in recent years.

Labor contract settlements this year have set records across the country. Construction unions have received raises amounting up to 15 percent per year for 2- and 3-year periods in some cases. Although less than half of our construction laborers are union members, union contracts generally set the scale for the rest of the industry. Many Americans find it difficult to sympathize with union rules restricting the width of a paint brush a painter may use, or the number of bricks a bricklayer may lay in a working day. Negroes have developed a justifiable anger at lily white apprenticeship policies. There are no good statistics on the number of blacks in the building trades union. However, it is pretty gen-

erally recognized that the percentage of Negroes in the higher paying construction union categories is very, very small. Unions have maintained that there are a few qualified Negroes who can apply. The rub here of course is what it takes, and who decides who will qualify. Labor union statements not to the contrary, we can train a man to be a soldier in a mechanized army in a matter of weeks. It therefore seems reasonable to suppose that we can teach a man to be a carpenter, a plumber, or other skilled craftsman in less time than is currently the rule.

In spite of all these negative factors, we cannot put all of the blame for the high cost of housing on labor unions. Despite rising union wages and restrictive union practices, onsite labor as a percentage of the cost of housing has been steadily decreasing in recent years. According to the National Association of Homebuilders onsite labor accounted for about 30 percent of the sales price of housing in 1944, but something less than 20 percent in 1964. This relative decline may be attributed partly to improved labor productivity, and partly to increasing prefabrication, but mainly because other costs have risen even faster than the cost of labor.

Construction materials are among those cost items whose price has risen more rapidly than labor. In addition, building materials account for a larger proportion of housing costs than does onsite labor. Building material prices have been rising extremely rapidly, partly because increasingly sophisticated and prefinished materials are being increasingly used, and partly because one of the main components—lumber—is in relatively inelastic supply. Plywood, for example, costs almost twice as much today as it did a year ago. Here again, however, to place the entire blame for the high and rising cost of housing on construction materials is a distortion of reality. Even though materials prices have been rising very rapidly, construction materials and labor together represent only about half the cost of an average new home. Thus, while rising materials costs have helped push up the price of housing construction, they can account for only a relatively small part of the total increase that has been recorded in recent years.

Land prices have by far outpaced increasing labor and materials costs. Average land costs has increased perhaps 300 percent since 1950. Land costs in some metropolitan areas jumped 10 to 25 percent last year alone.

The cost of land not only raises the price of housing in itself, but in addition builders almost invariably put more expensive houses on higher priced land. Thus, as land costs rise, the cost of the structure placed on the land tends to rise also, as builders try and keep some reasonable balance between the cost of land and the cost of the structure. Thus, rising land costs have had a double-barreled effect in raising the cost of the average new home today. Perhaps the one great myth that surrounds rising land costs is that the government, Federal, State, or local, is about to do anything drastic about it.

The cost of money, too, enters into the cost of shelter. Money may not be the root of all housing evils, but in terms of monthly shelter expense, the cost of money is the single largest factor. With FHA mortgages now carrying a staggering 9-percent interest, including the FHA guarantee fee, homeowners are in many instances paying the equivalent of 10-percent interest or more after discounts and other charges are added in. In addition to rising interest rates, mortgage amortization periods are also being shortened in many markets. Downpayments are being increased, and loan qualification criteria are being tightened up in many parts of the country.

In spite of record mortgage interest rates, there is still a shortage of mortgage funds. It appears to me that as long as business expectations continue to look good, businessmen will continue to borrow heavily in the capital markets for new plant and equipment expenditure. This, coupled with heavy needs from State, Federal, and local governments for various capital improvement projects, means that in the foreseeable future the supply of loanable funds will be insufficient to meet all demands for them. Short of direct credit control I do not know how the home mortgage market can be insulated from this basic situation. As long as lenders can make higher returns than are available on home mortgages by lending for other purposes, it seems unlikely that the amount of mortgage money will become available to finance the volume of housing that is generally recognized will be needed to meet our national housing goals.

This, then, is briefly the present situation as I see it in the areas of labor problems, materials, costs, land prices, and the financing of new residential construction. What about some of the proposals that have been made to improve the situation? I would like to start by discussing one of the most popular remedies for housing problems being suggested at the present time. This is the proposition that mass housing production, or industrialized housing technology as it is sometimes called, is one of the answers to the problem of cutting construction costs.

There appears no particular reason why the most industrialized nation on earth cannot produce houses the way it does automobiles. There is no doubt that increasingly complex factory-built components can speed construction, and reduce some onsite labor costs.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is sponsoring the development of new housing technology through its new program, Operation Breakthrough. This program, authorized by Congress in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, is designed to test the applicability of new housing technology in U.S. markets.

Another currently fashionable solution for solving today's housing problems is that of new towns.

New city building has proved to be considerably more expensive than most private developers have been able to afford. New towns require enormous initial investment before any cash return

is forthcoming. The most shining example of new town construction is James Rouse's Columbia, located in my home State of Maryland here between Washington and Baltimore. Columbia is often described as the forerunner of successful new communities in other parts of the country.

Many big city mayors, for example, have objected to Federal new town programs on the basis that they are likely to divert national resources from the crucial job of rebuilding center cities. New towns, it is argued, will simply provide social and economic amenities for the middle class who could afford to purchase them on their own.

It is estimated that there will be approximately 100 million additional Americans by the end of the century. That a sufficient number of new towns can be constructed to accommodate this number of additional persons does not appear likely. Even in England, where the new town movement is generally considered to be the most successful, new towns are expected to be able to account for not more than about 20 percent of the total population increase.

At the Federal level what is needed before any sizable corporation will be willing seriously to invest money in housing production is a public policy with a semblance of continuity. We must discover a way to remove the bulk of the constraints on mass housing production, and we must create large well organized markets for the end product of the mass-produced houses. It is the aim of Operation Breakthrough to work toward the achievement of these objectives. To the extent that Breakthrough proves successful, it will provide a useful stimulus to increased housing production in the long run.

I am convinced that we cannot permit the present deteriorating housing situation to continue. The combination of escalating costs, flagging commitment, and lack of long range planning is no longer tolerable. It is going to require a bold attack on many fronts, public and private. As Members of the Congress, we have an important responsibility, but for us to be really effective, we are also going to need broad public support. We must recognize that housing is, in fact, a national responsibility of the highest priority.

THE LATE HONORABLE RUTH THOMPSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the death on April 5 of a former colleague of many of you, former Representative from the Ninth District of Michigan, the Honorable Ruth Thompson.

Miss Thompson, a Whitehall, Mich., native, served three terms in the Congress. An attorney, she was Michigan's first woman in Congress, and spent most of her working life in public service.

Miss Thompson attended Whitehall schools, Muskegon Business College, and

studied law in the office of Robert E. Bunker, a professor of law at the University of Michigan. She was admitted to the practice of law in 1926 and was the first woman member of the Muskegon County Bar Association.

Her early public service included work as a court reporter, clerk, and probate register of probate court. She was elected probate judge of Muskegon County in 1924, and served three terms, until 1936.

Two years later, Miss Thompson won election to the Michigan House of Representatives, serving one term.

Her congressional career began in 1951, and she had the singular honor of being the only woman ever appointed to the House Judiciary Committee.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the need for an increase in railroad retirement benefits has always been apparent to anyone who has any contact at all with retired persons. The greedy tentacles of inflation have lashed out with more force against our citizens living on fixed incomes than against any other group of our population.

Far from slowing down, the cost of living has accelerated. The latest figures, as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, indicate an increase in the cost of living of five-tenths of 1 percent during the month of February. Add to this the record rise of the past year and you will see that living costs have gone up at the rate of 6.3 percent over the past 12 months; 6.6 percent over the past 6 months; and 7.2 percent over the past 3 months.

Rates of increase that are still climbing are food, nondurables, rent, and household services. There has been an astonishing increase of 23.8 percent in transportation costs in the past 3 months, which vitally affect the retiree, who is now more dependent on transportation than the younger, more vigorous worker.

The 1960 dollar is today worth only 78 cents.

With this ever-present threat of inflation, it was only appropriate that Congress should take action to protect the railroad retirement recipient the same as it did the social security recipient last year.

H.R. 15733, which was reported out unanimously by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, provides a temporary increase of 15 percent in monthly benefits for railroad retirees and prescribes a change in the method of investment of the funds of the railroad retirement account. Because of the unusual nature of the system, the committee, in its wisdom, also included a provision calling for a study of the entire concept of this program to be made available before July 1, 1972, when the Congress must again deal with this problem of the expiring benefit increases provided in H.R. 15733.

Mr. Speaker, the concern of the Congress over any actuarial deficit, which admittedly could be lower than current

estimates indicate, should not preclude the right of railroad employees, who have contributed generously to retirement plans in their productive years, to the measure of security and integrity that the Congress has properly granted to social security retirees.

Inflation has not discriminated in its ravages against our Nation's retirees; the Members of this body have accepted their responsibility to do no less for this group of senior citizens than it did for social security beneficiaries, and I want to congratulate my colleagues on their wisdom and unanimity in passing this legislation by the vote of 379 to 0. I am proud to cast my vote in favor of the enactment of this long overdue legislation—which was not only fair and equitable but truly deserving as well.

POSTAL REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the American people want to see progress and improvement in the Post Office. They are tired of the status quo. They support the President's proposal to reform the Post Office Department by making it a quasi-corporation. They recognize the potential this suggestion has for improving the benefits and working conditions of the postal employees.

They also recognize, Mr. Speaker, the delay tactics being used by some "status quo" politicians who have a vested interest in keeping the Department and its employees subservient for exactly what it is.

Today, due to the constructive attitude of the postal employees, their leadership and the Department in the face of a serious postal crisis, the idea is close to reality. Postal reform is clearly the best deal for the postal worker. The President of their own union recognizes this. Yet, those responsible for the stalling—the delays—are attacking the negotiated agreement before they have even read it.

This is not good legislating. It is not representative of the views of the people of this country. And it is not fair to the postal employees who need their raise and deserve better working conditions.

PRAYER FOR LITHUANIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the RECORD the following letter.

ST. ANN'S MONASTERY,
PASSIONIST FATHERS,
Scranton, Pa., April 6, 1970.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Recently, I sent a "Prayer for Lithuanians" to Mr. Joseph Kajeckas, Charge d'Affaires, Lithuanian Legation, Washington, D.C., and he suggested that I try to have this prayer published in the Congressional Record. This prayer has already been circulated among Americans of Lithuanian descent. Possibly it will be used offi-

cially by His Excellency, Bishop Vincent Brizgys (Chicago, Ill.) at the dedication (July, 1970) by the Pope, Paul VI, of the Lithuanian Martyrs' Chapel in Rome.

Would it be possible for you to arrange to have this prayer published in the Congressional Record? (The 30th anniversary of the Russian occupation of Lithuania falls in June).

When and if I receive a complimentary copy of the Congressional Record featuring this prayer, I will be in a position to have this information released to several Lithuanian (American) newspapers and magazines.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

Rev. CLEMENT KASINSKAS, C. P.

PRAYER FOR LITHUANIANS

(By Rev. Clement Kasinskas, C.P.)

Almighty God, benign Father of all peoples of diverse nationalities, may the tricolored Lithuanian flag, yellow, green and red, once again freely wave over Lithuania, the land consecrated to the immaculate heart of the Holy Virgin. Yellow stands for the sun shining over Lithuania. Green represents Lithuania's fields, farms and forests. Red symbolizes the blood of Lithuania's heroes and martyrs: blood, shed in the struggle for Lithuanian self-identity; blood, shed in the struggle for freedom to speak the ancient Lithuanian language. You, O God, gave this people; blood, shed in the struggle for the freedom to worship You.

May Your sun, O Lord, represented by the color, yellow, on our Lithuanian flag, once again dawn brightly over the green fields, farms and forests of Lithuania, casting out every shadow of oppression from this country, so tiny, yet so very precious to us, because Lithuania, so far away on the shores of the Baltic Sea, is the place of our origin. Lithuania soil is precious to us, Lord, because it is a soil seeped with the blood of Lithuanian martyrs and drenched with the continuous tears of its present living "martyrs" whose spirits are shackled by the heavy chains of foreign occupation at the present time.

