

FUNDS NEEDED FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the House soon will be considering important legislation dealing with health manpower. This legislation is a critical component of the Nation's efforts to create a better and a more meaningful life for all Americans—a life less burdened by disease and suffering.

The reason the forthcoming legislation is so crucial is that health manpower necessary to achieving the goal of better and more meaningful lives is in short supply.

We know, for example, that the United States right now faces a shortage of some 50,000 physicians, a shortage of 57,000 dentists, a shortage of nearly 150,000 nurses, and a shortage of more than 250,000 allied health personnel.

Yet the academic medical centers that educate and train health professionals are facing financial crises which prevent them from fulfilling their essential role in providing this manpower.

I firmly believe that national policy in support of medical education should be based on two concepts—that medical education is a function of national importance, and that the medical institutions involved are a national resource.

Only through viewing medical schools as a national resource and providing Federal support for their basic operations at substantial levels and in a continuing form can this structure of vital institutions and their indispensable functions be sustained.

Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed to learn recently of the severity of the financial conditions at the University of Mississippi School of Medicine, in my own district.

At the school of medicine, conditions of financial distress have forced detrimental changes in the content and quality of a number of programs. These are programs vital to functions of the school, and in some cases vital to my State.

As an example, lack of ability to pay competitive salaries has led to the loss of almost the entire department of anesthesiology. To rebuild this department will

cost approximately double the departmental budget.

Other examples abound. The school's ability to develop a full time department in family practice has been severely hampered. Funds are inadequate to staff badly needed full-time departments in plastic surgery, dermatology, and ophthalmology, and this deficiency is impairing the school's training programs.

Lack of funds has forced the school to forego the recruiting of faculty in a number of important fields, constituting very real handicaps in the training of students and house staff.

Due to lack of funds, the school is threatened with the loss of the only good, human drug toxicology laboratory in the State. The increase in the drug abuse problem makes the provision of toxicology support obligatory.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to increase class size and thus to help meet the national need for additional physicians, capital construction has been planned by the school. But the plans have fallen through due to the inability of the school to secure matching funds.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked by these conditions of extreme financial distress in such a prestigious school.

Provisions in the forthcoming health manpower legislation for construction assistance and for operating support of medical schools can provide useful approaches for meeting the financial needs of Mississippi and of all the Nation's medical schools.

The legislation should be the opportunity for a giant step forward, toward recognizing our medical schools as a national resource. It can be the beginning of a laudable national effort to provide the schools with a fundamental base of support at a substantial level and in a continuing form.

POLLUTION FIGHTER

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, for several decades our people have been indoctrinated with the idea that only the Federal Government can solve their ills.

Local governments, in line with this concept, have all waited to get the handout from Washington which, being slow in coming and deficient in amount, has made little progress possible, as witness the fight against pollution.

But the profit motive which accounted for our high standard of living and our great freedom, gets things done efficiently, quickly and without cost to the taxpayer. A good example is the extensive and expensive work done by the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., as described in the following editorial which appeared in the Santa Ana Register under date of April 16, 1971:

POLLUTION FIGHTER

It is popular to point the finger of shame for all kinds of pollution at business. But if business has in the past sinned in this area, it is hastening to make amends.

Take for instance the International Telephone and Telegraph Corp. and its subsidiaries. Not only are they involved with developing new products and processes to benefit all of us, but they are rapidly moving into improvement of social-environmental relations so that more of us may be better able to enjoy the new products.

The numerous subsidiaries are trying to improve the quality of life. Stenberg-Flygt AB, maker of industrial pumps, has entered the pollution-control market for the paper industry with a highly efficient proprietary process that purifies and re-uses waste water. In Hoquiam, Wash., helicopters lower anti-pollution "digester caps" into place on gas recovery towers at the ITT Rayonier mill. When Rayonier adds to its mill for chemical cellulose production in Jessup, Ga., it will be equipped with the most advanced air and water protection equipment.

Also in Washington state, Rayonier allows public use of most of its 350,000 acres of land for recreation and provides camping areas with cooking facilities. It has a research unit of oceanographers, marine biologists and air pollution scientists who devote full time to solving and preventing environmental problems associated with company operations. It has invested \$22 million for water protection and \$3 million for air protection.

In human relations, various subsidiaries have provided equal employment opportunities and upgrading of skills, risked venture capital in supporting minority groups having difficulty in obtaining capital otherwise; sponsored 47 drug education seminars in 1970 and turned over a building in Honolulu, rent-free for a year, for a drug clinic; airlifted blankets to Peruvian earthquake victims; and contributed to business training schools.

The list of other voluntary efforts is long and the results are helpful. Perhaps instead of crying "Shame" so often, it is time to look around at good efforts by business and say "Thanks."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 2, 1971

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

We know that in everything God works for good.—Romans 8: 28.

O God and Father of us all, who art ever calling us to live with good will in our hearts, help us so to open our hearts to Thee that this virtue may come to new life within us. Then, may we share it with one another and together share it with others across the seas that good will may

reign throughout the world and men learn to live together in peace.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

SCHEDULE OF APPROPRIATION BILLS

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I have been working with the House leadership in connection with the House schedule on appropriation bills for the months of June and July.

We hope to pass six appropriation

bills through the House during the month of June.

We expect to pass the legislative appropriation bill on Friday of this week.

We expect to take up the Treasury-Post Office-General Government bill about June 22; the agriculture, environmental and consumer protection bill about June 23; the State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary bill about June 24; the HUD-space science bill about June 28; and the Interior and related agencies bill about June 29.

The House passed the education appropriation bill earlier in the year, and if we do meet this schedule in June we will have passed in the House by June 30 one-half of the appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1972.

Let me add that the hearings and the report on the legislative bill are available in the Committee on Appropriations. Let me also say that we have conducted thousands of hours of hearings on the various bills, and that many of the hearings are now available to Members so that they can, if they desire, do background work on any of these bills.

Additional hearings will be released almost daily during the next 2 or 3 weeks, and others later on, in order that Members may have the maximum opportunity to familiarize themselves with the forthcoming appropriation bills. We are releasing them as soon as we get them from the printer.

Copies of bills and reports are always available at the committee rooms in the Capitol immediately after the committee reports.

JULY SCHEDULE

In July, we hope to pass all the remaining regular appropriation bills.

We expect to report the transportation appropriation bill shortly after the July 4 break.

Hearings on the Public Works-AEC bill are concluded.

Hearings on the Defense appropriation bill will conclude next week. A reporting date is uncertain as a result of the fact that we do not yet have an appropriate legislative authorization bill.

We hope to conclude hearings on the other bills during June.

I will place additional information on these matters in the Extensions of Remarks section of the RECORD.

As Members know, several of these bills are dependent to one extent or another on authorization legislation. But it is our hope to be able to clear all these bills through the House before the August 6 summer recess.

I should add that with the cooperation of the other body, we should be able to conclude conferences on quite a number of these bills before the August 6 summer recess.

MISS DIANA KAN, A GREENWICH VILLAGE ARTIST

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to our colleagues' attention the outstanding achievements of one of my constituents. Kan Man Shu, who is

known to Westerners as Diana Kan, lives at 26 West 9th Street in New York City and has received the distinguished honor of being the second living artist, and first woman, ever invited to exhibit work at the National Historical Museum in Taiwan. The exhibit of Miss Kan's work will open on July 7 and will continue for 2 months.

Miss Kan's talent is well known to residents of the 17th Congressional District, for her works have appeared for many years at the Washington Square Outdoor Art Exhibit, as well as at the National Arts Club, the National Academy of Design, the Christopher Art Gallery, and the Lord and Taylor Art Gallery, all in New York. Miss Kan also enjoys an international reputation which began when she first exhibited her work in Shanghai at the age of 9. Since then her paintings have appeared in Hong Kong, Macau, Bangkok, London, Paris, San Francisco, Greenwich, Conn., and Naples, Fla.

It is unfortunate that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD cannot reproduce pictures, because the brilliant colors and delicate artistry of Miss Kan's work are truly outstanding. I am pleased to bring this distinguished lady to our colleagues' attention, and I hope that they will have an opportunity to view her work in the near future.

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we all are going to be asked to vote on one of two alternative approaches to the very serious problem of the manpower and training for jobs in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking advantage of this moment to renew an urgent request made by our subcommittee to the administration and to the other side.

There is a table that will be presented by the other side to the membership representing how much better off our respective communities will be under the substitute proposal.

We have asked and have not received from the Department of Labor—and this is of very great importance to all growth States such as California—on what fiscal year cost information are they basing their formula. The formula is based on a 3-fiscal-year average. We have asked and have not received what the expenditures were—State by State and community by community—for the fiscal year 1969. We have requested and have not received a State-by-State and community-by-community figure for the fiscal year 1970.

We have requested and have not received on what basis they have estimated the expenditures for the current fiscal year. Their formula is based on the average of these 3 benchmark years. Yet, not a single Member on our side has been able to ascertain—and we have tried—what annual benchmark data they are using.

This proposal is one affecting every one

of our communities, and I would think before the vote today that the other side would provide us with the data upon which they have based their proposal.

A PROFIT FOR THE HOUSE CAFETERIAS

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had the first report from the auditors on the House restaurants and cafeterias. We have been auditing them on a daily basis.

I called in the Members of the press corps for the three dailies here in Washington, along with representatives of the wire services, and told them the good news, that the cafeterias for the first time in the memory of man in the month of May made a profit.

I did not see anything in either the Post or the News about that. I am happy to say the Star did carry a factual report.

They frequently talk about subsidized meals for Congressmen. Of course, about as many reporters eat down there, percentage-wise, as Congressmen. I never saw anything about any subsidized meals for reporters.

Anyway, after a close check and audit the cafeterias made a profit last month of about \$1,355. We are moving the same audit system into the House restaurant. I do not know whether we can make the restaurant make a profit because of the fact that after the lunch hour the waiters go on overtime and the restaurant remains open so long as the House is in session, but the deficit has been cut down drastically.

I thought that would be news. Apparently it was not, so the only way the Members are going to know about this is, apparently, if I tell them on a month-to-month basis, which I will do.

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. BOGGS. 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. 112]

Abourezk	Dulski	McKinney
Anderson, Tenn.	Dwyer	Metcalfe
Baring	Edwards, La.	Moss
Burleson, Tex.	Evins, Tenn.	Pike
Camp	Flowers	Pirnie
Carey, N.Y.	Flynt	Roberts
Carney	Ford,	Rooney, N.Y.
Chisholm	William D.	Rosenthal
Clark	Gallagher	Rostenkowski
Clawson, Del.	Glaimo	Rush
Clay	Goldwater	Runnels
Coughlin	Hathaway	Ruppe
Culver	Hébert	Satterfield
Dellums	Hillis	Shibley
Denholm	Ichord	Stratton
Dent	Jarman	Stuckey
Devine	Jones, Ala.	Symington
Diggs	Leggett	Teague, Tex.
Dorn	Long, La.	Thompson, Ga.
Dow	McClory	Thompson, N.J.
	McCulloch	Whalen
	McDade	Young, Tex.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 575, APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. BLATNIK submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 575) to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended:

CONFERENCE REPORT (REPT. No. 92-237)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 575) to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

TITLE I—PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION ACT

Sec. 101. This title may be cited as the "Public Works Acceleration Act Amendments of 1971".