O Holy Spirit, we pray You to strengthen our Lithuanian countrymen with renewed courage, perseverance, and nobleness of purpose as symbolized by our Lithuanian national emblem, the vytis, the knight in armor astride his white steed. May the Lithuanian wayside cross again appear throughout the land. May the churchbells once again ring out resoundingly in villages, towns, and cities, giving joyous notice to the Lithuanian people that they are free once again, free from hostile aggression, free to live and to work in peace, free to worship You, their God. Amen.

TO REQUIRE THE OPEN DATING OF PACKAGED FOODS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTAIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, I released a report on food coding practices in District of Columbia supermarkets.

The report contains the results of two recently conducted surveys, one by my staff and one by the Democratic Consumer Action Committee of the District of Columbia Central Committee.

The results of the two surveys demonstrate that many of the current food codes are subjectively determined and provide the consumer with little if any

guarantee as to food freshness. This conclusion, unfortunately, is not unique to the practices in the District of Columbia, but applies to almost every city in the country. Similar surveys are planned for other cities.

Every item sold in a supermarket, except perhaps the produce, carries a coded date for the benefit of the store employee. This coded date may be a short series of numbers, or letters or both stamped somewhere on the package, either by the manufacturer, wholesaler, or chain store. Some dates represent the last day of shelf life, called the "pull" date, and other dates represent the packaging date.

Thus, for example, "0404" stamped on a package of cheese may mean the fourth month, April, and the fourth day. The code "1192" on meat may represent March—you add together the first and last digits to get the month, 3 for March; the 11 for the 4th. "BKA" on a can may stand for February 1—B for February and A for the 1st.

Most consumers know of the existence of these codes, but they are not supposed to know what they mean. Any identical coding between chains is purely coincidental and codes change as frequently as once a month—and probably sooner, if publicized.

The surveys found large quantities of out-of-date foods. They found stores which repackaged items with new labels and code dates. They found store managers who completely ignored coded dates on meat and poultry, substituting their own subjective judgment as to when these items should be pulled. One store manager, for example, who ignored code dates said he would remove poultry from the shelves when it began to smell, turn reddish or yellowish, or when little growths began to appear.

This means that the consumer is getting food that is unfit for human consumption—food that has lost its nutritional value, smells or tastes bad, or is unhealthy; food that cannot perform the functions that food is expected to perform.

To correct this situation, last fall I introduced H.R. 14816, legislation to require the open dating of packaged foods. My bill would not only require every food item subject to deterioration to be openly dated, it would require the dating to be the day after which the food was unsafe to eat. This would give the consumer an objective guide on which to judge a product's freshness.

The bill would apply to foods canned or packaged by the producer, wholesaler, or retail store. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to determine how long a food could safely be kept on the shelf before it begins to deteriorate.

The consumer should know the last usable date of a food. The store manager should not be the only one able to recognize fresh food. To achieve this, the package should contain a comprehensible date.

A few municipalities now require the dating of certain kinds of foods. New

York City, for example, required the dating of milk. In addition Federal law and regulations require the dating of certain drugs and of durable products like film.

If the store manager regularly rotates his food stock, this requirement would in no way affect him. It would simply permit the consumer to confirm for himself that the food he is buying is fresh. If the manager is selling stale food, this legislation would hurt him by denying him the profits he now makes from such food.

The food industry appears to hold the belief that ignorance is bliss. The results of these surveys suggest that it may be bliss for the food industry, but it certainly is not for the consumer.

The report, the text of H.R. 14816, and a list of food shelf lives follow:

TO REQUIRE THE OPEN DATING OF PACKAGED FOODS

(A report done in connection with H.R. 14816, legislation to require the open dating of packaged foods)

Congressman Leonard Farbstein submitted the following report to the Congress and the American public. It is based upon surveys of food code dating practices of District of Columbia supermarket chains conducted by the Democratic Central Committee of the District of Columbia in cooperation with Congressman Farbstein. The staff of Congressman Farbstein also conducted both independent and related surveys in the District of Columbia.

Almost every item sold in a supermarket, except perhaps produce, carries a coded date for the benefit of the store employee. This coded date may be a short series of numbers or letters, or both, stamped somewhere on the package, either by the manufacturer, wholesaler, or chain store. Some dates represent the last day of shelf life, called the "pull" date, and other dates represent the packaging date. While most consumers know of the existence of these codes, they are meant to be intelligible only to store personnel. With the exception of some local requirements, such as the dating of milk in the City of New York, the label of a food item contains no information whatsoever with respect to a product's freshness. It is thus left up to the manufacturer, wholesaler or chain store operator employing coded dates to ensure that non-fresh food is not being sold to the public.

The surveys sought to examine the effectiveness with which this system is putting fresh food on the tables of the American people, and conversely, keeping non-fresh food off the public's table.

The results of these surveys demonstrate that many of the current food codes are subjectively based and provide the consumer with little if any guarantee as to food freshness. Following are the findings of the surveys conducted by

- (1) the Democratic Central Committee, and
- (2) the staff of Congressman Farbstein.

Also included is a summary of conclusions based on the surveys.

1. STATEMENT OF DEMOCRATIC CONSUMER ACTION COMMITTEE OF THE DISTRICT DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE, APRIL 8, 1970

The Democratic Consumer Action Committee of the District of Columbia Democratic Central Committee was established in response to the widespread recognition that consumers are often victimized and even defrauded. The Committee will investigate and expose consumer abuses and propose specific programs whereby the federal the District

governments can remedy these serious problems. Today, the Committee announces the results of its first investigation—the deliberate effort of supermarkets to conceal from housewives the date when their perishable products should be taken off the supermarket shelves.

The Committee received numerous complaints that supermarkets in the District of Columbia often sell "out of date" foods at regular retail prices. Preliminary investigation showed that each perishable packaged food is stamped with a code, signifying either the date the item was packaged or the date after which the item should not be sold. If a manufacturer uses a "packing" date code, the store manager is also advised of the "shelf life" of the product. In either event, these codes advise the store personnel of the date after which those items should be removed from the shelf.

The Committee conducted a limited survey on Tuesday, March 31, Thursday, April 2, and Monday, April 6, to determine whether the supermarkets comply with their own codes. A representative number of each of the three largest food chains serving the District of Columbia was surveyed—Safeway (12), Giant (3), A & P (3). The individual stores selected were located in various parts of the city, from predominantly white Northwest to all black Anacostia. The survey was conducted by 12 two-person teams, most of whom were housewives. Each team was provided with a survey sheet describing the several items to be examined, the probable types of codes, and a code sheet on which to record their findings. Ten product lines were surveyed, and except for one national brand of sausage, each product line was the store's own brand. These included milk, eggs, cottage cheese, ground beef, pork chops, chicken, bologna, hot dogs, and bread. When the survey was completed, each team was instructed to identify itself to the store manager (or other appropriate personnel) and ask him for an explanation of the codes.

The codes

An inspection of almost any of the subject items reveals several combinations of digits and/or letters, sometimes reflecting not only the "pull" date or the "packing" date, but also the identity of the employee who packed the item. Thus, it was important first to distinguish the "code" from all other symbols on the item and then to ascertain exactly what was meant. This was done by interviews with store personnel which produced the following results:

SAFeway

Item	Examples of codes found	Interpretation
Milk	406	4th month 6th day; April 6 pull date.
Eggs	Exp. 43	Expires Apr. 3—pull date.
Cottage cheese	406	Apr. 6—pull date.
Ground beef	0044	Add 1st and last number to get month, middle number is day Apr. 4—pull date.
Pork chops	25	2 equals date packed, equals Apr. 2; 5 equals scale number.
	021	02 equals pull date—Apr. 2; 1 equal packer's number.
	041	1 equals good until 1st of month; 4 equals packed at 4 p.m.
Chicken	See pork	
Bologna	3121	Apr. 21—pull date (see ground beef).
Hotdogs	2172	Apr. 17—pull date (see ground beef).
National brand sausage	1242	Mar. 24 equals packing date; 12-day shelf life.
Bread	1	Date stamped on end of loaf. ¹

GIANT

Item	Examples of codes found	Interpretation
Milk	402	Apr. 2 equals pull date.
Eggs	Mar. 30	Packing date—7-day shelf life.
Cottage cheese	406	Apr. 6 equals pull date.
Ground beef	31	Mar. 31—date packed.
Pork	31	Do.
Chicken	31	Do.
Bologna	3181	Apr. 18—pull date.
Hotdogs	2202	Apr. 20—pull date.
National brand sausage	1312	Mar. 31—date packaged.
Bread	Color ties	Red—Monday, Thursday; White—Tuesday, Friday; Blue—Wednesday, Saturday.

A & P

Item	Examples of codes found	Interpretation
Milk	0402	Apr. 2 equals pull date.
Eggs	Exp. Apr. 1	Apr. 1 equals pull date.
Cottage cheese	0405	Apr. 5 equals pull date.
Ground beef	2X	1 equals Monday, 2 equals Tuesday, X equals packer's number.
		Tuesday equals date packed.
Pork chops	2X	Do.
Chicken	2X	Do.
Bologna	4029	9 equals packer's number, 402 equals Apr. 2 equals pull date.
Hotdogs	0331	Mar. 31 equals pull date.
National brand sausage	Not in stock	
Bread	Tuesday, or date stamped on cardboard close.	Day it goes on shelf.

¹ Contrary to consumers' popular belief that bread is delivered fresh in morning and sold by evening, it was learned that bread is considered a 2-day item, and that bread delivered any morning is considered fresh until close of business the following day.

The codes are extremely complex. They are clearly designed to prevent the ordinary housewife from ascertaining when products should have been removed from the shelf. For the same information could be conveyed to store employees more easily by simply providing the date after which the item should not be sold.

Findings

Of the 18 stores surveyed, only 3 had no "out of date" items. Seven stores had one product line with one or more "out of date" items, and eight stores had from 2 to 5 product lines with one or more "out of date" items. In 15 out of 18 stores, therefore, from 1 to 5 of the 10 basic product lines surveyed had one or more out of date items. More specifically, the chart below shows the percentages of the stores within each of the three chains in which the survey found product lines with one or more "out of date" items.

	Percent Safeway	Percent Giant	Percent A & P
Milk	8½%	0	0
Eggs	50	33½	0½
Cottage cheese	8½	33½	
Ground beef	33½	0	33½
Pork chops	8½	0	33½
Chicken	0	0	0
Bologna	0	33½	66½
Hot dogs	0	33½	66½
National brand sausage ¹	33½	0	0
Bread	0	0	0

¹ It is supposedly the responsibility of the brand salesman, on his regular rounds of the individual stores, to pull "out of date" items from stock.

In other words, 20% of the product lines in A & P stores, 113% of the product lines

in Giant stores, and 16% of the product lines in the Safeway stores had one or more items which should have been removed from the shelf.

Meat and poultry

The above analysis understates the supermarkets' failure to follow their own codes. For, in the case of meat and poultry, their "shelf life" is generally determined subjectively by the individual meat managers.

Safeway. All chickens are received from the packing plant with a coded date on the label. (These "fresh" chickens can be identified by a red USDA seal on the label). At the store the chickens are re-weighed for water loss, re-packed, re-priced to reflect new weight, and often re-coded. After this point in time there is little unanimity among meat personnel as to their proper shelf life. Most personnel interviewed stated that they assessed the chicken's freshness thereafter by observation.

When survey teams inquired as to the shelf life of pork, they were told: a) pork could not be coded because it was difficult to determine how long the meat was in the store before it was cut; therefore, the manager inspected it daily to determine if it was still fresh; or b) pork was good for 2 days after it was packaged; or c) pork was good for 3 days after it was packaged; or d) pork was good up to 4 days after it was packaged.

The survey teams received similar responses when they inquired into ground meat. Most were told that ground meat (not the pre-packaged variety) is good for one day only. One survey team, however, was told that it is good for 3 days; when the color turns the manager knows it is bad—then it goes on sale.

A & P. All meat and poultry codes reflect the day the item was packed (or re-packed) and put on the shelf.

One manager, referring to all types of meat, stated that he daily looks at the meat and pulls whatever does not look good. When his attention was called to some greenish tinted meat, he admitted to not having inspected the meat that day. This same manager stated that he did not reduce the price of ground beef—if he thinks it is bad he pulls it out of the case, re-works it, and re-packages it. "If it's too bad" he throws it away.

Giant. All meat and poultry codes reflect the day the item was packed (or re-packed) and put on the shelf.

One surveyor was told that poultry is removed from the shelf when it begins to smell, or when it turns yellow or reddish, or when little growths appear.

General remarks

A survey team was told by a Safeway store manager that a local poverty organization had taken a code survey within the last two months. The manager also stated that the survey was discussed at a managers' meeting, and all managers were cautioned to keep their stock up to date. Thus, there is reason to believe that the Committee's survey was conducted under artificial conditions favorable to the supermarkets.

The personnel in all the stores, with one exception, were polite, courteous and cooperative. That one exception occurred in a Giant, where the surveyor was stopped by the manager and informed that he would need permission before he could continue his survey.

At least with respect to Safeway, the salaries both of the store managers and of the department heads are predicated upon their achieving a certain quota of sales. If they exceed that quota, they received a bonus. According to Safeway personnel, department heads can not return items to the warehouse for credit. Perishable items not sold are discarded at a loss to the particular de-

partment manager. It is therefore to the manager's advantage to sell at items in his inventory, regardless of expiration date.

One store in each chain was located in an upper middle class, predominantly white neighborhood. Out of these three stores, one had no "out of date" items, one had 1 product line with one or more "out of date" items, and one had two "out of date" items. The remainder of the stores (15) were in either integrated or all black neighborhoods.

There was no clear pattern to the abuses found. There were abuses in the stores in white upper-middle class as well as poor black neighborhoods. There were abuses in the older, smaller, less well-maintained stores as well as in the larger, more modern ones. Two of the stores, located in a predominantly black area, had no "out of date" items.¹ However, the three stores with the worst abuses were in Anacostia and Cardoza.

CONCLUSIONS

This survey was not meant to be an exhaustive study of coding practices. It did demonstrate, however, that supermarkets deliberately attempt to conceal information from the housewife which she needs in order to make intelligent decisions concerning the products she buys. The survey further found that the chain supermarkets in the District of Columbia frequently fail to remove items from the shelves according to their own estimate when these items should be removed. The staleness of perishable foods—particularly meats and dairy products—concerns not just the quality and taste of these products but the health of adults and children. The abuses uncovered in this survey therefore endanger the health of District residents throughout the city.

The Committee strongly recommends that the practice of coding be abolished. In its place, we recommend that the store place on each perishable item either (1) a clearly stamped expiration date after which the item should not be sold or (2) a clearly marked packing date and the shelf life of the product starting from this packing date.

If our recommendations are adopted, housewives will have the information they need to make intelligent decisions. Furthermore, housewives themselves could police the dates set by the supermarkets when products should be removed from the shelf by simply refusing to buy products after that date. This would ensure that store managers would stop either deliberately or negligently trying to sell products when they should no longer be sold.

It is sometimes said that, if housewives are given this information, prices will rise because they will only buy the most recent items and leave the others to spoil. However, stores can overcome this possibility by better inventory practices which result in goods being sold more quickly after they are put on the shelf and by not mixing goods of significantly different ages on the same shelf. When some goods are not sold promptly, they can and should be reduced in price to allow housewives to decide whether they are willing to purchase slightly older but still fresh goods at lower cost.

In any event, the housewife is entitled to all the information to make her own decision. It is time to end the paternalism by which businessmen decide that the American consumer, for his supposed own benefit, should be denied information to make an intelligent decision. Just as we have had Truth-in-Lending and Truth-in-Packaging, it is time for Truth-in-Dating.

We therefore urge the supermarkets to replace their codes immediately with clear,

¹ At the time of the survey, one store was sold out of 2 items (sausage & bread).

readable dates. But it is also essential that the government act to ensure that all supermarket comply. We urge that the Federal Trade Commission prohibit, under its present powers, coding as a deceptive and unfair trade practice (we intend to present a petition to the Commission in the near future seeking a regulation to this effect); that Congress pass a statute for the entire country requiring that the date for removing perishable goods from the shelf be clearly marked on the package; and that the City Council ascertain whether it has the power to adopt such a regulation for the District of Columbia.

2. SURVEY CONDUCTED BY THE STAFF OF CONGRESSMAN FARBSTEN

The survey conducted by the staff of Congressman Leonard Farbstien concentrated on a five week study of food-coding practices in a single Safeway store operated in a middle-income area of Washington. A store of the same chain, operated in a low-income area was also surveyed on one of the same dates as the middle-income store. In addition, a more comprehensive follow-up survey of an A & P store, located in a low-income area, previously found by the D.C. Central Committee to be particularly bad was also conducted.

The surveys of the middle-income area store were conducted every Saturday during the period from February 28 to April 4. The items surveyed included bread, eggs, milk, cheese, yogurt, ground beef, pork, pork sausage, sea food, cold cuts, chicken, and potato and corn chips. Items in these twelve categories were examined every week by the same person. To ensure that the code or the meaning of the code had not changed during the period of the survey, all samples of a product on the shelves were examined for their code dates.

Middle-income area Safeway

The survey turned up food being sold beyond the "pull date" on each visit, although the number varied significantly. On one date, only out-dated yogurt was found. But on March 28 over \$40 (retail price) in outdated food was found; and on April 4, the figure rose to over \$60.

The bakery goods, all of which were dated, were generally found to be fresh. However, on one occasion rolls were found to be out-dated and on another samples of bread were found which carried one of three separate dates, the current date, two days previous and two days in advance. The most significant finding, however, was that during the course of the survey, the store appeared to change its bread-coding policy and began to date bread two days in advance. The consumer could thus not tell if he were purchasing fresh or day old bread, and the consumer purchasing "day-old-bread" was actually getting two day old bread.

Dairy products were also generally fresh. The milk was dated 6 days ahead and generally the milk found on the shelves of this store was 5 or 6 days ahead. Similarly cheese and yogurt were generally fresh, with cheese being dated a month or two ahead. On the shelf at any one time, one could find American cheese samples with as much as two months difference in freshness. Examples of outdated yogurt and cheese were found.

The greatest abuses were found in the meat, fish and cold-cuts. This chain store dates most of its meat and fish two days ahead. At any one time, one could find labels with that day's date on them, and the dates for the two days following. The survey found out-dated lobster, perch, veal, veal patties and meat loaf, as well as consistently old examples of pork and/or pork sausage, and chicken. Many of the older items were observed to have been placed on top of the

fresher ones. This chain store also dated ground beef 6 days ahead. Half the one pound ground beef for April 4 was found to be 7

days beyond the expiration date. When the surveyor required the meat attendant to remove the out-of-date ground beef, she re-

fused, indicating that that was the responsibility of the store manager. A second attendant did remove the out-dated meat.

Date and item	Examples of codes found	Code meaning	Investigator's remarks	Date and item	Examples of codes found	Code meaning	Investigator's remarks
Mar. 28, 1970:				Apr. 4, 1970:			
Lobster	250	25—pull date Mar. 25; 0—Packer's number.		Eggs	Exp. 4 3	Expires Apr. 3, pull date	
Perch	260	26—pull date Mar. 26			Exp. 4 4 ¹	Expires Apr. 4, pull date	
Veal sweetbreads	302 ¹	30—pull date Mar. 30			Exp. 4 7 ¹	Expires Apr. 7, pull date	
Pork sausage:	245	24—pull date Mar. 24		Corn chips	03 31 MD	Mar. 31 pull date	
1 lb.	1252	Mar. 25 pull date	Brown color.		04 32 MD ¹	Apr. 29 pull date	
1 lb.	1262	Mar. 26 pull date	Do.	Cooked scallops	05 05 MD ¹	May 5 pull date	
2 lb.	1083 ¹	Apr. 3 pull date	Red color.		285	28—pull date Mar. 28	
National brand pork sausage.	1132	Mar. 13 package date	12-day shelf l.e., old Mar. 25.	Other sea foods	305	30—pull date Mar. 30	
	1202 ¹	Mar. 20 package date			105 ¹	10—pull date Apr. 10	
Pork rib chops	275	27—pull date Mar. 27		National brand "Smokies" sausage	115 ¹	11—pull date Apr. 11	On top.
					1262	Mar. 26 pull date	
				Kosher sliced bologna	2092 ¹	Apr. 9 pull date	On bottom.
					2032	Apr. 3 pull date	
					2152 ¹	Apr. 15 pull date	
				Ground beef:			
				1 lb.	0283	Mar. 28 pull date	Purchased.
					0444 ¹	Apr. 4 pull date	
					0084 ¹	Apr. 8 pull date	
				2 lb.	0104 ¹	Apr. 10 pull date	

¹ Food not out-of-date on date of survey.

While this store is located in a middle-income area, and includes among its customers many Members of Congress, it also serves a significant number of low-income persons. Many of the types of out-dated meats and cold cuts observed were those generally purchased by low-income persons. A good illustration of this was found one week when red meat was being sold at half price because it was old. Examination of the code revealed it to be one day past due. Located in the next bin were several kinds of pork as much as 4 or 5 days old and being sold at full price!

Low-income area Safeway

The survey of the low-income Safeway store conducted on the same date as one of the Saturday surveys of the middle-income store uncovered a large number of out-dated food. It also uncovered some differences in coding practices.

Included in the out-dated foods were milk, pickle and pimento loaf, onion loaf, ham, chicken breast rolls, pork steak, fudge and milk. In many of the cases, the older out-dated samples were found on top or in front of the fresher samples. The store was unswept and dirty and much of the food smelled and looked terrible.

The most flagrant abuse was found in connection with the milk. A number of cartons were found to have pull dates that had expired one or two days earlier. One had a pull date that was eight days old.

Even more interesting than the presence of the out-dated milk, was the shelving policy. All of the half-gallon vitamin D milk, except for that which was out-of-date had a zero shelf life. The shelf life expired with that date. The freshly crated milk delivery, sitting in the store aisles in violation of District of Columbia food regulations against keeping food unrefrigerated, also had the same date. The rest of the milk, the chocolate, and full gallon cartons had later dates.

This contrasts with the practice found in the middle-income store, where milk was generally sold which was dated six days ahead. Thus, milk that was six days older than what was being sold in the middle-income store was being sold in this low-income store.

Bakery goods were generally fresh although bread was dated with the next day's date (rather than the current date) which was the practice at the other store at that time. Meat was also dated one day farther ahead—up to four days ahead—although no meat with

that day's date or the following day's date appeared on the shelves. The surveyor found this most curious; for in the middle-income stores, meat with all three possible dates was generally observable.

Low-income A. & P.

A visit to the low-income A & P reported by the D.C. Central Committee to be among the worst in the city, turned up what was probably more than \$100 worth of out-of-date cold cuts and milk alone, and possibly as much as \$200 worth of out-dated meat and poultry.

In contrast with the low-income Safeway, almost all the slower moving milk (chocolate, full gallons, et al) was out of date, while the half gallon vitamin D milk was dated 6 or 7 days ahead. This was true not only for the chain brand milk, but for the national brand as well.

A similar pattern emerged with the meats. Assuming the practices followed in the middle-income Safeway for length of time meat should be left on the shelves, the large 20 pound turkeys and 7 pound capons were all out-of-date, while the red meat was fresh. As in the middle-income Safeway, much of the pork was out-of-date: slab bacon, pigs feet, hot sausage, polish sausage, smoke pork hocks, national brand sausage and national brand hot sausage. Among the cold cuts, the store stocked over 216 individual chain brand sliced bologna packages. A large number in the front and on top of the display were up to an entire month beyond the pull date, as was the chain brand meat pickle loaf, which sported one example of a package two months beyond the pull date. The chain brand peppered loaf was a lot fresher, although some was a week beyond the pull date.

All of the bakery products appeared fresh, stamped with the next day's date. In contrast to the low-income Safeway, this store was well kept and looked modern from the outside.

3. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

1. A large number of food items being sold in supermarkets in the District of Columbia were found to be out-dated

The D.C. Central Committee (DCC) survey found only 3 of 18 stores surveyed selling no "out-of-date" food. Seven stores had 1 out-of-date item and 8 had from 2 to 5 items. In an additional store the manager refused to permit the survey. The Farbstein survey

found out-of-date food every one of the five times it visited the middle-income store it was surveying, and found significant amounts of out-of-date food in the other stores it surveyed.

2. Significant food code abuses were found in middle- and upper-income stores as well as those located in lower-income neighborhoods—store appearance was also found to bear no correlation with food freshness

The DCC survey found one "white" store with no out-of-date food, one with one out-of-date item, and one with two out-of-date items. It also found two "ghetto" stores with no out-of-date items. The Farbstein staff survey found out-of-date food on each occasion it visited the middle-income store. The last two visited uncovered \$40 and \$60 respectively of such food.