Sec. 102. The Public Works Acceleration Act (42 U.S.C. 2641 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Clause (1) of section 2(a) is amended to read as follows: "(1) certain communities and areas in the Nation are presently burdened by substantial unemployment and underemployment resulting from the economic decline of 1970, and".

(2) Subsection (b) of section 2 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Congress further finds that Federal assistance to stimulate public works investment in order to increase employment opportunities is most urgently needed in those areas, both urban and rural, suffering persistent or substantial unemployment or underemployment."

(3) Subsection (a) of section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purposes of this section, the term 'eligible area' means—

"(1) those areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as 'redevelopment areas' or as 'economic development centers' for the purpose of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and those areas designated by such Secretary under section 102 of such Act.

"(2) those areas which the Secretary of Labor designates each month as having been areas of substantial unemployment for at least six of the preceding twelve months.

"(3) those areas which the Secretary of Labor designates each month as areas having an average rate of unemployment of veterans who served on active duty during the Vietnam era as defined in section 101(29) of title 38, United States Code, and who were discharged or released from active duty in the military, naval, or air service of the United States under conditions other than dishonorable, at least 25 per centum above the national average rate of all unemployment for three consecutive months or more during the preceding twelve-month period."

(4) The last sentence of subsection (c) of section 3 is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding any provision of such law requiring the Federal contribution to the State or local government involved to be less than a fixed portion of the cost of a project, grants-in-aid may be made under authority of this section which bring the total of all Federal contributions to such project up to 80 per centum of the cost of such project, or up to 100 per centum of the cost of such project if the State or local government has exhausted its effective taxing and borrowing capacity for such purposes and therefore does not have economic and financial capability to assume all of the additional financial obligations required."

(5) Subsection (d) of section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1970, not to exceed \$2,000,000,000, to be allocated by the President in accordance with subsection (b) of this section."

(6) Subsection (e) of section 3 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In prescribing such rules, regulations, and procedures, the President shall require that priority be given to projects for assistance in the construction of basic public works (including works for the storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water; and sewage, sewage treatment, and sewer facilities) for which there is an urgent and vital public need."

(7) Subsection (h) of section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The criteria to be used by the Secretary of Labor in determining areas of substantial unemployment for the purposes of paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section shall be the criteria established in section 8.3(a) of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations as in effect March 2, 1971."

(8) Subsection (a) of section 4 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) No part of any allocation made by the President under this Act shall be made available during any fiscal year to any State or local government for any public works project if the proposed or planned total expenditure (exclusive of Federal funds) of such State or local government during such fiscal year for all its capital improvement projects is decreased."

(9) By adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 7. An eligible area under this Act shall retain such designation for only so long as it continues to meet the unemployment criteria applicable to it but in no event shall such designation be terminated prior to one year after the date of designation.

"Sec. 8. Federal financial assistance made from allocations made by the President under this Act may be used for all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to projects and for the purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to such projects."

Sec. 103. (a) Clause (ii) of the last sentence of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of section 202 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "section 9" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3".

(b) Section 202(e) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "section 9" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3", and by striking out "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "80 per centum".

Sec. 104. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act.

TITLE II—THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Sec. 201. This title may be cited as the "Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1971".

Sec. 202. Section 105 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3135) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and not to exceed \$550,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973."

Sec. 203. Subsection (c) of section 201 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3141) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

Sec. 204. Section 302 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3152) is amended by striking out "and June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973".

Sec. 205. Section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3161) is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) is amended by striking out "40 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 per centum".

(2) Paragraph (6) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) the Secretary may designate as redevelopment areas those communities or neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) which—

"(A) the Secretary determines have one of the following conditions:

"(i) a large concentration of low-income persons;

"(ii) rural areas having substantial out-migration;

"(iii) substantial unemployment; or

"(iv) an actual or threatened abrupt rise of unemployment due to the closing or curtailment of a major source of employment; and

"(B) have submitted an acceptable proposal for an overall economic development program which will have an appreciable beneficial impact upon such condition.

No redevelopment area established under this paragraph shall be eligible to meet the requirements of section 408(a) (1) (B) of this Act;

"(7) those areas where per capita employment has declined significantly during the next preceding ten-year period for which appropriate statistics are available."

Sec. 206. The first sentence of section 402 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3162) is amended by striking out "thereof" and all that follows down through and including the period at the end of the sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "of such reviews shall terminate or modify such designation whenever such an area no longer satisfies the designation requirements of section 401, but in no event shall such a designation of an area be terminated prior to the expiration of the third year after the date such area was so designated."

Sec. 207. Subsection (g) of section 403 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3171) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1971", and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

Sec. 208. Subsection (d) of section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 3188a) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and for the two-fiscal-year period ending

June 30, 1973, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$305,000,000."

Sec. 209. Section 512 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3191) is amended by inserting immediately after "1971," the following: "and \$500,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973."

Sec. 210. Section 2 of the Act of July 6, 1970 (Public Law 91-304) is amended by striking out "1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1972".

Sec. 211. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

TITLE III—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Sec. 301. This title may be cited as the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1971".

Sec. 302. The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 105 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 105) is amended to read as follows: "To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$2,700,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973 (of such amount not to exceed \$525,000 shall be available for expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff), and not to exceed \$3,300,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1975 (of such amount not to exceed \$575,000 shall be available for expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff)."

Sec. 303. Paragraph (7) of section 106 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 106) is amended by striking out "1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975".

Sec. 304. Subsection (g) of section 201 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 201) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) To carry out this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, to be available until expended, \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; \$185,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; \$185,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976; \$185,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977; and \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1978."

Sec. 305. There is inserted after section 207 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 207) a new section as follows:

"APPALACHIAN AIRPORT SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS"

"Sec. 208. (a) In order to provide a system of airports in the Appalachian region which can accommodate a greater number of passengers in safety and thereby increase commerce and communication in areas with developmental potential, the Secretary of Transportation (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make grants to existing airports for the purpose of enhancing the safety of aviation and airport operations.

"(b) Such airport safety improvement projects may include (A) approach clearance, the removal, lowering, relocation, and marking and lighting of airport hazards, navigation aids, site preparation for navigation aids, and the acquisition of adequate safety equipment (including firefighting and rescue equipment), and (B) any acquisition

of land or of any interest therein, or of any easement through or other interest in airspace which is necessary for such projects or to remove or mitigate or prevent or limit the establishment of, airport hazards.

"(c) Grants under this section shall be made solely from funds specifically made available to the President for the purpose of carrying out this Act in accordance with the provisions of this Act, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States made pursuant to any other provisions of law.

"(d) Except as context otherwise indicates, words and phrases used in this section shall have the same meaning as in the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended.

"(e) Federal assistance to any project under this section shall not exceed 90 per centum of the costs of the project, except for assistance for navigation aids which may be 100 per centum.

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to incur obligations to make grants for airport safety improvement projects, in a total amount not to exceed \$40,000,000 during the period ending June 30, 1975. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be required for liquidation of the obligations incurred under this section."

Sec. 306. (a) The third sentence of subsection (c) of section 202 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 202) is amended by striking out "health services" and inserting in lieu thereof of the following: "health and child development services, including title IV, parts A and B, of the Social Security Act. Notwithstanding any provision of the Social Security Act requiring assistance or services on a statewide basis, if a State provides assistance or services under such a program in any area of the region approved by the Commission, such State shall be considered as meeting such requirement".

(b) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following: "The Federal contribution to such expenses of planning may be provided entirely from funds authorized under this section or in combination with funds provided under other Federal or Federal grant-in-aid programs. Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share in any such other program, funds appropriated to carry out this section may be used to increase such Federal share to the maximum percentage cost thereof authorized by this subsection."

Sec. 307. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) (1) of section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 205) is amended by inserting before the period at the end: "; and to control or abate mine drainage pollution."

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal share of mining area restoration project costs carried out under subsection (a) of this section and conducted on lands other than federally owned lands shall not exceed 75 per centum of the total cost thereof. For the purposes of this section, such project costs may include the reasonable value (including donations) of planning, engineering, real property acquisition (limited to the reasonable value of the real property in its unreclaimed state and costs incidental to its acquisition, as determined by the Commission), and such other materials and services as may be required for such project."

Sec. 308. (a) The catchline for section 207 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 207) is amended to read: "ASSISTANCE FOR PLANNING AND OTHER

PRELIMINARY EXPENSES OF PROPOSED LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS"

(b) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of such section are amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to encourage and facilitate the construction or rehabilitation of housing to meet the needs of low- and moderate-income families and individuals, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make grants and loans from the Appalachian Housing Fund established by this section, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to nonprofit, limited dividend, or cooperative organizations, or public bodies, for planning and obtaining federally insured mortgage financing for housing construction or rehabilitation projects for low- and moderate-income families and individuals, under section 221, 235, or 236 of the National Housing Act, in any area of the Appalachian region determined by the Commission.

"(b) No loan under subsection (a) of this section shall exceed 80 per centum of the cost of planning and obtaining financing for a project, including, but not limited to, preliminary surveys and analyses of market needs, preliminary site engineering and architectural fees, site options, application and mortgage commitment fees, legal fees, and construction loan fees and discounts. Such loans shall be made without interest, except that any loan made to an organization established for profit shall bear interest at the prevailing market rate authorized for an insured or guaranteed loan for such project. The Secretary shall require repayment of loans made under this section, under such terms and conditions as he may require, upon completion of the project or sooner, and except in the case of a loan to an organization established for profit, may cancel any part or all of such a loan, if he determines that a permanent loan to finance such project cannot be obtained in an amount adequate for repayment of such loan under this section.

"(c) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, no grant under this section shall exceed 80 per centum of those expenses, incident to planning and obtaining financing for a project, which the Secretary considers not to be recoverable from the proceeds of any permanent loan made to finance such project, and no such grant shall be made to an organization established for profit.

"(2) The Secretary is authorized to make grants and commitments for grants, and may advance funds under such terms and conditions as he may require, to nonprofit organizations and public bodies for reasonable site development costs and necessary off-site improvements, such as sewer and water line extensions, whenever such a grant, commitment, or advance is essential to the economic feasibility of any housing construction or rehabilitation project for low- and moderate-income families and individuals which otherwise meets the requirements for assistance under this section, except that no such grant shall exceed 10 per centum of the cost of such project."

(c) Subsection (e) of such section is amended by striking out "The Secretary is further authorized to" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary or the Commission may".

Sec. 309. (a) The catchline for section 211 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 211) is amended by adding at the end "AND VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS".

(b) The first sentence of subsection (a) of such section is amended by inserting "and operation" after "equipment".