3. Non-uniform criteria were found to be employed in determining how long a particular food item was permitted to remain on the shelf

Stores were found to employ different lengths of time in determining "pull dates" for meat and poultry. Some stores were found to date three-day-old food for removal, others four and five day old food for removal, and one Safeway manager said he dated his meat and poultry 12 days ahead.

Stores which employed the date of packaging rather than the "pull date" were also found to employ rather different lengths of time in determining when to remove an item from the shelf. DCC surveyors were told in one store that pork had a shelf life of two days, in another of three days, and in a third, four days; similarly, they were told ground beef has to be fresh each day, and that it was good for three days.

4. Some stores were found to repackage items with new labels and codes

The DCC survey found some Giant stores repackaged all their meat and poultry every day with a new coded date. No indication as to the age of the meat appeared on the label. Determination of when an item was to be removed from the shelf was subjectively made. The Farbstein survey found examples of individual items in A & P stores being relabeled with new dates. The surveyors also were told that Safeway chicken was frequently repackaged upon the expiration date, after having been reweighed and smelled.

5. Some store managers were found to completely ignore coded dates on meat and poultry, substituting their own subjective judgments as to when these items should be pulled.

One manager, who did not bother with the code dates, told a surveyor he observed the meats and pulled whatever did not look good. He admitted that the green meat on the shelves of his store was there because he had not yet done his daily inspection. A packer said she sometimes did not bother to change the date on the code of her stamping machine since coding was not the basis for pulling food from the shelves. A Giant store manager said he removed poultry from the shelves when it began to smell, turned "reddish or yellowish," or when "little growth" began to appear. When the latter occurred, he threw the chicken out.

6. At least one store did not code its meat or poultry at all.

The surveys found that the coding of meat and poultry, unlike most other items in the stores, was completely left up to the store manager. Thus meat and poultry codes varied

from store to store within the same chain, and at least one Safeway did not code its meat and poultry at all!

H.R. 14816

A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require a packaged perishable food to bear a label specifying the date after which it is not to be sold for consumption.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 4 of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (15 U.S.C. 1453) is amended by inserting "(A)" immediately after "label" and by inserting before the semicolon the following: ", and (B) if the commodity is a perishable food, stating that it is not to be sold for consumption after a specified date".

(b) Section 5 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1454) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) For purposes of section 4 (a) (1) (B) of this Act, the Secretary of Health, Edu-

cation, and Welfare, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall by regulation prescribe the manner in which the last day for the sale of a perishable food shall be determined."

(c) Section 10 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1459) is amended—

(1) by striking out "meat or meat product, poultry or poultry product, or" in subparagraph (1) of paragraph (a);

(2) by adding after subparagraph (5) of paragraph (a) the following new sentence: "Such term includes meat or meat products or poultry or poultry products only to the extent necessary to implement the requirements of section 4 (a) (1) (B)."; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(g) The term 'perishable food' means meat, poultry, fish, dairy products, eggs, fruit, vegetables, bread, coffee, and any other food that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare designates as perishable."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on the ninetieth day following the date of its enactment.

STORAGE REQUIREMENTS AND PROPERTIES OF PERISHABLE PRODUCTS

Commodity	Storage temperature, fahrenheit	Relative humidity, percent	Approximate storage life	Water content, percent	Highest freezing point, fahrenheit	Specific heat above freezing ¹ , B.t.u./lb./F.	Specific heat below freezing ¹ , B.t.u./lb./F.	Latent heat (calculated) ² , B.t.u./lb
Apples (ch. 29)	30-32	90	See ch. 29	84.1	29.3	0.87	0.45	121
Apricots	31-32	90	1-2 weeks	85.4	30.1	.88	.46	122
Artichokes (Globe)	31-32	90-95	do	83.7	29.9	.87	.45	120
Jerusalem	31-32	90-95	2-5 months	79.5	27.5	.83	.44	114
Asparagus	32	90-95	2-3 weeks	93.0	30.9	.94	.48	134
Avocados	45-55	85-90	4 weeks	65.4	31.5	.72	.40	94
Bananas (ch. 29)		85-95		74.8	30.6	.80	.42	108
Beans (green or snap)	45-50	90-95	8-10 days	88.9	30.7	.91	.47	128
Lima	32-40	90	10-15 days	66.5	31.0	.73	.40	94
Beer, barreled ⁴	35-40		3-10 weeks	90.2	28.0	.92		129
Beets:								
Bunch	32	90-95	10-14 days		31.3			
Topped	32	95	3-5 months	87.6	30.1	.90	.46	125
Blackberries	31-32	90-95	3 days	84.8	30.5	.88	.46	122
Blueberries	31-32	90-95	3-6 weeks	82.3	29.7	.86	.45	118
Bread (ch. 32)	0		Several weeks	32-37		.70		46-53
Broccoli, sprouting	32	90-95	7-10 days	89.9	30.9	.92	.47	130
Brussels sprouts	32	90-95	3-4 weeks	84.9	30.5	.88	.46	122
Cabbage, late	32	90-95	3-4 months	94.4	30.4	.94	.47	132
Candy (ch. 33)	0-34	40-65						
Carrots:								
Prepackaged	32	80-90	3-4 weeks	88.2	29.5	.90	.46	126
Topped	32	90-95	4-5 months	88.2	29.5	.90	.46	126
Cauliflower	32	90-95	2-4 weeks	91.7	30.6	.93	.47	132
Celeriac	32	90-95	3-4 months	88.3	30.3	.91	.46	126
Celery	32	90-95	2-4 months	93.7	31.1	.95	.48	135
Cherries	31-32	90	10-14 days	83.0	28.8	.87	.45	120
Coconuts	32-25	80-85	1-2 months	46.9	30.4	.58	.34	67
Coffee (green)	35-37	80-85	2-4 months	10-15		.30	.24	14-21
Corn, sweet	32	90-95	4-8 days	73.9	30.9	.79	.42	106
Cranberries ⁴	36-40	90-95	1-4 months	87.4	30.4	.90	.46	124
Cucumbers ⁴	45-50	90-95	10-14 days	96.1	31.2	.97	.49	137
Currants	31-32	90-95	do	84.7	30.2	.88	.45	120
Dairy products:								
Cheese (ch. 28)	30-45	65-70	(*)	37-38		.50	.31	54
Butter (ch. 28)	32-40	80-85	2 months	15.5-16.5		.33		23
Butter	0 to -10	80-85	1 year	15.5-16.5			.25	23
Cream (sweetened)	-15		Several months	72.5		.78	.42	104
Ice cream (ch. 28)	-15		do	62.0		.70	.39	89
Milk, fluid whole:								
Pasteurized grade A	33		7 days	87.0	31.0	.90	.46	125
Condensed, sweetened	40		Several months	28.0		.42		40
Evaporated	Room temperature		1 year, plus	74.0		.72		106
Milk, dried:								
Whole milk	45-55	Low	Few months	2-3		.22		4
Nonfat	45-55	do	Several months	2-3		.22		4
Dates (ch. 83)	(*)	(*)	(*)	20.0	3.7	.36	.26	29
Dewberries	31-32	90-95	3 days		29.7			
Dried fruits (ch. 33)	32	50-60	9-12 months	14-26		.31-.41	.26	20-32
Eggplant	45-50	90	7 days	92.7	30.6	.94	.48	137
Eggs (ch. 35):								
Shell	29-31	80-85	6-9 months	66.0	28.0	.73	.40	96
Shell, farm cooler	50-55	70-75		66.0	28.0	.73	.40	96
Frozen, whole	0 or below		1 year, plus	74.0			.42	106
Frozen, yolk	do		do	55.0			.36	79
Frozen, white	do		do	88.0			.46	126
Whole egg solids	35-40	Low	6-12 months	2-4		.22	.21	4
Yolk solids	35-40	do	do	3-5		.23	.21	6
Flake albumen solids	Room temperature	do	1 year plus	12-16		.31	.24	20
Dried spray albumen solids	do	do	do	5.8		.26	.22	11
Endive (escarole)	32	90-95	2-3 weeks	93.3	31.9	.94	.48	132
Figs (ch. 33):								
Dried	32-40	50-60	9-12 months	24.0		.39	.27	34
Fresh	31-32	85-90	7-10 days	78.0	27.6	.82	.43	112

See footnotes at end of table.

STORAGE REQUIREMENTS AND PROPERTIES OF PERISHABLE PRODUCTS—Continued

Commodity	Storage temperature, Fahrenheit	Relative humidity, percent	Approximate storage life	Water content, percent	Highest freezing point, Fahrenheit	Specific heat above freezing ¹ B.t.u./lb./F.	Specific heat below freezing ¹ B.t.u./lb./F.	Latent heat (calculated) ² B.t.u./lb
Fish (ch. 27):								
Fresh	33-35	90-95	5-15 days	62-85	28.0	0.70-.86		89-122
Frozen	-10-0	90-95	8-10 months	62-85			0.38-.45	89-122
Smoked	40-50	50-60	6-8 months			.70	.39	92
Brine salted	40-50	90-95	10-12 months			.76	.41	100
Mild cured	28-35	75-90	4-8 months			.76	.41	100
Shellfish:								
Fresh	33	90-95	3-7 days	80-87	28.0	.83-.90		113-125
Frozen	0 to -20	90-95	3-8 months				.44-.46	113-125
Frozen-pack fruits (ch. 29)	-10-0		6-12 months					
Frozen-pack vegetables (ch. 29)	-10-0		6-12 months					
Furs and fabrics ⁴	34-40	45-55	Several years					
Garlic, dry	32	65-70	6-8 months	74.2	30.5	.79	.42	106
Gooseberries	31-32	90-95	3-4 weeks	88.9	30.0	.90	.46	126
Grapefruit (ch. 29)	50	85-90	4-8 weeks	88.8	30.0	.91	.46	126
Grapes (ch. 29):								
American type	31-32	85-90	3-8 weeks	81.9	29.7	.86	.44	116
European type	30-31	90-95	3-6 months	81.6	28.1	.86	.44	116
Honey	(°)	(°)	1 year, plus	18.0		.35	.26	26
Hops (ch. 34)	29-32	50-60	Several months					
Horseradish	32	90-95	10-12 months	73.4	28.7	.78	.42	104
Kale	32	90-95	1-2 weeks	86.6	31.1	.89	.46	124
Kohlrabi	32	90-95	2-4 weeks	90.1	30.2	.92	.47	128
Lard (without antioxidant)	45	90-95	4-8 months	0				
Lard (without antioxidant)	0	90-95	12-14 months	0				
Leeks green	32	90-95	1-3 months	88.2	30.7	.90	.46	126
Lemons (ch. 29)	32 or 50-58 ⁴	85-90	1-4 months	89.3	29.4	.92	.46	127
Lettuce	32	95	2-3 weeks	94.8	31.7	.96	.48	136
Limes	48-50	85-90	6-8 weeks	86.0	29.1	.89	.46	122
Logan blackberries	31-32	85-90	5-7 days	82.9	29.7	.86	.45	118
Maple sirup	(°)	(°)	(°)	35.5		.48	.31	51
Meat (ch. 25):								
Bacon:								
Frozen	-10-0	90-95	4-6 months					
Cured (farm style)	-60-65	85	4-6 months	13-29		.30-.43	.24-.29	18.41
Cured (packer style)	34-40	85	2-6 weeks					
Beef:								
Fresh	32-34	88-92	1-6 weeks	62-77	28-29	.70-.84	.38-.43	89-110
Frozen	-10-0	90-95	9-12 months					
Fatbacks	34-36	85-90	0-3 months	6-12		.25-.30	.22-.24	9-17
Hams and shoulders:								
Fresh	32-34	85-90	7-12 days	47-54	28-29	.58-.63	.34-.36	67-77
Frozen	-10-0	90-95	6-8 months					
Cured	60-65	50-60	0-3 years	40-45		.52-.56	.32-.33	57-64
Lamb:								
Fresh	32-34	85-90	5-12 days	60-70	28-29	.68-.76	.38-.51	86-10
Frozen	-10-0	90-95	8-10 months					
Livers: Frozen	-10-0	90-95	3-4 months	70.0			.41	100
Pork:								
Fresh	32-34	85-90	3-7 days	32-44	28-29	0.46-0.55		46-63
Frozen	-10-0	90-95	4-6 months				0.30-0.33	
Smoked sausage	40-45	85-90	6 months	60.0		.68	.38	86
Sausage casings	40-45	85-90						
Veal	32-34	90-95	5-10 days	64-70	28-29	.71-.76	.39-.41	92-100
Mangoes	55	85-90	2-3 weeks	81.4	30.3	.85	.44	711
Melons, cantaloupe	32-40	85-90	5-15 days	92.0	29.9	.93	.48	132
Persian	45-50	85-90	2 weeks	92.7	30.5	.94	.48	132
Honeydew and honey ball	45-50	85-90	3-4 weeks	92.6	30.3	.94	.48	132
Casaba	45-50	85-90	4-6 weeks	92.7	30.1	.94	.48	132
Watermelons	40-50	80-85	2-3 weeks	29.1	31.3	.97	.48	132
Mushrooms ⁴	32	90	3-5 days	91.1	30.4	.93	.47	130
Mushroom spawn:								
Manure spawn	34	75-80	8 months					
Grain spawn	32-40	75-80	2 weeks					
Nursery stock (table 4)	32-35	85-90	3-6 months					
Nuts (ch 33)	32-50 ⁴	65-75	8-12 months					
Oil (vegetable salad)	35		1 year		(°)	.21-.22	.21-.22	4-8
Okra	45-50	90-95	7-10 days	89.8	28.7	.92	.46	128
Oleomargarine	35	60-70	1 year	15.5		.32	.25	22
Olives, fresh	45-50	85-90	4-6 weeks	75.2	29.4	.80	.42	108
Onions and onion sets	32	65-70	6-8 months	87.5	30.6	.90	.46	124
Oranges (ch. 29)	32-34	85-90	8-12 weeks	87.2	30.6	.90	.46	124
Orange juice, chilled	30-35		3-6 weeks	89.0		.91	.47	128
Papayas	45	85-90	2-3 weeks	90.8	30.4	.82	.47	130
Parsley	32	90-95	1-2 months	85.1	30.0	.88	.45	122
Parsnips	32	90-95	2-6 months	78.6	30.4	.84	.44	112
Peaches and neclarines	31-32	90	2-4 weeks	86.9	30.3	.90	.46	124
Pears (ch. 29)	29-31	90-95	(°)	82.7	29.2	.86	.45	118
Pears, green	32	90-95	-12 weeks	74.3	30.9	.79	.42	106
Peppers, sweet ⁴	45-50	90-95	2-3 weeks	92.4	30.7	.94	.47	132
Peppers, chili (dry) ⁴	32-40	65-75	6-9 months	12.0		.30	.24	17
Persimmons	30	90	3-4 months	78.2	28.1	.84	.43	112
Pineapples:								
Mature green	50-55	85-90	3-4 weeks		30.2			
Ripe	45	85-90	2-4 weeks	85.3	30.0	.88	.45	122
Plums, including fresh prunes	31-32	91-95	3-4 weeks ⁴	85.7	30.5	.88	.45	123
Pomegranates	34-35	90	2-4 months		26.6			
Popcorn, unpopped	32-40	85	(°)	13.5		.31	.24	19
Potatoes:								
Early crop	50-55	90	(°)	81.2	30.9	.85	.44	116
Late crop	38-50 ⁴	90	(°)	77.8	30.9	.82	.43	111
Poultry (ch. 26):								
Fresh	32	85-90	1 week	74.0	27.0	.79		106
Frozen, eviscerated	-20-0	90-95	9-10 months				.42	
Pumpkins ⁴	50-55	70-75	2-6 months	90.5	30.5	.92	.47	130
Quinces	31-32	90	2-3 months	85.3	28.4	.88	.45	122
Radishes:								
Spring, prepackaged	32	90-95	3-4 weeks	93.6	30.7	.95	.48	134
Winter	32	90-95	2-4 months	93.6		.95	.48	134

See footnotes at end of table.

STORAGE REQUIREMENTS AND PROPERTIES OF PERISHABLE PRODUCTS—Continued

Commodity	Storage temperature, fahrenheit	Relative humidity, percent	Approximate storage life	Water content, percent	Highest freezing point, fahrenheit	Specific heat above freezing ¹ B.t.u./lb./F.	Specific heat below freezing ¹ B.t.u./lb./F.	Latent heat (calculated) ² B.t.u./lb.
Rabbits:								
Fresh	32-34	90-95	1-5 days	68.0		0.74	0.40	98
Frozen	-10.0	90-95	0-6 months					
Raspberries:								
Black	31-32	90-95	2-3 days	80.6	30.0	.84	.44	122
Red	31-32	90-95	2-3 days	84.1	30.9	.87	.45	121
Frozen (red or black)	-10-0		1 year					
Rhubarb	32	90-95	2-3 weeks	94.9	30.3	.96	.48	134
Rutabagas	32	90-95	2-4 months	89.1	30.1	.91	.47	127
Salsify	32	90-95	2-4 months	79.1	30.0	.83	.44	113
Spinach	32	90-95	10-14 days	92.7	31.5	.94	.48	132
Squash: ⁴								
Acorn	45-50	70-75	5-8 weeks		30.5			
Summer	32-40	85-95	4-5 days	95.0	31.1	.96		135
Winter	50-55	70-75	4-6 months	88.6	30.3	.91		127
Strawberries:								
Fresh	31-32	90-95	5-7 days	89.9	30.6	.92		129
Frozen (ch. 29)	-10-0		1 year	72.0			.42	103
Sweet potatoes	55-60	85-90	4-6 months	68.5	29.7	.75	.40	97
Tangerines	31-38	90-95	3-4 weeks	87.3	30.1	.90	.46	125
Tomatoes:								
Mature green	57-60 ⁴	85-90 ⁴	2-3 weeks ⁴	94.7	31.0	.95	.48	134
Firm ripe	45-50 ⁴	85-90 ⁴	2-7 days ⁴	94.7	31.1	.95	.48	134
Turnips roots	32	90-95	4-5 months	90.9	30.1	.93	.47	130
Vegetable seed	32-50	50-65	(*)	7.0-15.0		.29	.23	16
Yeast compressed baker's	31-32			70.9		.77	.41	102

¹ Calculated by Siebel's formula. For values above freezing point $S = 0.008a + 0.20$. For values below freezing point $S = 0.003a + 0.20$. Recent work by H. E. Staph, B. E. Short and others at the University of Texas has shown that Siebel's formula is not particularly accurate in the frozen region, because foods are not simple mixtures of solids and liquids and are not completely frozen even at -20 F.

² Values for latent heat (latent heat of fusion) in B.t.u. per pound, calculated by multiplying the percentage of water content by the latent heat of fusion of water, 143.4 B.t.u.

³ Average freezing point.

See text in this chapter or under appropriate commodity chapter.

⁴ Eggs with weak albumen freeze just below 30 F.

⁴ Lemons stored in production areas for conditioning are held at 55 to 58 F.; in terminal markets they are customarily stored at 50 to 55 F. but sometimes 32 F. is used.

Note: Acknowledgment is due the following men for assistance with certain commodities: R. L. Hiner, L. Feinstein, and A. Kotula, meat and poultry; J. W. White and C. O. Willis, honey and maple sirup; E. B. Lambert, mushrooms; H. Landani, furs and fabrics; M. K. Veldhuis, orange juice; A. L. Ryall, plums and prunes; L. P. McColloch, tomatoes (all the former are U.S. Department of Agriculture staff members); and J. W. Slavin, fish, U.S. Department of Interior.

Source: (From Ashrae Guide and Data Book Applications for 1968, published by the American Society of Heating Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers, Inc.)

HEARINGS ANNOUNCED ON INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND MONETARY FUND LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee will hold hearings on legislation to authorize the appropriation of additional funds for the Asian Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—World Bank—on April 16, 17, and if need be, April 20.

The witnesses before the committee as of this time will be the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable David M. Kennedy, and the Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, the Honorable Paul A. Volcker.

Others requesting to testify will be announced at a later date. At this point in the RECORD I would like to summarize the bill I am introducing today along with 10 other members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Chapter 1 authorizes the United States to pledge a contribution to the Asian Development Bank of \$100 million to the Bank's special funds over a 3-year period. It would authorize the appropriation of \$25 million in the present fiscal year and \$35 million and \$40 million, respectively, in the next 2 fiscal years.

It should be noted that section 1(c) (1) provides for an untied procurement from the United States if approved by the U.S. Governor to the Bank, in consultation with the National Advisory Council.

The language contained in chapter 1

of the draft bill concerning the Asian Development Bank is the language as submitted to the Congress by the administration. This is also true of chapter 2.

Chapter 2 of the draft bill authorizes the U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund to consent to an increase of \$1,540 million in the quota of the United States in the Fund. Of this amount, 25 percent is equivalent to a general increase and 4.8 percent is equivalent to a selected increase for the United States, taking account of our economic growth during the last 5 years relative to that of other countries.

In addition, the U.S. Governor to the IMF would be authorized by this legislation to vote for allocations of special drawing rights to the United States in any future basic period in an amount equal to the proposed new U.S. quota of \$6.7 billion. This proposal follows the precedent of existing legislation which bases the limit on U.S. authority to vote for SDR allocations to the United States upon the size of the U.S. quota in the Fund.

The proposed IMF legislation authorizing the appropriation of \$1,540 million would be payable 25 percent in gold and the remainder in the form of a dollar letter of credit.

Chapter 2 also provides authority for the U.S. Governor to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. If enacted, under section 3 of the proposed bill, the U.S. Governor of the Bank would be authorized to vote for an increase of \$3 billion in the authorized capital of the Bank and a U.S. contribution thereto of \$246,100,000. Of this amount, 10 percent of the subscription

must be paid in, with the remaining 90 percent callable to meet obligations of the Bank.

Chapter 3 of the draft legislation, if enacted, would provide for an audit of the exchange stabilization fund. This fund, amounting to more than \$2 billion, was created as a result of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 and has, since that time, been exempt from audit by the General Accounting Office. Expenditures like the purchase of a \$150,000 home in Tokyo, and \$5.6 million in "administrative expenses" in fiscal year 1969, are not audited by the Comptroller General.

Chapter 3 provides for an annual report of the operations of the fund to the President and the Congress and directs the General Accounting Office to annually audit the funds.

Chapter 4 prohibits the Secretary of the Treasury from purchasing gold from any country which has violated, is violating, or appears to him to be about to violate the March 1968 IMF two-tier gold agreement, as amended in 1969, unless he determines that it is in the national interest. Violators should not benefit from U.S. gold price support. This chapter also directs the Secretary, when he has the option in the settlement of any debt due the United States, to elect to receive special drawing rights in balancing our international credits and debits.

Chapter 5 of the proposed bill sets forth a policy directive to the U.S. Governor of all international financial institutions in which the United States participates to follow a policy that will maximize assistance to the people of the less developed countries. This chap-

ter also requires an annual report of each loan application submitted for a vote in which the U.S. representative participates, indicating in such report the position taken by the representative, and a discussion of how each such loan application conforms with the above policy.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to authorize United States participation in increases in the resources of certain international financial institutions, to provide for an annual audit of the Exchange Stabilization Fund by the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

CHAPTER 1—AMENDMENT OF ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT

Sec.

1. Amendment of Asian Development Bank Act

SECTION 1. Amendment of Asian Development Bank Act

The Asian Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 285-285h) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 12. (a) Subject to the provisions of this Act, the United States Governor of the Bank is authorized to enter into an agreement with the Bank providing for a United States contribution of \$100,000,000 to the Bank in three annual installments of \$25,000,000, \$35,000,000, and \$40,000,000, beginning in fiscal year 1970. This contribution is referred to hereinafter in this Act as the 'U.S. Special Resources'.

"(b) The U.S. Special Resources shall be made available to the Bank pursuant to the provisions of this Act and Article 19 of the Articles of Agreement of the Bank, and in a manner consistent with the Bank's Special Funds Rules and Regulations.

"SEC. 13. (a) The U.S. Special Resources shall be used to finance specific high priority development projects and programs in developing member countries of the Bank with emphasis on such projects and programs in the Southeast Asia region.

"(b) The U.S. Special Resources shall be used by the Bank only for—

"(1) making development loans on terms which may be more flexible and bear less heavily on the balance of payments than those established by the Bank for its ordinary operations; and

"(2) providing technical assistance credits on a reimbursable basis.

"(c) (1) The U.S. Special Resources may be expended by the Bank only for procurement in the United States of goods produced in, or services supplied from, the United States, except that the United States Governor, in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, may allow eligibility for procurement in other member countries from the U.S. Special Resources if he determines that such procurement eligibility would materially improve the ability of the Bank to carry out the objectives of its Special Funds resources and would be compatible with the international financial position of the United States.