(c) Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) In order to assist in the expansion and improvement of educational opportunities and services for the people of the region, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for planning, construction, equipping, and operating vocational and technical educational projects which will serve to demonstrate areawide educational planning, services, and programs. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purposes of this Act and shall not be taken into account in any computation of allotments among the States pursuant to any other law.

"(2) No grant for the construction or equipment of any component of a vocational and technical education demonstration project shall exceed 80 per centum of its costs.

"(3) Grants under this section for operation of components of vocational and technical education demonstration projects, whether or not constructed by funds authorized by this Act, may be made for up to 100 per centum of the costs thereof for the two-year period beginning on the first day that such component is in operation as a part of the project. For the next three years of operation, such grants shall not exceed 75 per centum of such costs. No grants for operation of vocational and technical education demonstration projects shall be made after five years following the commencement of the initial grant for operation of the project. Notwithstanding section 104 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3134), an education-related facility constructed under title I of that Act may be a component of a vocational and technical education demonstration project eligible for operating grant assistance under this section.

"(4) No grant for expenses of planning necessary for the development and operation of a vocational and technical education demonstration project shall exceed 75 per centum of such expenses.

"(5) No grant for planning, construction, operation, or equipment of a vocational and technical education demonstration project shall be made unless the facility is publicly owned.

"(6) Any Federal contribution referred to in this section may be provided entirely from funds appropriated to carry out this section, or in combination with funds available under other Federal grant-in-aid programs providing assistance for education-related facilities or services. Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share in such programs, funds appropriated to carry out this section may be used to increase such Federal share to the maximum percentage cost thereof authorized by the applicable paragraph of this subsection."

Sec. 310. (a) Section 214(a) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 214) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to enable the people, States, and local communities of the region, including local development districts, to take maximum advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs (as hereinafter defined) for which they are eligible but for which, because of their economic situation, they cannot supply the required matching share, or for which there are insufficient funds available under the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such programs to meet pressing needs of the region, the President is authorized to provide funds to the Federal Cochairman to be used for all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to projects under such Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized by Federal grant-in-aid Acts, and for the purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to projects under such programs, as here-

after defined, above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of such projects otherwise authorized by the applicable law. In the case of any program or project for which all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to the project under a Federal grant-in-aid program is proposed to be made under this subsection, no such Federal contribution shall be made until the responsible Federal official administering the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such contribution certifies that such program or project meets the applicable requirements of such Federal grant-in-aid Act and could be approved for Federal contribution under such Act if funds were available under such Act for such program or project. Funds may be provided for programs and projects in a State under this subsection only if the Commission determines that the level of Federal and State financial assistance under Acts other than this Act, for the same type of programs or projects in that portion of the State within the region, will not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by this subsection. Funds provided pursuant to this Act shall be available without regard to any limitations on areas eligible for assistance or authorizations for appropriation in any other Act. Any findings, report, certification, or documentation required to be submitted to the head of the department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of any Federal grant-in-aid program shall be accepted by the Federal Cochairman with respect to a supplemental grant for any project under such program."

(b) The first sentence of subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "December 31, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1974".

Sec. 311. Subsection (a) (2) of section 302 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 302) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to make grants to the Commission for investigation, research, studies, evaluations, and assessments of needs, potentials, or attainments of the people of the region, technical assistance, training programs, demonstrations, and the construction of necessary facilities incident to such activities, which will further the purposes of this Act. Grant funds may be provided entirely from appropriations to carry out this section or in combination with funds available under other Federal or Federal grant-in-aid programs or from any other source. Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share in any such other program, funds appropriated to carry out this section may be used to increase such Federal share, as the Commission determines appropriate."

Sec. 312. Section 401 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 401) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 401. In addition to the appropriations authorized in section 105 for administrative expenses, in section 201 for the Appalachian Development Highway System and Local Access Roads, and in section 208 for Appalachian Airport Safety Improvements, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, to be available until expended, to carry out this Act, \$268,500,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971; \$282,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973; and \$294,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1975."

Sec. 313. Section 405 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 405) is amended by striking "1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975".

Sec. 314. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any

program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance under the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title and agree to the same.

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
KEN GRAY,
ED EDMONDSON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JOSEPH M. MONTTOYA,
EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 575) to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendments struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text and provided a new title for the Senate bill.

With respect to the amendment of the House to the text of the Senate bill, the Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below except for minor technical and clarifying changes made necessary by reason of the conference agreement.

TITLE I SHORT TITLE

Senate bill: No comparable provision.

House amendment: Section 101 provides that the title may be cited as the "Public Works Acceleration Act Amendments of 1971".

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION ACT

Senate bill: No comparable provision.

House amendment: Section 102 of the House amendment made a series of amendments to the Public Works Acceleration Act as follows:

Section 102(1): Alters the purpose clause (sec. 2) to cite congressional recognition of communities and areas burdened by substantial unemployment and underemployment resulting from the economic decline of 1970.

Section 102(2): Alters purpose clause to emphasize need for assistance in urban and rural areas suffering persistent or substantial unemployment or underemployment.

Section 102(3): Amends section 3(a) to redefine eligible areas as—

(1) Redevelopment areas or economic development centers designated as such for the purpose of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (title IV), or title I areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce under that Act,

(2) Areas designated by the Secretary of Labor as areas of substantial unemployment for at least 6 of the preceding 12 months, and

(3) Areas which the Secretary of Labor

designates monthly as having an average rate of unemployment of Vietnam veterans at least 25 percent above the national average rate of all unemployment for three consecutive months or more during the preceding 12-month period.

Section 102(4): Amends section 3(c) to increase maximum Federal participation from 50 percent and 75 percent to 80 percent, or up to 100 per centum of the cost of such project if the State or local government has exhausted its effective taxing and borrowing capacity and therefore does not have effective taxing and borrowing authority to assume all of the financial obligations required.

Section 102(5): Amends section 3(d) to authorize a total of \$2 billion for the fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1970, to be allocated by the President.

Section 102(6): Amends section 3(e) to require the President to give priority to those basic public works projects vitally and urgently needed, including works for storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water, and sewage treatment, and sewer facilities.

Section 102(7): Amend subsection 3(h) to redefine the criteria used by the Secretary of Labor in determining areas of substantial unemployment. Substantial unemployment is defined in section 8.3(a) of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations as in effect March 2, 1971.

Section 102(8): Amends section 4(a). This amendment changes the maintenance of effort requirements by eliminating the requirement for an increase in the non-Federal shares but prohibits any allocation by the President if the proposed or planned total expenditure (exclusive of Federal funds) of such State or local government during such fiscal year for all its capital improvements projects is decreased.

Section 102(9): New section 7 provides that an eligible area designated under this Act shall retain such designation only so long as it continues to meet the unemployment criteria applicable to it, however, it further provides that in no event shall such designation be terminated prior to one year from the date of designation.

Section 102(9): New section 8 provides that Federal financial assistance made from allocations made by the President under this Act may be used for all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to projects and for the purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to such projects. This includes contributions to the local share of projects to be constructed by Federal agencies.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

Senate bill: No comparable provision.

House amendment: Section 103 of the House amendment makes technical amendments to correct certain errors in reference to the Public Works Acceleration Act in the Housing Amendments of 1955 and increase from 50 to 80 percent the maximum Federal participation in grants made by the President from allocations under the Public Works Acceleration Act for construction of public works for facilities under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

SEX DISCRIMINATION

Senate bill: No comparable provision.

House amendment: Section 104 of the House amendment provides that no one shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participating in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination in any other way under any program or activity receiving Fed-

eral assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

TITLE II

SHORT TITLE

Senate bill: No comparable provision.

House amendment: Section 201 provides the short title the "Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1971".

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

GRANT PROGRAM EXTENSION

Senate bill: Section 115(a) of the Senate bill provides a one year extension of title I grants under EDA at the existing level of authorization of \$500 million.

House amendment: Section 202 of the House amendment amends section 105 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (hereinafter referred to as the EDA) to authorize \$550 million annual authorization for grants and supplementary grants for two fiscal years through June 30, 1973.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

LOAN AND GRANT EXTENSION

Senate bill: Section 115(b) of the Senate bill authorizes a one year extension of the title II loan and grant program at the existing authorization level.

House amendment: Section 203 of the House amendment extends the loan and grant program of EDA for two additional fiscal years through June 30, 1973, at the existing authorization level.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RESEARCH EXTENSION

Senate bill: Section 115(c) of the Senate bill extends for one more fiscal year the \$50 million annual authorization for technical assistance and research.

House amendment: Section 204 of the House amendment extends for two more fiscal years through June 30, 1973, the authorization in section 303 of EDA for technical assistance and research at the existing level of \$50 million.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

REDEVELOPMENT AREA CRITERIA

Senate bill: No comparable provision.

House amendment: Section 205 of the House amendment amends section 401(a) of EDA to revise two of the existing criteria for designation of "redevelopment areas" eligible for financial assistance under EDA, and adds a new criterion.

Presently areas having a median family income 40 percent or less of the national median, as determined by the most recent available statistics would qualify for designation. This is amended to increase from 40 percent to 50 percent of the national median, the maximum median family income under which an area can qualify.

The "special impact" area definition is broadened by redefining it to include communities or neighborhoods (a) with large concentration of low-income persons, (b) that are rural in nature, with substantial outmigration, (c) with substantial unemployment, (d) with an actual or threatened abrupt rise in unemployment due to closing or curtailment of major source of employment, or (e) with severe economic distress due to occurrence of a national disaster. Any

such "special impact" area must have submitted an acceptable proposal for an OEDP which will have an appreciable, beneficial impact upon such condition. No such area shall be eligible to fulfill the prerequisite of two redevelopment areas necessary for the creation of an economic development district.

A new criterion is added permitting designation of those areas where per capita employment has declined significantly during the next preceding 10-year period for which appropriate statistics are available.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment except that the conference substitute eliminates from the redefined "special impact" areas those with severe economic distress due to occurrence of a national disaster since other legislation is more appropriate to deal with the problems resulting from natural disasters.

TERMINATION OF DESIGNATION

Senate bill: No comparable provision.

House amendment: Amends section 402 of EDA to provide that the designation of an area shall not be terminated before the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of designation.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

DEVELOPMENT CENTER ASSISTANCE EXTENSION

Senate bill: Section 115(d) of the Senate bill extends for one year the \$50 million annual authorization for grant and loan assistance to economic development centers and the 10 percent bonus for projects in redevelopment areas within designated economic development districts.

House amendment: Amends section 403 of EDA to extend for two more years until June 30, 1973, this authorization.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

EXTENSION OF SUPPLEMENTARY GRANT PROGRAM AND TITLE V AUTHORIZATION

Senate bill: Section 115(e) of the Senate bill extends for an additional year the authorization for the supplementary grant program and title V authorization authorized in section 509 of EDA at an authorized level of \$127,500,000.