"(2) The U.S. Special Resources may be used to pay for administrative expenses arising from the use of the U.S. Special Resources, but only to the extent such expenses are not covered from the Bank's service fee or income from use of U.S. Special Resources.

"(d) All financing of programs and projects by the Bank from the U.S. Special Re-

sources shall be repayable to the Bank by the borrowers in United States dollars.

"Sec. 14. (a) The letters of credit provided for in section 15 shall be issued to the Bank only to the extent that at the time of issuance the cumulative amount of the U.S. Special Resources provided to the Bank (A) constitute a minority of all special funds contributions to the Bank, and (B) are no greater than the largest cumulative contribution of any other single country contributing to the special funds of the Bank.

"(b) The U.S. Governor of the Bank shall give due regard to the principles of (A) utilizing all special funds resources on an equitable basis, and (B) significantly shared participation by other contributors in each special fund to which U.S. Special Resources are provided.

"Sec. 15. The U.S. Special Resources shall be provided to the Bank in the form of a nonnegotiable, noninterest-bearing, letter of credit which shall be payable to the Bank at par value on demand to meet the cost of eligible goods and services, and administrative costs authorized pursuant to section 13(c) of this Act.

"Sec. 16. The United States shall have the right to withdraw all or part of the U.S. Special Resources and any accrued resources derived therefrom under the procedures provided for in section 8.03 of the Special Funds Rules and Regulations of the Bank.

"Sec. 17. For the purpose of providing U.S. Special Resources to the Bank there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 1970, \$35,000,000 for fiscal year 1971, and \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 1972, all of which shall remain available until expended."

CHAPTER 2—INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Sec.

21. Amendment of Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

22. Amendment of Special Drawing Rights Act.

Sec. 21. Amendment of Bretton Woods Agreements Act

The Bretton Woods Agreements Act (22 U.S.C. 286-286k-2) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Sec. 22. (a) The United States Governor of the Fund is authorized to consent to an increase of \$1,540,000,000 in the quota of the United States in the Fund.

"(b) In order to pay the increase in the United States quota in the Fund provided for in this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$1,540,000,000, to remain available until expended.

"Sec. 23. (a) The United States Governor of the Bank is authorized (1) to vote for an increase of \$3,000,000,000 in the authorized capital stock of the Bank, and (2) if such increases become effective, to subscribe on behalf of the United States to 2,461 additional shares of the capital stock of the Bank.

"(b) In order to pay for the increase in the United States subscription to the Bank provided for in this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$246,100,000 to remain available until expended."

Sec. 22. Amendment of Special Drawing Rights Act

Section 6 of the Special Drawing Rights Act (22 U.S.C. 286g) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall on behalf of the United States vote to allocate in each basic period Special Drawing Rights under Article XXIV, sections 2 and 3, of the Articles of Agreement of the Fund so that allocations to the United States in that period exceed an

amount equal to the United States quota in the Fund as authorized under the Bretton Woods Agreements Act."

CHAPTER 3—AUDIT OF EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

Sec.

31. Annual report

32. Audit by General Accounting Office

Sec. 31. Annual report

The last sentence of section 10(a) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (31 U.S.C. 822a(a)) is amended to read: "The Secretary of the Treasury shall annually make a report on the operations of the fund to the President and to the Congress."

Sec. 32. Audit by General Accounting Office

Section 10(b) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (31 U.S.C. 822a(b)) is amended by striking "not be subject to review by any other officer of the United States," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that the fund shall be audited by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General of the United States may by regulation prescribe. There shall be furnished to the Comptroller General such information regarding the powers, duties, activities, organization, financial transactions, and methods of business of the Exchange Stabilization Fund as he may from time to time require; and the Comptroller General or any of his representatives shall, for the purpose of securing this information, have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the United States Government that pertain to the operations and financial transactions of the fund and are necessary to facilitate the audit."

CHAPTER 4—GOLD PURCHASES

Sec. 41. Gold purchases

Section 3700 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 734) is amended (1) by changing "Sec. 3700. With the approval of the President, the Secretary of the Treasury" to read "Sec. 3700. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the President", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury may not purchase gold from any country which has violated, is violating, or appears to him to be about to violate the March 17, 1968, two-tier gold agreement, as amended by the December 30, 1969, South African gold agreement, unless he determines that it is in the national interest of the United States to do so, and communicates that determination to the Congress no later than the date on which the purchase is to take place.

"(c) Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury has an option, in the settlement of any debt due the United States, of receiving gold or Special Drawing Rights, he shall elect to receive Special Drawing Rights."

CHAPTER 5—ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL POLICY OF INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Sec.

51. Declaration of policy

52. Action of United States representatives

53. Annual report

Sec. 51. Declaration of policy

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States, through participation in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank.

To assist the people of the less developed countries in their efforts to develop their resources, and to increase their opportunity

to participate in sharing in the benefits of economic development.

Sec. 52. Action of United States representatives

In the consideration of any project or program loan application presented for approval to the governing board of any such international financial institution, the United States representative shall exercise his voting rights in such a way as to maximize the achievement of the above policy.

Sec. 53. Annual report

The National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies shall include in its annual report to the Congress a statement with respect to each such loan application, setting forth a description of the application, the position taken by the United States representative, and a discussion of how each said loan application conforms with the above policy.

THE LATE HONORABLE STEPHEN PACE, SR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, I stood before this body and eulogized the late E. L. "Tic" Forrester, who had served as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from the Third District of Georgia. Today, only 2 weeks later, I again address this body because of the passing of another distinguished Georgian who so ably represented the Third District immediately prior to the late Congressman Forrester. My wife, Lois, and I express our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Pace and to the other members of this fine family.

Stephen Pace, Sr., a Democrat, was born in Terrell County, Ga., near Dawson, on March 9, 1891. He graduated from high school in Terrell County, and then attended the Institute of Georgia Technology—Georgia Tech—in 1908–09. After a year at Georgia Tech, Steve borrowed funds to enter the University of Georgia in order to obtain his legal education. He received his law degree in 1914 and began the practice of law in Americus, Ga., that same year. While at the university, he was most active and served as president of his junior law class, and president of the Pan-Hellenic Council. He was also a member of Sigma Nu Fraternity and the Gridiron Society.

Steve was married in 1916 to Grace Ragan, daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Thomas B. Ragan of Hawkinsville.

From 1917 until 1920, Steve served in the Georgia General Assembly and in 1923 was elected to the State senate where he served, with distinction, for 2 years.

Steve was elected to serve in the House of Representatives from the Third District of Georgia in 1937 and served until his retirement in 1950. While in Congress, he was a nationally known figure in the field of farm legislation. He fostered the REA legislation which established the broad coverage by that agency to insure that electricity would be available to any farmhouse, no matter how remote, by providing 2-percent loans to the local cooperative for that purpose.

He also fostered the act which made the REA a permanent agency of the Federal Government, thereby insuring that farmers would always have the blessings that came with electrical service at a price they could afford.

He was an early proponent of Federal aid to education and specifically demanded that control of the funds be given to the States, and not Washington. A dream that Steve saw fulfilled was the farm mortgage plan which enabled tenants, sharecroppers, and other farmworkers to buy farms for themselves. He believed that people produced better, took better care of the land and natural resources when they owned land themselves, and this is the reason he sponsored and was instrumental in passing the farm security homeownership legislation, which is now known as Farmers Home Administration.

The seniority system prevented Congressman Pace from ever obtaining chairmanship of the Agriculture Committee on which he served, but time and time again he was called upon to chair special subcommittees to solve most pressing farm problems of the day.

An early opponent of President Truman's civil rights measure, he said:

President Truman speaks only of rights and freedom, but not a single word about duties, obligations, and responsibilities of citizenship. There was not one word of what a man should do to earn these rights and to preserve his freedom.

In 1945 Steve was appointed as a Special Representative of Secretary of Agriculture Anderson at the International Food Conference in London. It was recognized by many that no man in Congress had a broader conception of America's problems. He carried on a constant battle to protect the interest of Georgia and the South, but did not seek to achieve these gains at the expense of other sections of the country. He fought fairly and by so doing gained the respect and confidence of his colleagues and the agricultural leaders of the Nation.

In 1946 efforts were made to draft Steve to seek the governorship of Georgia, but after much deliberation and appeals by farm leaders and farmers, he decided he could be of greater benefit to his area as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Not only was Steve an outstanding and respected public servant, he was also an outstanding and respected citizen. He was a charter member of the Americus Kiwanis Club, and was an active participant by deed and word in many religious, civic, and cultural affairs. He was greatly interested in young people and was cited many times for his work in the betterment of various groups such as the Boy Scouts. He was also a former president of the Americus and Sumter County Chamber of Commerce.

From a humble beginning as a poor farmboy in Terrell County, Stephen Pace, Sr., rose to be respected as an outstanding agricultural authority and leader in Georgia and the Nation.

He will be greatly missed by all who knew him.

In conclusion may I read an article written about Congressman Pace by the Progressive Farmer on the occasion of his selection in 1948 by this magazine as "Man of the year in agriculture" from Georgia.

This article is applicable today in the sense of a sequel. It would be appropriate in featuring Steve Pace of Georgia as man of the century in American agriculture.

The article follows:

FOR GEORGIA: STEVE PACE

When history comes to write the story of American agricultural statesmen of the present day, few are likely to stand higher in the list than Stephen Pace, of Georgia's Third Congressional District. The son of a farmer and a boy who grew up reading by oil lamps and pineknights, Congressman Steve Pace has made it his business to support, sponsor, and fight for legislation that would aid all farm families.

Mr. Pace was author of legislation to make peanuts a basic crop, to set up support prices and to establish marketing quotas when needed.

In 1944 as chairman of a special postwar subcommittee on agriculture, he gave first attention to cotton and its problems. The hearings of December 1944 and the reports that followed are recognized as the most valuable study ever made of cotton and the problems of the Cotton Belt. They are used for constant reference by groups everywhere and as textbooks in some schools.

Believing that fertile fields are the foundation of all farm prosperity, Mr. Pace has been active in support and aggressive in expanding programs to save and build the soil. Having studied the fate and the condition of other nations which were unmindful of the loss of their soil, he is alarmed at the rapid rate of loss in this country.

It was to save soil and people and to further promote the family-type farm that Mr. Pace started 7 years ago his efforts to set up an insured farm-mortgage plan, similar to the FHA insured mortgage plan for city homes, to enable tenants, sharecroppers, and other farm workers to buy farms for themselves. He knew that a good percentage of soil destruction comes because a tenant has neither the incentive nor the opportunity to preserve and build up the rich topsoil. He knew that a home is the foundation of democracy and prosperity and a safeguard against the spread of foreign "isms." He had also seen what a fine start had been made through the Farm Security home-ownership program and wanted to see its opportunities expanded.

This legislation is now in effect. A number of these loans have been made in Georgia, Alabama, and Florida since the first one was closed in Mr. Pace's home county of Sumter last October 3.

Mr. Pace has been one of the most active champions of REA. He has often said that he could not rest until there is a power line to every farmhouse in the Nation. He is seeking funds adequate to complete this job by January 1, 1950.

These are but a few of the things Steve Pace has supported for the good of southern farm families. He will always be found in the forefront in securing a square national deal for those who produce the food and fiber to feed and clothe the Nation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I share the sadness of my colleagues from Georgia over the news of the death of our late friend and colleague, the Honorable Stephen Pace, Sr. Steve Pace and I served on the Committee on Agriculture

together. I believe I worked with him as closely as any other Member. We worked together on major farm bills and we shared common interests in agricultural commodities, particularly cotton and peanuts. I was on his subcommittee when we wrote a modification of the farm bill which had been recommended by former Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannon. I have worked with him in his office until late at night. I believe that he was the hardest working person that I have ever known in all my life. He had a capacity for continuous labor that was almost phenomenal. He has a keen, penetrating, and analytical mind. He had a broad view of life. He had an amazing understanding not only of agricultural but of all problems that beset our Nation and the human race in his time. He made one of the most eloquent speeches I have ever heard in support of the Marshall plan. He was indeed an extraordinary man.

I shall be eternally grateful to Steve Pace for the manner in which he took me by the hand when I was a very junior Member of this House. He was a great teacher as well as a wonderful friend. One of the highlights of my service during all my years in the House of Representatives has been the close association and friendship that I enjoyed with the late Honorable Stephen Pace.

He was a man who served his constituents with extraordinary ability and who served his day and generation with rare distinction. May his soul rest in the peace which he has earned and may the comforting hand of the Almighty protect Mrs. Pace and all his loved ones in their bereavement.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying respect to our late beloved colleague, Stephen Pace of Georgia.

Stephen Pace was a distinguished Member of the House who ably and effectively represented the people of his district nearly a decade and a half. He was a dedicated public servant.

Those of us who served with Representative Pace recall with appreciation and admiration his valuable service to the Nation through his work on the Committee on Agriculture. He was a great agriculture leader who had intimate and personal knowledge of the requirements and aspirations of those in rural areas.

He knew of the vital relationship of the agricultural economy to the entire country. He used his legal and legislative skills, acquired in his home State and in this Chamber, to contribute to the advancement of agriculture and, consequently, the entire Nation.

He is to be particularly remembered and honored for his part in shaping the legislation to bring American agriculture to a maximum productive effort for the large requirements during World War II and the days which followed.

To his wife and family I extend my sympathy for their great loss in his passing.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker,

I was saddened to learn of the passing of our former colleague and friend, Stephen Pace, Sr., of Georgia, and I want to take this means of joining with members of the Georgia delegation and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to his memory.

Stephen Pace served with distinction, as a Member of Congress from the Third Congressional District of Georgia until his retirement in 1950.

He was an able, vital, and important member of the Committee on Agriculture and rendered an outstanding service to his district, State, and Nation.

I want to extend to Mrs. Pace and other members of the family an expression of my deepest sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues in paying special tribute to our esteemed friend and distinguished former colleague, the late Honorable Stephen Pace, Sr., who passed away on April 5. He was a warm and genuine human being who spent much of his life in the service of his fellow man and his country. It was my privilege to serve with Steve. He was already recognized as a leader in the important field of agriculture when he came to Congress as a freshman. As the years went by, his influence grew in that often controversial field and it was my belief that he, more than anyone else, united and strengthened the efforts of the great House Committee on Agriculture in its deliberations and in its legislative programs.

As we pause to honor the memory of the gentleman who so ably represented the Third Congressional District of Georgia for 14 years, from 1937 to 1951, it is pleasant to recall the many outstanding accomplishments of this very able legislator.

Representative Pace was admitted to the bar in 1914 and commenced practice in Americus, Ga., the same year. He served in the State house of representatives from 1917 to 1920 and was a member of the State senate in 1923 and 1924. He was elected to the 75th and to each succeeding Congress until his retirement in 1950. Steve Pace's record in Congress earned for him the genuine admiration of his colleagues. He was a loyal and generous friend, a helpful coworker, a tireless and deeply knowledgeable student of our Nation's most difficult and complex problems.

I join my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to the family of our beloved departed friend Steve Pace, and I assure them he will long remain in our thoughts and prayers. The Congress and the Nation benefited from his diligent and capable service.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the late Honorable Stephen Pace, Sr., who passed away on April 5. Steve represented the Third District of Georgia in the U.S. House of Representatives from the 75th Congress until his retirement in 1950. After his retire-

ment he returned to his beloved Americus and the practice of law.

Before coming to Washington Steve served in the Georgia State House of Representatives and State Senate with distinction.

He was a treasured personal friend. Not only was he known for his ability and dedication, but for humility and humor. I know of no person with whom I have served who was more anxious to cooperate and who was more kindly in his association with all his colleagues. He worked toward the ideals he expressed with all his might.

Steve Pace became a member of the House Agriculture Committee in the 76th Congress. With the 81st Congress he became vice chairman of the Agriculture Committee and also served as chairman of the Cotton Subcommittee and Farm Labor Subcommittee. In previous years he had served on the Food Shortage Subcommittee and Crop Insurance Subcommittee. Much important legislation was written into law during his work with the Agriculture Committee. He was indeed a friend to the farmer.

The burden of sadness borne by the surviving members of his family is one shared by those of us in this body who had the privilege of knowing and working with Steve Pace.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the life and service of Stephen Pace.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND THE COURTS

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most critical problems of today is crime in the streets. Recognizing this, in 1968 Congress passed the Safe Streets Act, establishing the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency to provide Federal assistance to State and local enforcement and courts.

This agency has been termed by the Attorney General as the best means of providing needed Federal assistance in the fight against crime, which is principally a local responsibility. The Nixon administration continues to talk a great crusade against crime, but when it comes to positive action, it opts for halfway measures, as indicated by its lack of support of adequate funds for LEAA.

The Attorney General, as spokesman for the administration, testified that LEAA needed only \$480 million. Yet, the cities and States are all asking for additional help. Therefore, the House Ju-

diary Committee chairman, who has taken the initiative in many other anti-crime measures, has said he plans to request \$750 million for the Agency. This contrasts to the \$480 million request of the administration.

The Judiciary Committee is currently marking up the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, and Chairman Celler has assured me that it will be reported out with the \$750 million funding request. Some believe that an even greater amount should be funded for the agency, and that the \$750 million is the minimum assistance figure.

The Judiciary Committee has taken the initiative in many other areas after patiently waiting for administration proposals and positions. The Voting Rights Act is a good example. The administration sought to weaken the provisions of this most significant civil rights legislation to guarantee every citizen the right to vote. Also, there is now some question about exactly where the administration stands on the 18-year-old vote; the provision, added by the Senate, has received on-again, off-again support of the administration.

Despite the vacillation and ambiguity of the administration, Congress has moved ahead to meet its responsibilities. Some of the activity and statements by administration spokesmen raise questions about the sincerity of positions—do they really desire legislative action, or do they seek political gain?

Again, I ask the administration to join with a concerned Congress in meeting the pressing needs of the Nation, and to assist in moving necessary legislation.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

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. In 1966 the United States produced 1,296,000 metric tons of copper. This represented almost one-fourth of the world total. The Soviet Union was second producing 750,000 metric tons.

INCREASE IN POSTAL RATES

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the administration has added insult to injury with its proposal to increase first-class mailing rates by almost 67 percent in order to finance the bulk of the proposed postal pay raises.

The administration laid the groundwork and fostered a climate that allowed the threat of the Nation's first national postal strike to become a grim reality. By adamantly refusing to consider postal pay raises unless accompanied by a postal reform package to turn the Post Office into a private postal corporation, the

administration effectively kept the postal pay legislation bottled up in conference after it had passed both Houses. Despite the fact that the climate for effective postal reform had become favorable, and in spite of the valid demands of postal employees for pay increases necessary to keep pace with the rising cost of living, the administration refused to remove this obstacle and the Nation was the loser.

In place of the traditional use of the legislative process, the administration has embarked upon a course whereby normal governmental processes and the patience of our citizens are pushed to the limit, and in this instance, almost broken.

I support reasonable and necessary postal pay increases, and I support measures to increase the efficiency of the postal operations, but I am opposed to the administration's heavyhanded method of achieving these goals, and to its proposal to put almost the entire burden for these necessary adjustments upon the average citizen in the form of a disrupted mail service and unreasonable increases in first-class mailing rates.

While the President recommends increasing first-class mailing rates from 6 cents to 10 cents, almost a 67-percent increase, to produce \$2.3 billion in added revenues, he proposes to increase second- and third-class mail rates by a mere 5 percent to produce an extra \$125 million in added revenues. First-class mail is utilized predominantly by individual citizens, while business concerns comprise the bulk of second- and third-class mailers. Although first-class mailers already pay more than their own way, second-class mail pays approximately one-quarter of its costs, and third-class mail pays about 82 percent of its costs. Certainly some reasonable adjustments can be made to bring second- and third-class mail revenues more in line with their costs to the Government. Even under the present system with the first-class mailers, that is average citizen mailers, subsidizing second- and third-class mail, the Post Office has a deficit of \$1.3 billion. Second- and third-class mailers must be made to share more equitably in the burdens as well as the benefits of our postal operations.

Average citizens are fed up with having to subsidize the delivery costs for the publishing industry, and I for one am going to oppose the administration's proposal to have first-class mailers almost exclusively bear the burden for these postal increases.

As a first step toward bringing postal wages up to realistic levels, I support H.R. 16844, a bill providing for a 6-percent across-the-board pay increase for Federal employees, and I intend to support the proposed additional 8-percent increase for postal employees when it comes up for consideration.

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER FIREMEN'S WEEK

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce that 44 of our colleagues are cosponsoring legislation today which would authorize the President to proclaim "National Volunteer Firemen's Week" from September 19, 1970, to September 26, 1970.

The two bills introduced today are companion bills to House Joint Resolution 1154 which I introduced on April 6.

Those joining in honoring the Nation's volunteer firemen include Congressmen WILLIAM R. ANDERSON of Tennessee, EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR., JAMES A. BYRNE, and R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, of Pennsylvania, JOEL T. BROYHILL of Virginia, ROBERT V. DENNEY, of Nebraska, THOMAS N. DOWNING, of Virginia, JOSHUA EHLBERG and EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, of Pennsylvania, HAMILTON FISH, JR., of New York, and DANIEL J. FLOOD and JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania.

Other cosponsors are: Congressmen EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland; JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, of Pennsylvania; JAMES F. HASTINGS, of New York; MRS. HECKLER, of Massachusetts; FRANK HORTON, of New York; WILLIAM L. HUNGATE, of Missouri; ANDREW JACOBS, JR., of Indiana; JOSEPH M. McDADE, of Pennsylvania; JOHN O. MARSH, JR., of Virginia; JOHN MELCHER, of Montana; G. V. MONTGOMERY, of Mississippi; WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD and THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania; BILL NICHOLS, of Alabama; J. J. (JAKE) PICKLE, of Texas; ALEXANDER PIRNIE, of New York; and HOWARD W. ROBISON, of New York.

Also joining the list of sponsors are Congressmen FRED B. ROONEY and HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania; WILLIAM L. SCOTT, of Virginia; BURT L. TALCOTT, of California; FLETCHER THOMPSON, of Georgia; JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, of Pennsylvania; WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, of Virginia; G. ROBERT WATKINS, of Pennsylvania; LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., of Connecticut; J. IRVING WHALLEY, of Pennsylvania; LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS, of Pennsylvania; LARRY WINN, JR., of Kansas; LESTER L. WOLFF and JOHN W. WYDLER, of New York, and GUS YATRON, of Pennsylvania.

I will be introducing another companion bill to those introduced today and invite other of our colleagues to join in support of this long overdue tribute to the Nation's volunteer firemen.

NARCOTICS EDUCATION ACT OF 1970

(Mr. OTTINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, I introduced H.R. 16730, the Narcotics Education Act of 1970. The thrust of this bill is to authorize \$10 million in fiscal 1971 to establish pilot projects employing former narcotic addicts to educate young people about the dangers of drug abuse.

A frightening epidemic of drug addiction is threatening our young people.

There are over 25,000 teenage addicts in New York City alone, and the rate is increasing at 7 to 10 percent a month. Giving drugs to a child is the same thing as killing him. Yet we are doing almost nothing to stop our young people from getting hooked.

Prevention is the most vital task before us. Education is the best means of prevention. But a recent study of 133 teenage addicts showed that only 17 percent had received any education at all on the dangers of heroin. Indeed, the New York City Board of Education does not allocate a single cent of its \$1.2 billion budget for drug education.

My bill to establish an addict prevention corps is an effort to fill that education gap. I propose that the Federal Government appropriate \$10 million this year to send ex-addicts and other young people into the Nation's schools to lead the fight against teenage drug abuse.

Our young people no longer listen to their parents or teachers on the drug problem. There is a communication barrier between generations. As a parent of three boys approaching adolescence, I am deeply concerned about this communication failure. I do not want them "cured" after they have become addicted—I want them prevented from experimenting with dangerous drugs altogether. I think most parents feel the same.

To prevent teenage addiction, we have to reach teenagers on their own level. Ex-addicts can communicate with teenagers because they have been the addiction route. They can tell them from firsthand experience the horrors of addiction and the terrible difficulty of becoming unhooked. Their own lives give them the credibility which will make other young people listen.

In addition to teaching in the schools, APC members would be available for counseling youngsters with drug problems and sponsoring teenage clubs to combat drug addiction.

In too many places, popping pills or shooting heroin is the thing to do. What we have to do is to provide an impetus for teenagers to organize their own fight against addiction.