House amendment: Section 208 of the House amendment amends section 509 of EDA to extend the supplementary grant program and title V authorization for a two fiscal year period beginning June 30, 1973 at a level for that 2-year period of \$305 million.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment. This authorization includes funds for administrative expenses of new regional commissions which may hereafter be designated, such as the Upper Missouri Basin and the Mid-South Regional Commissions.

ALASKA

Senate bill: Amends section 512 of EDA to extend for an additional fiscal year the authorization of funds to the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska.

House amendment: Section 209 of the House amendment extends section 512 of EDA for another two year authorization of \$500,000.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

DEDESIGNATION OF DEVELOPMENT AREAS

Senate bill: No comparable provision.

House amendment: Section 210 of the House amendment amends section 2 of P.L. 91-304 which provided that no redevelopment area would have its designation terminated

or modified after May 1, 1970, and before June 1, 1971, unless the local governing body of the county qualified under existing criteria specifically requests that action. This section of the House amendment extends the June 1, 1971 date to June 1, 1972.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

SEX DISCRIMINATION

Senate bill: No comparable provision.

House amendment: Section 211 of the House amendment provides that no one shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participating in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination in any other way under any program or activity receiving assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

TITLE III

SHORT TITLE

Senate bill: The first section of the Senate bill provided a short title—the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1971".

House amendment: Section 301 of the House amendment provides for the same short title as the Senate bill.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill and the House amendment.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

Senate bill: Section 102 of the Senate bill amends section 105(b) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (hereinafter referred to as the Appalachian Act) to provide an open-ended authorization for administrative expenses of the Commission.

House amendment: Section 302 of the House amendment amends section 105 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to extend the current 2-fiscal-year authorization of \$1,900,000 for two additional fiscal bienniums, fiscal year 1972—1973 and fiscal year 1974—1975. Of each such 2-year authorization, \$475,000 is provided for the expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate and his staff.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute authorizes for administrative expenses \$2,700,000 for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 with not to exceed \$525,000 for the expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff. It also authorizes \$3,300,000 for fiscal years 1974 and 1975 with not to exceed \$575,000 for the expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff.

OFFICE SPACE

Senate bill: Section 103 of the Senate bill amends section 106(7) of the Appalachian Act to extend for four more years until June 30, 1975, the authority of the Commission to lease office space.

House amendment: Section 303 of the House amendment is the same as the Senate bill.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill and the House amendment.

APPALACHIAN HIGHWAY AND LOCAL ACCESS ROAD PROGRAM

Senate bill: Section 104 of the Senate bill amends section 201(g) of the Appalachian Act to increase the 1973 fiscal year authorization from \$170 million to \$180 million and to extend the program for five more years through fiscal year 1978 by authorizing \$180 million for fiscal year 1974, \$185 million for fiscal year 1975, \$185 million for fiscal year 1976, \$185 million for fiscal year 1977, and \$180 million for fiscal year 1978.

House amendment: Section 304 of the House amendment is the same as the Senate bill.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill and the House amendment.

APPALACHIAN AIRPORT SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

Senate bill: Section 105 of the Senate bill adds a new section 201A to the Appalachian Act which establishes a program of safety improvements for Appalachian airports. Grants under this program would be made by the Secretary of Transportation and are limited to upgrading safety facilities at existing public airports. Improvements relating to safety would be eligible for funding including removal of hazards, acquisition of safety equipment, navigation aids, and the acquisition of any land, easements, or airspace rights necessary for the project, including site preparation for navigation aids. Federal participation would not exceed 90 percent of the project costs, except for navigation aids which are eligible for 100 percent assistance. The Secretary would have obligational authority to make grants which would later be liquidated by appropriations, up to a total of \$40 million for the four-year period ending June 30, 1975.

House amendment: No comparable provision.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill except for the renumbering of the new section.

HEALTH AND CHILD CARE

Senate bill: Section 106 of the Senate bill amends section 202(c) of the Appalachian Act to provide that Federal funds authorized under Federal grant programs for the provision of child development services, including title IV of the Social Security Act may be used in combination with funds provided under the Appalachian Act. In addition, this amendment provides an exception to the Social Security Act to permit States to utilize funds for programs or projects that would be implemented in areas of the Appalachian States without regard to any provision of law requiring the providing of this type of assistance or service on a statewide basis.

This section of the Senate bill also amends section 202(d) of the Appalachian Act to insure that funds under the Appalachian Act may be used in combination with any other Federal funds for planning grants for the development and operation of health and other projects.

House amendment: No comparable provision.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill.

MINING AREA RESTORATION

Senate bill: Section 107 of the Senate bill amends section 205 of the Appalachian Act (1) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance for the control or abatement of mine drainage pollution in the region, (2) to provide that reasonable land acquisition costs of mine area restoration projects may be included as eligible project costs for Federal participation, and (3) to permit financial assistance under the Appalachian Act to be used for reclaiming strip mine areas on lands owned by private nonprofit entities organized under State law for public recreation, conservation, economic development, or low- or moderate-income housing purposes, as well as on lands owned by Federal, State, or local governments as now provided in the law. A requirement is added to the law that if reclaimed land is sold or leased for private purposes then the grant made for its reclamation must be recovered from the proceeds of such sale or lease.

House amendment: Section 305 of the House amendment amends section 205(b) of the Appalachian Act to extend the existing 75–25 Federal-State cost sharing ratio for restoration projects and to make clear that the reasonable value of donated land, materials, and services may be included in the computation of such costs.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill in that it authorizes financial assistance for the control or abatement of mine drainage pollution. It is the same as the House amendment with respect to the extension of the cost-sharing ratio and the inclusion of the reasonable value of donations. It does not contain any of the provisions of the Senate bill relating to the reclamation of lands owned by private entities since the managers determined that this problem should be explored further at a later date.

APPALACHIAN HOUSING

Senate bill: Section 108 of the Senate bill revises subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 207 of the Appalachian Act relating to low and moderate income housing in the region.

Existing section 207 provides for grants and loans to public bodies and certain nonprofit and other organizations for expenses of planning and obtaining insured mortgages for housing construction or rehabilitation under sections 221 and 236 of the National Housing Act in those areas of the region determined by the Commission as having significant potential for future growth. The Senate amendment provides for the making of grants for necessary expenses of these public and private bodies in planning and obtaining federally insured mortgage financing under sections 221, 235, and 236 of the National Housing Act or any other Federal law in any area of the region as so determined by the Commission.

Section 207(b) of the existing law limits grants to 80 percent of administrative expenses incident to planning and obtaining a mortgage under section 221 or 236 of the National Housing Act. The revision of this provision contained in paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of the Senate bill first exempts from this limitation paragraph (2) of that subsection (hereafter discussed), and provides that the 80 percent limitation would not be limited only to administrative expenses but would apply to all expenses incident to planning and obtaining financing for a housing project.

Subsection (c) of section 207 of the existing Appalachian Act is limited to sections 221 and 236 of the National Housing Act. The Senate bill would amend this to include section 235 of the National Housing Act and any other Federal law with respect to which financing for housing construction or rehabilitation projects is authorized. In addition, legal fees are specifically included in the law for the first time. The provisions relating to repayment of loans are modified to permit cancellation of all or any part of the loan if the Secretary determines that a permanent loan cannot be obtained in any case except loans to profit making organizations.

The Senate bill further amends these provisions of section 207 of the Appalachian Act to authorize the Secretary of HUD to make grants, grant commitments, and advances to nonprofit organizations and public bodies for site development costs and off-site improvements when he finds that these projects are essential to the feasibility of housing projects for low and moderate income families. No such grant may exceed 10 percent of the cost of the housing project.

The Senate bill also amends section 207(e) to authorize the Commission in addition to the Secretary of HUD to provide or contract

for information, advice, and technical assistance with respect to construction, rehabilitation, and operation of low and moderate income housing in the region.

House amendment: No comparable provision.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill except that it is modified to make it clear that these grants and loans are to nonprofit, limited dividend or cooperative organizations, or public bodies, for planning and obtaining Federally-insured mortgage financing for housing construction or rehabilitation projects under section 221, 235, or 236 of the National Housing Act, and under no other provision of law.

EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Senate bill: Section 109 of the Senate bill amends section 211(a) of the Appalachian Act to authorize the use of funds for the operation of vocational education facilities in addition to the presently authorized use of such funds for construction and equipping such facilities.

Section 211(b) is also amended to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to make grants for planning, construction, equipping, and operating educational projects in order to demonstrate area-wide education planning, services, and programs. Grants for construction or equipment shall not exceed 80 percent. Grants for operation may cover 100 percent of operating costs for two years and 75 percent of such costs for the next three years. Projects could be funded jointly by the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Economic Development Administration. Planning grants would be limited to 75 percent. Grants are limited to publicly owned facilities and those owned by public or private nonprofit organizations not operated for profit. Assistance under this section shall be in addition to funds apportioned under other Federal programs. Funds provided to carry out this section can be combined with funds under other Federal grants-in-aid to raise Federal contribution to such projects up to maximum percentages authorized in section 211 of the Act.

House amendment: No comparable provision.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill except that the revision of section 211(b) of the Appalachian Act is restricted to vocational and technical educational demonstration projects and grants are limited to publicly owned facilities.

SUPPLEMENTAL GRANTS

Senate bill: Section 110 of the Senate bill amends section 214 of the Appalachian Act which authorizes supplements to grant-in-aid programs, to permit the use of this authority to make basic grants when funds available under a basic Federal grant-in-aid program are insufficient for that purpose. As a prerequisite to providing such assistance, the Federal official administering the grant-in-aid program concerned must certify that the program or project to be funded meets the applicable requirements of the program and could be approved for assistance if funds were available. Before approving such assistance, the Commission must find that the level of Federal and State assistance to the Appalachian region under other Acts will not be diminished by the substitution of funds authorized by this subsection. The ceiling on the total Federal contribution to a project remains at 80 percent.

It also amends the provisions of section 214(c) of the Appalachian Act which provides that only grant-in-aid programs authorized on or before December 31, 1970, may be supplemented to change that date to December 31, 1974.

House amendment: The House amendment revises section 214(c) of the Appalachian Act with respect to the change in date of the programs which may be supplemented by advancing that date to December 31, 1974.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill.

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Senate bill: Section 111 of the Senate bill amends section 224(b) of the Appalachian Act to prohibit financial assistance for any land reclamation, water resource, or environmental project under section 203, 204, 205, 212, or 214 which is not part of a comprehensive environmental improvement plan for the area to be served, and approved in the manner provided for programs or projects under sections 223 and 303 of the Appalachian Act.

House amendment: No comparable provision.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute does not contain this provision of the Senate bill.

RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Senate bill: Section 112 of the Senate bill amends section 302(a) (2) of the Appalachian Act to permit the use of technical assistance, research, and demonstration funds for construction when necessary to carry out the activities therein authorized.

House amendment: No comparable provision.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill.

PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS

Senate bill: Section 113 of the Senate bill amends section 401 of the Appalachian Act to provide authorizations (in addition to those for administrative expenses in section 105, for highways in section 201, and for airports in section 201A) to carry out the Act. For the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, the existing authorization of \$268,500,000 is retained. For the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973, \$277,000,000 is authorized. For the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1975, \$294,000,000 is authorized. Specific allocation of authorizations is eliminated from the existing law.

House amendment: Section 307 of the House amendment amends section 401 of the Appalachian Act to authorize \$302,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973, and \$314,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1975, to carry out the Act other than the highway program and administrative costs for which separate authorizations are provided in sections 201 and 105, respectively.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill except that the authorization for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973, is set at \$282,000,000.

TIME EXTENSION

Senate bill: Section 114 of the Senate bill amends section 405 of the Appalachian Act which now provides for termination of that Act on June 30, 1971, to extend that date to June 30, 1975.

House amendment: Section 308 of the House amendment provides the same extension as in the Senate bill.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill and the House amendment.

SEX DISCRIMINATION

Senate bill: No comparable provision.

House amendment: Section 309 of the House amendment provides that no one shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participating in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination in any other way under any program or activity receiving Fed-

eral financial assistance under the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

TITLE OF THE BILL

Conference substitute: The conference substitute adopts the amendment of the House to the title of the bill since it more accurately reflects the text as proposed in the conference substitute.

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
KEN GRAY,
ED EDMONDSON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1971

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3613) to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 3613, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) had 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) had 32 minutes remaining.

For what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey rise?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, yesterday during the course of the debate an agreement was entered into that due to the disparity in remaining time the minority agreed it would reduce its time for the balance of the debate to the amount of time that the majority had.

Is that not correct?

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct. So we will yield 16 minutes, to have the same as the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA).

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, the question before us today is whether we ought to pass a public service employment bill, such as the Daniels bill which has been reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, or whether we ought to attempt to enact something that is a great deal more than that a reorganization of all the existing manpower programs of the United States.

I have a few thoughts on the subject and I would like to share them with the

members of the Committee, Mr. Chairman.

The Esch substitute for the committee bill simply represents another way of doing things we are already doing.

The committee bill sponsored by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) on the other hand proceeds on the basis that the first priority is not to find new and better ways of doing things we are already doing, and have been doing with reasonable success for a number of years, but that the first priority is to start something which we have not been doing to meet the needs of the 2.5 million people who have been added to the unemployment rolls in the last 2 years.

I agree that the first priority is to create a system of public service employment. When that has been done, and this has been the position of the gentleman from New Jersey all along and the position of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), after we get a system of public service employment created and operating, then we can address ourselves to the much larger, much more complex and much less urgent question of the manner in which these programs ought to relate to one another and to State and local government.

It would be a mistake to attempt today to pass a brand new reorganization program which was not even introduced until after the hearings on this bill began and which is not—and I repeat—is not the same thing as the bill this House passed last August and which is not the same bill that any of my friends on the minority side introduced in the last Congress, but which is indeed an entirely different proposal—the administration's manpower revenue sharing bill which has never had a day of hearings and which I do not think can be considered by the House without careful analysis.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would plead with the members of the committee to turn their attention to that first priority, to put into effect and into operation a system of public service employment to provide needed job opportunities for jobs that need to be done by State and local governments. Then, when we have that operating let us turn our attention in a more deliberate manner to the need for reorganization of the manpower programs generally and relating them to this public service employment program as well as the other programs which are in existence.

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

Mr. O'HARA. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORSE. There is one question which I have about the committee bill. Professionals may be employed in public service jobs and receive a salary of up to \$12,000 a year. There are a number of scientists, engineers, and other people of great competence who could contribute to municipal and local government. Would it be possible under the committee bill for the municipality, to add to that \$12,000 in order to attract these scientists and engineers who might not be

able to accept these jobs at the rate of \$12,000 a year?

Mr. O'HARA. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts—and I cannot answer for the chairman—if the city wanted to hire that professional under their payroll rather than the public service employment program and put him in charge of some aspect of public service employment, they could pay him whatever was appropriate and, in turn, they could put others to work in other facets of public service unemployment in order to achieve the objectives the gentleman from Massachusetts seeks.

I have great respect, Mr. Chairman, for my colleague from Michigan and his strong support of the administration's talk about "revenue sharing," but I submit, with all respect to him that his amendment does not address itself to the problem of putting people to work. It is true that it may be possible, under the vague wording of the gentleman's amendment, to put people to work in public service jobs. It is possible, I suppose, to do a lot of things under the gentleman's amendment. But given the passionate opposition of this administration, including the President, the Budget Director, and the Secretary of Labor, to putting people to work in public service jobs, I doubt very much that the wholly permissive language of the substitute will in fact result in putting very many people to work. And those it does put to work, as a result of one of the very few provisions of that amendment which actually creates a legal duty, will be kicked out of work in 2 years, whether or not the economy has improved, and whether or not they can get what the public service employees in the Labor Department are pleased to call "real jobs."

Mr. Chairman, let us look briefly as to what the substitute amendment is, and what it is not.

We have been told, with fervency that the Esch amendment is "not revenue-sharing." We were told specifically and with great vigor, during the debate on the rule, that "there is no general revenue sharing in this, but it is instead a consolidation of manpower programs."

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Esch amendment, which the rule was amended to make in order, in spite of its nongermane nature, is the text of H.R. 8141. When the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) introduced H.R. 8141, on May 6 of this year, he said:

I believe that the manpower revenue sharing proposal embodied in H.R. 8141, which I have introduced today would bring the reform of our manpower delivery system which is so urgently needed.

So the gentleman from Michigan, the chief sponsor of the amendment, thought it was revenue sharing, a little less than a month ago.

H.R. 8141 has a short title. It calls itself "The Manpower Revenue Sharing Act of 1971." So whoever wrote that section thought it was revenue sharing.

Throughout its text, H.R. 8141 keeps using the phrase "revenues shared under this act." So those who drafted most of

the bill thought they were drafting a revenue-sharing bill.

But let us further examine the antecedents of H.R. 8141. The bill is taken, virtually verbatim from the text of H.R. 6181, introduced in this House on March 16, by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUINN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch), the distinguished minority leader, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, and seven other able Members on the minority side—all members of the Committee on Education and Labor. In introducing H.R. 6181, the gentleman from Minnesota said:

I am pleased to introduce today the bill to carry out the recommendations of President Nixon for special revenue sharing for manpower—Congressional Record, March 16, 1971, page 6758.

In his own remarks upon that occasion, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) said:

Within the context of the philosophy of revenue sharing, which I strongly support, the proposed Manpower Revenue Sharing Act builds upon the agreement which was reached last session on the decentralization of manpower responsibilities—Congressional Record, March 16, 1971, page 6760.

The following day, the Secretary of Labor and the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower appeared before the Education and Labor Committee hearings on emergency employment legislation. During their presentation, they repeatedly referred to H.R. 6181 as the administration manpower revenue-sharing bill.

There are, as my colleague will no doubt assure us, differences between H.R. 6181 and H.R. 8141. But those differences, Mr. Chairman, in no way alter the revenue-sharing concept built into both bills. In fact, those few differences that occur in these two nearly identical bills are primarily efforts to placate those people in the States who most vehemently oppose revenue sharing, by offering them rhetorical, but not substantive concessions.

The differences—and this is an exhaustive list of the differences between two 25-page-long bills—involve the following:

1. A sentence calling upon recipient governments to make "maximum feasible use of existing facilities" (p. 4, lines 11-15)
2. A proviso allowing the Secretary of Labor to waive the otherwise strict limitation the bill places on how long a person can receive manpower services—(p. 6, lines 14-22)
3. A subsection calling for State coordination of state and local activities (and so much, incidentally, for tailoring programs to "local conditions" (p. 6, lines 23 to p. 7, line 7), three sentences apparently designed to indicate what happens when an eligible government's "fair share amount" (undefined term) exceeds or falls short of the unit's "average base amount" (p. 9, line 10 to p. 10, line 5), and a veteran's preference provision taken in its entirety from the bill H.R. 8141 is offered to supplant. (p. 14, lines 9-24)

Except for these rather clumsy efforts to attract the support or the neutrality of friends of vocational education, friends of the employment services, and friends of veterans, H.R. 8141 is the same bill

that was described by the President of the United States as a proposal which, "teamed with my other special and general revenue sharing proposals—can help to launch the United States on a new era of revolutionary change for the better."

Mr. Chairman, I think the evidence that H.R. 8141 is a revenue-sharing bill is overwhelming. I do not blame those who seek to claim that it is something else. I understand and sympathize with those of its advocates who want us to believe we are simply reorganizing a Federal activity. But the fact is that by their own words, H.R. 8141 stands clearly labeled "a revenue-sharing proposal." If its supporters have now become embarrassed by the title they gave it a month ago, then that is their problem.

So much for what the bill is. Now a few words, Mr. Chairman, on what it is not. My good friend from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) sought to assure the House during the debate last week, that—

H.R. 8141 is nothing more nor less than an effort to build on the bill (H.R. 19519) that passed this body last year.

Mr. Chairman, I was the principal sponsor of H.R. 19519, the bill which passed this body last year, and I think I can speak with some authority on the question of how today's substitute "builds upon" last year's bill.

First, their purposes were wholly different. H.R. 19519, in its statement of findings and purpose, set as its objective, "assuring an opportunity for a gainful productive job for every American who is seeking work and—making—available the education and training needed by any person to qualify for employment consistent with his highest potential and capability."

H.R. 8141, on the contrary, in its statement of findings and purpose, calls for "sharing Federal revenues for the purpose of carrying out training and employment activities designed to provide greater opportunities for training and related services necessary to assist individuals to develop their full economic and occupational potential."

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the bill of last year was aimed at producing jobs, and it looked upon training as a means to that end. The substitute bill, in its own terms, looks upon training programs as the objective, and employment as a stop-gap measure to aid in securing better training.

Second, under H.R. 19519, as it passed the House last fall, with the then-enthusiastic support of the gentleman from Wisconsin, and promises of support from the administration, manpower services were to be provided by the Secretary of Labor, working with and through State and local prime sponsors. The prime sponsor concept had been painstakingly and carefully worked out to make sure that the sometimes conflicting, sometimes complementary interests and concerns of all State and local interests could be adjusted.

The substitute amendment, Mr. Chairman, wholly and casually junks the prime sponsor concept of H.R. 19519. The bill is

silent about prime sponsors. Under H.R. 8141, the Secretary of Labor leaves the money on a stump, and walks away, leaving States and localities, the schools and the community action agencies, the vocational educators, and the employment services, to fight over it. There is no way to determine, from a reading of the text of H.R. 8141, how the money will be divided among various activities, or among various levels of government.

Efforts were made by the committee to secure some answers to this question—and efforts have been made by the corresponding committee in the other body to do the same thing, but all to no avail.

In a letter to the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), Assistant Secretary Lovell tried to defend his inability to answer some factual questions about how much money would be available for job creation by States and localities. He said in that letter:

We are currently preparing such tabulations. This task has been very much complicated by the need to develop methods for applying the President's "hold harmless" pledge which accompanied his first broad proposals for revenue sharing—general and special.

I sympathize with Assistant Secretary Lovell in the difficulty he finds in reconciling the President's rhetoric and the President's actual legislative proposals. But my sympathy for Mr. Lovell's dilemma does not overshadow the fact that they have not yet been able to do the job.

Third, and perhaps of crucial importance, H.R. 19519 sought to provide an assured input into manpower planning by all affected segments of the community. H.R. 19519 assured that input by requiring manpower plans to be developed through local manpower advisory councils, which were required to include representatives of CAP agencies, the Employment Service, educational and training agencies, specifically including vocational education agencies and community postsecondary institutions, social service programs, industrial development agencies, apprenticeship programs, business, labor, and veterans organizations.

H.R. 8141 throws this concept out of the window along with the prime sponsor. There is no assurance that vocational educational agencies will be consulted in any way in the development of manpower programs under H.R. 8141. There is no assurance that business or labor will be consulted, there is no assurance of consultation with veterans organizations, in spite of the growing number of veterans who need manpower services. H.R. 8141, to be sure, calls for making "maximum feasible use" of existing vocational education agencies, and the phrase "make use of" is, I submit, a well chosen one. The vocational education agencies may be "used" under H.R. 8141, but they are not likely to be consulted or have a voice in the planning.

Last year, the American Vocational Association supported H.R. 19519. This year, AVA opposes H.R. 8141. And in that fact stands additional evidence that this

year's administration bill is not simply an updating of last year's bill.

H.R. 19519 required that appropriate health and safety standards be met applicable to the performance of work or training on any project under that act. H.R. 8141 is silent on worker or trainee health or safety.

H.R. 19519 required workmen's compensation for participants in work or training programs. H.R. 8141 is silent on workmen's compensation.

H.R. 19519 had a "maintenance of effort" provision, assuring that the Federal funds would not simply replace other funds leaving the level of services the same. H.R. 8141 is carefully silent on this crucial issue.

H.R. 19519 provided a program of occupational upgrading, so that persons could train for better jobs, freeing entry-level jobs for the unskilled. H.R. 8141 is wholly silent on this matter.

H.R. 19519 created a public service employment program, and mandated the expenditure of no less than 18.75 percent of the funds appropriated for public service employment. H.R. 8141, in spite of the high "ceilings" its sponsor talks about, does not in fact require 1 red cent be spent for job creation. And, taking into account the perverid opposition of this administration to actually putting people to work, we can only assume that tremendous pressure will be brought to bear, through the Employment Service as "State Coordinator" to prevent the development of such programs. It seems perfectly clear from the careful omissions in H.R. 8141, from the statements made last year and this by the administration's unemployment spokesmen, and from the violent attacks made on the concept of public service employment, that it is the clear intention of this administration that shared revenues under H.R. 8141 will not be used to create public jobs, if they can help it.

Under H.R. 19519, public service employees were to be assured treatment on an equal basis with other employees performing similar work. Pay and working conditions were to be the same. Under H.R. 8141, there is absolutely nothing in the bill that requires such equality of treatment even where there is a public service job program.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me tell you what our colleagues mean by their zealous opposition to "categorical programs."

Green Thumb is a "categorical program," and specific provision was made in H.R. 19519 to authorize and continue it. There will be no Green Thumb under H.R. 8141.

Operation SER is a "categorical program," and there were specific provisions in H.R. 19519 which would have saved Operation SER. There will be no Operation SER under H.R. 8141.

OIC, Mr. Chairman, is a "categorical program," and the sponsors of H.R. 8141 were vociferously assuring us last year that they believed in OIC. Under H.R. 19519, Mr. Chairman, OIC could have continued. There will be no room for OIC under H.R. 8141.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary

to cite every provision of the Esch substitute that differs from last year's bill. We have definitive testimony on this point from the Secretary of Labor himself.

On February 23 of this year, testifying before the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the Labor Committee in the other body, in opposition to a jobs bill and in urging instead a manpower revenue-sharing bill, the Secretary of Labor said, with commendable frankness:

As I sat the other evening trying to think how you must react to our current position, it seems to me that you would find yourself thinking that you have come to play in our court, and we have moved the court. . . . To some extent, I have to admit that is true, you see, because we have moved on to what might be called a macro-objective in manpower programing, tied to general revenue sharing. We are thinking of not just a mere change or simple revision of the traditional approach, but a real major change—a whole conceptual change.

And, Mr. Chairman, on May 6, testifying before the same subcommittee, again trying to push the manpower revenue-sharing bill which I have shown is virtually identical to the Esch substitute, the Secretary of Labor expressly reiterated that previous comment.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Labor himself is my chief witness to the effect that the Esch substitute is a revenue-sharing bill; that it is only remotely similar to the manpower reorganization bill which we passed last fall, and that it has hardly anything at all to do with the subject before the House today—which is our urgently needed proposal to put people back to work.

H.R. 8141, Mr. Chairman, may, indeed, have been "built upon" the bill the House passed last year. But before they built, they razed last year's structure to the ground. The Manpower Revenue-Sharing Act of 1971 is "built on" the ashes of the hopes of millions of unemployed. Unlike some of his colleagues who the other day were assuring us that enactment of H.R. 8141 would cure all our manpower problems, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) was frank enough when he introduced the bill, to admit that it "was no panacea." Indeed it is not, Mr. Chairman. It is a placebo, not a panacea.

We cannot cure unemployment by pretending it does not exist—or that it is "merely transitional" or "local" or any of the other excuses that Shultz and Hodgson and Nixon have advanced to conceal the havoc they have wrought upon the lives of the nearly 3 million Americans they have added to the unemployment rolls in the 2½ long years since they first came to office. We cannot cure unemployment by "training" people for jobs that do not exist. We can cure unemployment by creating jobs. And that is the one remedy that H.R. 8141 is clearly and expressly designed to counteract. It should be rejected, not merely as not germane to, but as repugnant to, any legislative effort to meet the unemployment crisis.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5

minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN).

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, the question before the House today, which we will be voting on shortly, is not whether we should have a public service employment program in the United States to meet the problems of unemployment that currently face us but, rather, whether this should be the only thing we do to solve these problems.

The committee bill is just another narrow categorical answer to an existing problem that faces the country. The alternative is the Esch substitute, a reorganization of the manpower delivery system combined with a public service employment component.

The problem that we face with the narrow, categorical programs is that, looking at the national indices, rates of unemployment, and so forth, we may design a program such as the committee majority has done, but it is so inflexible that it cannot answer the individual problems that face different sections of the country.

The area that I come from in Illinois has been fortunate. We have not relied heavily upon space expenditures or defense expenditures, and we have not relied heavily upon any one segment of our economy. And with the diverse economy in our area we have not suffered as much unemployment as others have, so we have different needs than what they may have in Seattle, or in other areas of the country that have been affected by our reduction of public expenditures in the fields of defense and space, and may have been affected by problems in a particular industry in which that part of the country is heavily engaged.

So that we can have the kind of flexibility today and in the future to answer the disparate needs of different sections of the country, I urge the adoption of the Esch substitute in place of the committee bill.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman in the well has stated that the committee proposal would present another categorical program. Is it not true that the administration has from time to time, when it deemed it practical, created another categorical program? For example, when they discovered that persons completing training programs could not find jobs, they created a new categorical program called STEP—supplementary training and employment program—which met a real need. In addition to that, recently the administration announced that they were seeking funds for a summer employment program—a sound decision to help youths find jobs.

And then the other day I read in the New York Times that 400 engineers of the aerospace industry were now being specially trained for jobs. The department said that they would recruit 100 persons in the Boston area, 100 from four California communities—Los An-

geles, Orange County, San Jose, and San Diego; from Seattle; 40 from Long Island, 35 from Cape Kennedy, Fla., and 25 each from Huntsville, Ala. and Wichita, Kans.

So I say to the gentleman in the well that the administration resorts to categorical programs whenever they find there is a need for them. And they are doing exactly, by giving employment to these people who are displaced in the aerospace industry, exactly what my emergency employment bill would do. Is that not true?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Well, I am not familiar with the programs the gentleman has referred to, and neither am I suggesting that all categorical programs must be done away with. If we even fully implemented the revenue-sharing proposal of the administration we would still maintain some categorical programs.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the point the gentleman from New Jersey was attempting to make is not related to what we are talking about here. At the present time in the Department of Labor the administration can only do what the law says; they can only use the authorities that are contained in the law, and that is to promote certain kinds of categorical programs. But this in no way takes away from the basic concerns of decategorizing and decentralizing. I think the point the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN), is making is a very valid point, and that is that the Esch substitute would enable the administration to have flexibility at the local level that is needed now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN).

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just make this one last point. This is not a new issue. We debated this issue last year, and I recall in our committee we came very close to reaching the same condition that we are faced with today, and that is reporting out a public service emergency employment bill and having a substitute offered on the floor. But I think last year fortunately within the committee we resolved that question and we brought out a combined bill that had a public service employment as one component and the reformation of the existing manpower programs as another component. Last year the majority had the good sense to see that this was the right thing to do. We passed that bill. We went to conference in trying to resolve the differences between the House and Senate bill, and we were unable to resolve all of those differences.

One of the major problems we faced in conference was that the measure was not a limited public service employment program, so that those who are under subsidized employment will be moved out

into unsubsidized public employment or private employment. And it was this major difference, I think, that caused the President to veto the program of unending public service employment.

With that history I really do not understand why we are today considering the separate public service employment bill unless—unless what the majority wants is an issue rather than a good bill that will solve the problems of unemployment. Really I think that is what we are faced with today—not an honest attempt to solve these problems, but to create an issue. Yes, we know that next year is a presidential election year. We know that the public service employment bill as a solution to unemployment in this country may be a very appealing idea. But if we want to really solve the problems of unemployment, we would accept the combination of reformation of existing manpower programs along with public service employment so that we can attack these problems in a coordinated manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, as was pointed out the other day by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN), the mayors of this country simply do not support the proposed amendment to the committee bill. Now why is that? And why are so many of us concerned about what this bill means to our respective communities? Perhaps you do not know it, but the major element in the matching formula is the utilization of a past 3-year average—the fiscal years 1969 and 1970 actual data and the projected fiscal year 1971 manpower allocations among the States and localities.

The first question I ask is this: Where is that data? If you average past fiscal years, how does that affect those of us from communities or States that have growth rates in population? The average of the fiscal years 1969, 1970, and 1971 literally means that you are using essentially a 1970 figure if there is a uniformly equal increment in allocations.

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

Mr. BURTON. I will not yield with the 2 minutes I have left.

Mr. ESCH. The gentleman wants to know where the data is.