I recently spent a morning touring Horizon House, a city rehabilitation facility housing ex-addicts at 300 East 4th Street in New York City. It is a moving experience to see these young people trying to build new lives. They are struggling for survival, and they are winning. There are 87 ex-addicts there and over 1,300 in other similar facilities in the city. They represent our hope for turning back the blight of addiction.

As a part of their program, the Horizon House ex-addicts have been counseling students against drugs in the New York City schools. Their pilot APC project has been very successful and highly praised by participating school officials.

At present, the Nixon administration is holding up action on the city's application for refunding the existing narcotics program. Further delay could seriously jeopardize the prevention, education, and rehabilitation programs pioneered by the city's addiction services

agency. It would be a travesty if the administration should now cut off these programs just where they are beginning to make an impact. The lives of these young people are at stake, and they deserve better than procrastination.

What I am proposing is an effort to stop the infection of addiction before it starts. The young people in Horizon House know the horror of being hooked. They have already started going out to schools to tell others about their experience. They are the best apostles of drug prevention that we have. And the time has come to use their talents so that others can be prevented from making the same tragic mistake.

The authorization in H.R. 16730 is for \$10 million to demonstrate the effectiveness of employing ex-addicts and other young people trained in narcotics prevention to teach in schools in the Nation's cities, suburbs, and rural areas. Part of the money would be used for special audiovisual materials such as films which can be used in conjunction with lectures. As many as 4,000 to 5,000 ex-addicts and addiction specialists could be employed at an annual per capita expense of \$20,000.

Mr. Speaker, the Addiction Prevention Corps concept has already been endorsed by Commissioner Larry Bear, Addiction Services Agency, New York City; Project HELP, a private addiction services agency; and Mr. John Niemayer, president, Bank Street College. I hope that my colleagues will join me as cosponsors of this important legislation to combat the growing menace of drug abuse among young people. The full text of H.R. 16730 follows:

H.R. 16730

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Narcotics Education Act of 1970."

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that drug abuse has reached epidemic proportions in the United States and constitutes a direct threat to the strength and vitality of our Nation; that such abuse is increasing rapidly among schoolchildren in urban and suburban areas; that there is a lack of creative projects designed to educate students and others about drugs and their abuse; and that prevention and control of such drug abuse require intensive and coordinated efforts on the part of both governmental and private groups.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to establish study programs on the problems of drug abuse and educational programs in the public schools of the Nation.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

USES OF FUNDS

SEC. 4. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 3, the Commissioner of Education shall assist projects designed to educate students in public schools on the problems of drug abuse by making grants to or entering into contracts with public educa-

tional and social service agencies for pilot projects designed to demonstrate the effectiveness of employing addiction specialists, including, but not limited to, ex-addicts, in classroom education and other rehabilitation programs.

APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Financial assistance for a project under this Act may be made only upon application at such time or times, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Commissioner deems necessary, and only if such application—

(1) provides that the activities and services for which assistance under this Act is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

(2) sets forth a program for carrying out the purpose set forth in section 4 and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of such program;

(3) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the applicant under this Act; and

(4) provides for making reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) Applications from public educational and social service agencies for financial assistance under this Act may be approved by the Commissioner only if the Governor has been notified of the application and been given the opportunity to offer recommendations.

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

CONSULTATIONS WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 6. (a) The Commissioner may not approve an application for assistance under this Act unless he has given the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health and the head of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in the Department of Justice an opportunity to review the application and make recommendations thereon within a period of not to exceed sixty days.

(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall promulgate regulations establishing the procedures for consultation with other Federal agencies (including the consultation required by subsection (a)) and with other appropriate public and private agencies.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 7. Payments under this Act may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 8. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or private agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. As used in this Act—
(a) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "public educational or social service agency" means a public board of education or a social service agency legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public schools and social service agencies in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public education or social services.

(c) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HALL for 1 day, April 9, on account of business in district.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for April 13 through April 23, on account of official business as a member of and at the request of the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to inspect hospital facilities in Vietnam and to review other related veterans matters.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL, today, for 60 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRINKLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BRINKLEY, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOGAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. VANDER JAGT, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 30 minutes, Monday, April 13.

Mr. BUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PERKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOGAN to follow the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Florida) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. SNYDER in three instances.

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. BUTTON in two instances.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. NELSEN in two instances.

Mrs. MAY.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. HARSHA.

Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRINKLEY) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. MINISH in three instances.

Mr. FISHER in three instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama.

Mr. MCCARTHY in three instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. DORN in four instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in eight instances.

Mr. BARING in two instances.

Mr. KARTH.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. MONAGAN.

Mr. CULVER in two instances.

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

Mr. DOWDY in two instances.

Mr. KYROS in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. KOCH in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. CASEY in two instances.

Mr. TIERNAN.

Mr. YATES.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in three instances.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 190. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House ad-

joined until Monday, April 13, 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:

1905. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the eighth annual report of the Office of Civil Defense for the year 1969, pursuant to section 406 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1906. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting prospectuses proposing construction or alteration of certain public buildings for use by the Post Office Department, pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 480), as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

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. DADDARIO: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 16595. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 16844. A bill to increase the pay of Federal employees, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept. No. 91-992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 905. Resolution for administration of H.R. 16844, a bill to increase the pay of Federal employees, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-993). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEED: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 16900. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 16915. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLOOD: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 16916. A bill making appropriations for the Office of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-996). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:
H.R. 16861. A bill to preserve and stabilize the domestic gold mining industry on public, Indian, and other lands within the United States and to increase the domestic production of gold to meet the needs of industry

and national defense; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 16862. A bill to amend the act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 986), as amended (43 U.S.C. 1411-18) and the act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 988), as amended (43 U.S.C. 1421-27); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 16863. A bill to extend the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, for 3 years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 16864. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 16865. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act so as to extend its duration, provide for national standards of ambient air quality, expedite enforcement of air pollution control standards, authorize regulation of fuels and fuel additives, provide for improved controls over motor vehicle emissions, establish standards applicable to dangerous emissions from stationary sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16866. A bill to authorize the Council on Environmental Quality to conduct studies and make recommendations respecting the reclamation and recycling of material from solid wastes, to extend the provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16867. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to provide financial assistance for the construction of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 16868. A bill to establish an Environmental Financing Authority to assist in the financing of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 16869. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 16870. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 16871. A bill to transfer to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the functions of the Secretary of Agriculture relating to insecticides, fungicides, and rodenticides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 16872. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for increases by the Postmaster General in postage rates applicable to third-class bulk mailings when the revenue from such rates is insufficient to cover the cost of third-class bulk mail service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 16873. A bill to improve public nutrition through the expanded use of dairy products and to increase the income of dairy farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 16874. A bill to establish a senior citizens skill and talent utilization program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16875. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 16876. A bill to amend section 152(a) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 16877. A bill to extend the District of

Columbia Compulsory Immunization Statute; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 16878. A bill to encourage States to establish abandoned automobile removal programs and to provide for tax incentives for automobile scrap processing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 16879. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the establishment of mail rates by the filing of tariffs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 16880. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the program of health insurance for the aged for services furnished an individual by a home maintenance worker (in such individual's home) as part of a home health services plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 16881. A bill to establish a senior citizens skill and talent utilization program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 16882. A bill to protect the public health and safety to provide new means for the control of the depressant, stimulant, and hallucinogenic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 16883. A bill to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible the lake areas of the Nation by establishing a National Lake Areas System and authorizing programs of lake and lake areas research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JARMAN (for himself and Mr. ROGERS of Florida):

H.R. 16884. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and other laws 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.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself and Mr. POFF):

H.R. 16885. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to establish the Federal Administrative Justice Center to enhance the quality of administrative law operations in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 16886. A bill to recognize direct benefits to the United States from the construction of the Toledo Bend Dam and Reservoir project and exempt Sabine River Authority, State of Louisiana, and Sabine River Authority of Texas, from further charges for the use, occupancy and enjoyment of certain lands of the United States within the Sabine National Forest, Tex.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 16887. A bill to provide for annual adjustments in monthly monetary benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration, according to changes in the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCKNEALLY:

H.R. 16888. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 16889. A bill to create a select committee on the Investigation of Pornographic Enterprises; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 16890. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to give the Interstate Commerce Commission additional authority to alleviate freight car shortages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr.

BARRETT, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. REES, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 16891. A bill to authorize U.S. participation in increases in the resources of certain international financial institutions, to provide for an annual audit of the exchange stabilization fund by the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 16892. A bill to amend section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income up to \$300 per month of scholarships and fellowship grants for which the performance of services is required; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 16893. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 16894. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus personal property to State fish and wildlife agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 16895. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, to clarify the provisions relating to custom slaughtering operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 16896. 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 Federal or State pollution control standards; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 16897. A bill to extend for a period of 10 years the existing authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. OBER):

H.R. 16898. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by imposing a tax on the transfer of explosives to person who may lawfully possess them and to prohibit possession of explosives by certain persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 16899. A bill to improve law enforcement in urban areas by making available funds to improve the effectiveness of police services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 16900. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 16901. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the narcotic, depressant, stimulant, and hallucinogenic drug laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 16902. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to transfer Charlotte and Lee Counties from the middle to the southern district of Florida and Highlands County from the southern to the middle district

of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 16903. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain rights in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 16904. A bill to authorize the payment of interest on certain claims against the United States by small contractors and the payment of interest and attorneys' fees on judgments obtained against the United States by such contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER (for himself, Mr.

BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. VANIK, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. KYROS, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16905. A bill to permit State agreements for coverage under the hospital insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 16906. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 16907. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 with respect to donable surplus property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 16908. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, to clarify the provisions relating to custom slaughtering operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 16909. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide compensation for substitute employees in the postal field service for holidays and extra compensation for such employees for time worked on holidays, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 16910. A bill to provide that the interest on certain insured loans sold out of the agriculture credit insurance fund shall be included in gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself,

Mr. CARTER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. REES, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. MCKNEALLY):

H.R. 16911. A bill to encourage States to establish abandoned automobile removal programs and to provide for tax incentives for automobile scrap processing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 16912. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a Federal insurance guarantee program under the Federal Insurance Administrator to protect the American public against losses resulting from the insolvency of insurers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YATES (for himself, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. MCKNEALLY, and Mr. POLLOCK):

H.R. 16913. A bill to amend section 208 of the National Emissions Standards Act to permit States to adopt motor vehicle emission

standards more stringent than the Federal standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 16915. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 16916. A bill making appropriations for the Office of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.J. Res. 1160. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National Volunteer Firemen's Week from September 19, 1970, to September 26, 1970; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 1161. Joint resolution to authorize an ex gratia contribution to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages during the Second World War, and to establish a Micronesian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 1162. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 403, 80th Congress, of January 28, 1948, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.J. Res. 1163. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Commission on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.J. Res. 1164. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 1165. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in June of each year as "National PBX Operators Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BIESTER,

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MARSH, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.J. Res. 1166. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National Volunteer Firemen's Week from September 19, 1970, to September 26, 1970; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHNEEBELL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. WHALLEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WYDLER, and Mr. YATRON):

H.J. Res. 1167. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National Volunteer Firemen's Week from September 19, 1970, to September 26, 1970; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H. Con. Res. 566. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in opposition to the high interest rate policy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H. Con. Res. 567. Concurrent resolution

expressing the sense of the Congress in opposition to the high interest rate policy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. YATES, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. MINISH, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. GETTYS):

H. Con. Res. 568. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in opposition to the high interest rate policy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. BARING, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FARSTEIN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. GIAIMO, and Mr. GRAY):

H. Res. 906. Resolution calling for a national commitment to cure and control cancer within this decade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr.

HALPERN, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. REES, Mr. ROE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SANDMAN, and Mr. STOKES):

H. Res. 907. Resolution calling for a national commitment to cure and control cancer within this decade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MINISH introduced a bill (H.R. 16914) for the relief of Joseph F. Sullivan, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

350. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to increasing the Farmers Home Administration loan ceiling, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

437. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Oneida Indian Nation of New York, Nedrow, N.Y., relative to treaty obligations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

438. By Mr. LONG of Louisiana: Governor John J. McKeithen, et al. on freedom of choice in public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

439. By Mr. ZWACH: Petition of the citizens of Cold Spring, Minn., asking the President and Congress to do all in their power for humane treatment and release of the men held prisoners of North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.