Mr. BURTON. Regular order, Mr. Chairman. I want to know where is that 1969, where is that 1970, where is that 1971 and, more importantly, where is the projected, under current law, 1972 allocations? For those of us in California as well as the growth States of Florida and Texas, and those of you from the growing cities, had better find out what the impact of this amendment will mean to your community. We do not know. We cannot find out. The minority cannot tell us. The Department of Labor will not answer our questions. If the formula is equitable, why will they not give us the data so we will know the consequences of a vote for the alternative amendment?

And an amendment, I might note, that would permanently change the law—forever and ever. There is no termination date in it. Why can we not know what the impact is on our communities?

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, the emergency employment bill is urgently needed now; in fact, it was urgently needed 6 months ago. It will provide both needed jobs and needed services.

I doubt that it is necessary to inform any Members of this House that the unemployment picture in this Nation is a dismal one. When the unemployment rate went to a low of 5.8 percent in February, administration spokesmen were assuring us that we had turned the corner and all would soon be well. But we have not turned the corner; the rate has gone up to 6.1 percent. It is time to stop wishing. It is time to act.

The increase in the unemployment rate does not even tell the full story. It is bad enough that the number of unemployed has increased by over a million in the last year and by just about 50 percent in Pittsburgh. But, even worse, the average duration of unemployment is increasing. It is a misfortune to be unemployed, but think of the disaster faced by over half a million persons who have been unemployed for over 26 weeks and not eligible for extensions. The number of these long-term unemployed have doubled over the last year.

We have already acted to provide jobs in private industry through the reenactment of the Accelerated Public Works Act. That act will provide jobs in private industry and it will provide funding for the facilities that every community in this Nation needs. Facilities are visible, and when they are built everyone can see the result. This emergency employment bill provides services—they may not be as visible but they are just as needed.

Mr. Chairman, who in this House can say that his State or local government does not need more teachers, more sanitation men, more policemen; that his locality does not require more public services than it can presently afford. This bill provides money so that localities will be able to afford these needed services. The need is there and any fears that this is a make-work bill are utterly unfounded.

Survey after survey has shown the extent of additional needed public services and that the number of people that are required to perform them far exceeds the modest authorization under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey for the work he has put into this bill. I am particularly happy that the bill provides not only a national trigger but also recognizes the special unemployment problems faced by certain areas and provides a special employment assistance fund for additional public service programs in areas where the unemployment rate exceeds 6 percent.

The funds invested in this bill will yield a return better than any investment that we can make. I know that there are

those who say that we cannot afford to enact this measure. That we cannot afford the cost of putting the unemployed to work. That is a false arithmetic; there is nothing more costly than the waste of human resources represented by unemployment. But even if we close our minds to the human costs involved, this bill is an economic proposition. For every dollar we spend putting people to work, we gain a return in reduced unemployment insurance costs, in reduced welfare payments and in increased Federal and State taxes. In addition, we get the value of the services that are provided.

Mr. Chairman, let us not be deterred by appeals to economy or the specter of dead-end jobs. All of us in this Chamber are employees of Government and we know well enough that there is nothing demeaning in public service employment. Let us provide the opportunity for that service to the unemployed. Both they and the Nation will benefit.

In this House we have heard eloquent statements—many from the Members on the other side of the aisle now supporting H.R. 8141, against the evils of giveaway programs. But H.R. 8141 is an unprecedented giveaway program—it gives away Federal funds and imposes no obligation on the recipients.

Mr. Chairman, we have many excellent grant-in-aid programs in which the Federal Government assists State and local governments in coping with problems such as education, health, pollution, and manpower. But in all of these grant-in-aid programs, the Federal and State and local governments are in partnership to insure that the objectives of the program are accomplished; and they are also in partnership in determining what those objectives are. This partnership is usually accomplished through the mechanism of a State plan or other form of application which is locally developed but must be federally approved.

That has been the pattern of our Federal partnership in the past. But the manpower revenue-sharing proposal breaks new—and as the President himself described it—revolutionary ground. It destroys the partnership and makes the State and local governments into sole proprietors. The Federal Government is responsible for raising the revenue—the State governments for spending it. The State government submits a program statement—but the Federal Government is only permitted to comment on it. No matter how inconsistent with the policies of the Federal Government, the States can go ahead and spend the Federal funds as it sees fit.

The only Federal requirements in the manpower revenue-sharing proposal are that the funds be spent for manpower purposes, that veterans and the disadvantaged get preference and that there be no discrimination on account of race, color, or national origin. In addition, funds may not be used for political purposes or so as to impair existing contracts for services.

But let us look at just some of the requirements that are not there. There is no requirement of administrative efficiency; and if 90 percent of the funds

are spent for overhead and 10 percent for program, there is nothing the Federal Government can do about it. There are no Federal standards for the kinds of jobs for which training money can be spent; and if the State chooses to pick up the regular training costs of employers in order to induce them to locate in the State, there is nothing the Federal Government can do about it. There are no standards for recruitment and placement; and if the State chose to use its funds in order to recruit and train new employees to take the place of men on strike, there is nothing the Federal Government can do about it. I do not have the time to list all the abuses against which the Federal Government has no recourse.

Reading the manpower revenue-sharing bill is a bit like meeting the man who was not there. It is hard to say what you do not like about him, because you cannot see him. If the amendment were adopted you cannot tell what would happen because the bill has no standards and no requirements. If it were passed, Congress would have abdicated its responsibility for determining how Federal funds should be spent. We would just direct the Secretary of Labor to send a check to every State and every large city—and hope that those governments spend it in a sensible way. This is what I call a give away program. I, for one, would feel that I have not carried out the obligations that I assumed when I became a Member of Congress, if I supported such an abandonment of the Federal responsibility for ensuring that Federal funds are properly spent. I urge support of the committee bill.

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Biaggi).

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3613, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 as reported by the committee.

We need only examine the committee's report which explains the bill's several sections to realize that this legislation provides us with a succinct and penetrating picture of the wave of unemployment that is gripping the country. The bill speaks directly to the problem and proposes a realistic method to deal with it—not later this year, or next year—but right now. In my opinion, the report prepared by the committee on H.R. 3613 is extremely eloquent in its forthright approach and its simplicity.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced with an increasing mass of jobless men and women of all ages. More particularly, the veterans of Vietnam and Korea and the younger members of the work force are experiencing the wrath of the declining economy.

This is a problem all of us recognize. We are not talking about projections or predictions. And we do not have to read the Bureau of Labor Statistics report to know that people are being hurt financially and psychologically by the high incidence of unemployment.

Hard-working members of proud families are being forced to ask for public welfare assistance because they cannot find income-producing jobs. Consequently, our cities are paying the price of Federal inaction in increased welfare costs and rising taxes.

Mr. Chairman, a dangerous possibility exists. If able-bodied welfare recipients remain on the rolls for too long they could well be swept into the undertow of the "poverty cycle" unless definite and swift action is taken and taken now.

We cannot wait indefinitely for the promised economic upturn before willing workers return to constructive and rewarding jobs. This bill offers Government units at all levels an opportunity to put into operation well-planned and closely monitored manpower programs that will have an inherent quid pro quo . . . "fair wages for useful work." The bill does not create leaf-raking boondoggles nor pyramid-building fiascos.

Instead the measure is tailored to deal with the critical shortage of much needed public services existing in our cities and counties.

Our roads are in disrepair. Our parks are in shambles. Schools and hospitals are deteriorating. And transportation facilities are crumbling. Yet taxes are high. But more important, a willing and able body of workers is standing by idle all because units of Government cannot raise sufficient public funds to match workers with work.

Therefore it is obvious that this bill will enable a good part of our idle masses to use the skills they now have—or can develop under its provisions—to the advantage of the general public as well as to their own advantage.

The committee admits, and I agree, that the public payroll is no place for artificial padding. Certainly H.R. 3613 does not spread largess among the few. It will provide meaningful work for 150,000 jobless people who are in a class that is most affected by the economic recession—those in the under \$12,000 wage-earning capacity.

H.R. 3613 also contains necessary controls that will assure productive work in areas of the Nation experiencing the worst effects of unemployment.

The \$12,000 maximum salary limitation will actually result in an average income of approximately \$6,000 to \$7,000. While this does not represent a cure-all, it does lift people out of the poverty level and into the active work force. And it gives them the dignity they so earnestly seek.

Combined with the limitation on the number of professionals to be admitted to the program, the salary limitation insures that the \$200 million authorized for the remainder of fiscal year 1971, and the \$750 million for fiscal year 1972, will be well spent and will have a significant impact on the unemployment picture in our cities.

This legislation does not create a never-ending public works program. Its design is such that, while it will not interrupt implemented work programs for at least a year, it can be extended or cut

back according to the level of the national unemployment index and area unemployment rates.

Another important provision states that those employed in the emergency employment program will be assured equal treatment with regular employees in matters of job conditions and benefits. At the same time, the bill makes it clear that regular employees will not be displaced nor passed over in their promotional opportunities. In other words, we should either treat workers employed under this program as full-fledged members of the work force, or not attempt the plan at all.

This bill also stipulates that within the 150,000 to be employed under the program, a large share will be from the expanding numbers of unemployed veterans of the Southeast Asia wars. These men who view their misfortune as a cruel hoax played upon them by the same Government they so readily served, are now locked out of the job market because of the strange quirks in our modern economy.

Let us not shirk our responsibility to them, or to the many other unemployed workers and the thousands of under-skilled people now clamoring for a fair shake in the job market.

Mr. Chairman, one final observation is in order. Federal revenue sharing is an issue this body must soon consider in one form or another. However, to becloud the immediate issue of emergency employment with the wider and much more complex issue of Federal revenue sharing will only tend to delay and confuse both programs.

I therefore ask the Members of this body to focus on the immediate problem of too few jobs for too many people willing to do so many chores waiting to be done in our Nation. I urge that H.R. 3613 be passed so that our Nation can start the hard trek back to economic stability and lower unemployment.

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the dean of the New Jersey delegation (Mr. Rodino).

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to speak in support of H.R. 3613, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971.

It is an appalling fact that unemployment in this Nation increased by 73.5 percent from the first quarter of 1969 to the first quarter of 1971. Our unemployment rate for April rose to an alarming 6.1 percent. I do not believe anyone can honestly dispute the need for some immediate and effective action to create employment opportunities in this situation which is described in the committee report as an "impending national crisis."

At the same time, areas throughout the country, and particularly in our older urban centers, are in desperate need of assistance for urgent public services and facilities. The bill before us would directly meet this need by providing funds for employment to deal with such pressing problems as environmental quality, health care, housing, neigh-

borhood improvement, recreation, education, public safety maintenance of streets and parks, transportation and conservation.

Under the 5-year authority provided by H.R. 3613, \$200 million would be available in this fiscal year, \$750 million for fiscal year 1972 and \$1 billion for each of the 3 final fiscal years. However, I think it is important to stress that this emergency aid program only takes effect when the national unemployment rate reaches 4.5 percent or more for 3 consecutive months.

Another important provision included in the bill in that stipulating that preferences for jobs be given to veterans of the Vietnam era. We have all been concerned by the increasing problem of finding employment for our returning veterans and this measure will help meet this need. Other provisions in the bill specify that not more than one-third of the new jobs be filled by professionals and executives, that persons employed under the bill would not receive less than the minimum wage, but that no person would be paid more than \$12,000 annually.

Of particular significance, in my judgment, is the bill's establishment of a Special Employment Assistance Fund, authorizing \$250 million for fiscal year 1972 and such further sums as are necessary to assure that at the end of the 3 succeeding fiscal years at least \$250 million would be left in the fund. The funds available under this special program would be authorized for use in really hard hit areas where the unemployment rate exceeded 6 percent for 3 consecutive months. Programs under this Special Employment Assistance Fund would operate concurrently with the regular public service employment program, with the important difference that they would continue to be funded for areas of over 6 percent unemployment even though the national rate of unemployment might drop below the specified 4.5 percent.

The city of Newark, part of which is in my congressional district, would benefit greatly from the regular and the special public service programs authorized under H.R. 3613. The assistance is vitally needed, as Newark's mayor, the Honorable Kenneth A. Gibson, made clear in testimony earlier this year before the Joint Economic Committee. In it he stated that Newark, the largest city in the Nation's most urban State, had in January 1971 the shocking unemployment rate of 11.1 percent.

Mayor Gibson explained that in both the private and public sectors the employment outlook in Newark is dismal. The manufacturing industry, which traditionally provided the greatest employment opportunities, has steadily declined in Newark. The city also has a massive budget crisis that threatens to bankrupt the city. As he concluded:

The list of problems, the areas which are in desperate need of new money, runs the full spectrum of city services and basic urban institutions.

Part of the answer to Newark's problems, and that of other depressed areas and communities throughout our country, is through the bold and affirmative commitment to act provided in H.R. 3613. I strongly urge its passage.

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the distinguished gentleman from California that data is available. It is my understanding that it was made available to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) and I am sure he would be more than willing to share it with the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentleman yield and now make it available so that we might look at it? If we are not given this data now, of what value will it be?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I will not yield further. I told the gentleman where data is available and I would ask him to go over and take a look at it.

Mr. Chairman, whether the AVA is happy or unhappy, the League of Cities, the Conference of Mayors or somebody else, I have the feeling that we have lost sight of three things that I think ought to be brought home to the members of this committee in regard to what we are talking about with relation to the committee bill. We have spent some considerable amount of time talking about what the substitute proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) does, but we have not spent, in my judgment, enough time talking about what the committee bill proposes to do.

If you look at that committee bill, if you would step back for just a minute, you would understand that in large part the bill was formulated apparently in response to the President's veto of the comprehensive bill last year. In that veto message the President of the United States indicated that he was unwilling to accept a public service employment section such as that contained in the conference report, which did not provide for real jobs, and which did not give to those who participated an ability to move off temporary public service employment onto permanent rolls either in the public or private sector. If you will look at H.R. 3613, I found three things that struck me as being very inadequate in that bill and for these reasons the House ought not to act in support of it but rather should support the Esch substitute.

In the first place, it is uncertain. Let us recognize that this bill does not provide any kind of real, long-term program to handle the needs of the unemployed. It is called an emergency public service program, and that may be in effect what it is. But what does it do for people?

It says that if the rate of unemployment goes up, you will have a program. If the rate of unemployment goes down,

you will have no program. What happens to a man in a municipality in this country and who recognizes that when he goes on the public service roll, if the rate of unemployment goes below 4.5, he will be out of a job, and there is no job for him? What kind of program is that? What kind of real job does that create? I do not think it does. I think this kind of yo-yo charade that is being played by the majority through this bill ought to be recognized for what it is. It is not a permanent program. It does not provide real jobs. All it does is to say to somebody, "We will put you to work now, maybe, but if the rate of unemployment goes down, then you will be out of a job."

I believe the second thing which is important to understand about this particular bill is the point the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) made so well, that it is nothing more than a continuation of the same kind of single purpose categorical limited program we have had heretofore.

One of the complaints those of us on the Committee on Education and Labor have had about our present manpower programs is that they are not sure we are training people for jobs that exist; and yet this bill does nothing about that problem. That training will still go on without any effort to be able to create a job at the end, such as that which would be proposed by the Esch substitute.

So in my judgment it does not do a job of attempting to handle the very serious manpower employment and under-and-unemployment problems that exist in this country.

In addition to that, I believe we also should know this is a particular kind of program which would require a multitude of applications to be filled out. Page upon page of the committee bill is filled with what is required to be done by a municipality, to ask for funds under the bill.

I believe we are again going to see the creation of some jobs in the public sector for those who are in charge of grantsmanship. But I do not believe this does much to create jobs for those who are unemployed.

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the third problem is that it is a limited program, and 150,000 jobs is limited when the rate of unemployment is this high. I do not really believe one can stand here and say that this bill, if it is passed and if it were to survive what the President might decide he was going to do with it, would make any serious inroads on the problem of unemployment in this country.

For these reasons and a host of others the Esch substitute is the way to handle this problem. It is comprehensive and flexible, and gives the decisionmaking power to the officials at the State and local levels, and it will, in my view, do the best job of offering real jobs and real services to those who are most in need of them.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr.

Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 8 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Minnesota has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota to use the remainder of his time, because I am going to allocate the remainder of the time on this side to our one speaker.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH).

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

Mr. ESCH. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California on his time.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it should be pointed out that the formula has been distributed to the subcommittee chairman, and in contrast to what the gentleman from California said, if population increased in the past 10 years a State or local governmental unit would receive more under the substitute bill rather than less. I would suggest the gentleman from California read carefully the system of distribution of funds before he makes statements which may indeed be misunderstood.

In the very limited time we have here, before we go to the attempt to amend this bill by presenting the substitute. I want to point out one additional fact concerning the committee bill itself. It has been suggested by the subcommittee chairman that it would create 150,000 jobs, and it was suggested that this would solve the problem of unemployment in the country.

According to statistics supplied to me by the Department of Labor there could be 82,909—82,909 receiving districts under the committee bill. In other words, there could be 82,909 districts that could apply for funds. That means there would be less than two persons employed in each district in the country under the committee bill.

I would suggest again that the deception of the committee bill in terms of solving the problem is brought out by this statistic.

As we move to the time when the substitute will be presented, it should be made clear also that there has been some confusion as to whether or not the mayors support the Esch bill or the committee bill.

It was pointed out in a letter to me late yesterday from Mayor Richard Lugar, of Indianapolis, the president of the National League of Cities:

I regret the unfortunate and inaccurate analysis of your substitute bill—H.R. 8141—contained in the letter of Mr. Samuel Merrick on behalf of the Conference of Mayors and League of Cities.

He goes on to say that he supports the Esch substitute and asks for the passage of it in the House of Representatives.

Likewise, the mayor of the city of Baltimore, Mayor D'Alesandro, endorsed the Esch substitute in a communication to me.

Likewise, Mayor Carl B. Stokes, of

Cleveland, has endorsed the Esch substitute. He says:

I am registering my support of House Resolution 8141, your Manpower Revenue Sharing Bill presently before the U.S. House of Representatives for Floor vote. I earnestly urge all Congressmen concerned about the plight of the unemployed and unemployable in the cities of this nation to vote yes on H.R. 8141.

So the issue is this: Do we want to pass a committee bill that does not solve the problem of employment in this country or do we want to change the fundamental structure of the manpower training programs in this country to bring about needed reform, restructuring, and relief. The substitute bill which will be offered will do this. It will contain public service employment not in an unending stream, but limited to 2 years in duration.

However, who will make the decision—this is the fundamental question which we face today. The decision will be left locally—rather than on the Federal level.

There is not a Member of this House that admits the present manpower training programs are working. Adding one more feature to it will not suffice. It is time for a fundamental change.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise for a unanimous-consent request. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) be given the opportunity to amend his remarks because of the misstatement and misrepresentation that he made on the floor. The full subcommittee chairman has not received the year-by-year cost information which is the allocation that I made.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that today the issue we are confronted with—

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I cannot yield at this time, but later I will yield if I have time.

Mr. Chairman, the real issue today is whether or not this House shall act on a public employment program or on a bill which pretends to be public employment and a reorganization of manpower training programs.

I think the chairman of the subcommittee has used very, very good judgment in separating these two issues and bringing to the floor of the House today a bill which only deals with public employment. With the unemployment in this Nation above 6 percent, I suggest that it is critical and that it is urgent. I also suggest to the Members of this House that with 750,000 or 800,000 veterans coming across the labor market this year we are faced with a major social problem, a problem of social dynamite ready to explode at any moment. Veterans who have served in Southeast Asia and other parts of the world will not look kindly to

a situation of coming back to the United States and having no jobs available to them.

If there is any way in which I am critical of the Daniels bill, it is that it does not provide enough jobs, but I also suggest that if it were a larger bill, with several hundred thousand jobs guaranteed, it would be vetoed by this administration on the basis that it costs too much.

And so, I think Mr. DANIELS used wisdom in bringing in a moderate bill which will go to the heart of the problem. We will gain experience from it, and next year we can make the decision on whether or not it should be expanded and to what extent.

Now, the main point I would like to address myself to is the claim in the minority views that this will reorganize manpower training.

In fact, this is the main reason that they opposed the committee bill, because the committee bill does not go into the reorganization of the manpower training programs.

Further, Mr. Chairman, if one reads the minority views contained in the report, time after time one will find the words to the effect that we must have a comprehensive reorganization of manpower training, we must reform manpower training, and I am in complete agreement with those words. But I suggest that the substitute which gives the appearance of reorganizing manpower training, in fact does not touch but about one-half of the manpower training programs in operation. I have said all along, and I would be glad to respond—

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Not at this point.

Mr. ESCH. If the gentlewoman would yield, I would be happy to furnish an answer to that question.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Does your bill go to—and I would like a yes or no answer because I do not have much time—does it recognize all of the manpower training programs?

Mr. ESCH. It covers those programs over which this committee has jurisdiction.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is exactly the point, Mr. Chairman. It does not even cover all of the programs over which our Committee on Education and Labor has jurisdiction because it does not go to manpower training under vocational rehabilitation; it does not go to vocational education, it does not go to Job Corps—all under the jurisdiction of the Education and Labor Committee. Also, it seems misleading to me to talk about this being a comprehensive reorganization of manpower training when it does include WIN—which involves several hundred million dollars, it does not go to the manpower training programs under the Department of Agriculture; it does not go to the manpower training programs under the Department of the Interior and especially with reference to Indians. It does not go

to the manpower training programs under the Department of Defense involving the program "100,000" and the "Transition" training programs, it does not go to the manpower training programs of the Veterans' Administration or those which are operated under HUD or Public Health.

Mr. Chairman, this last year the Federal Government was spending \$2,502 million on manpower training programs. The Department of Labor had under its jurisdiction \$1,592 million and OEO \$30 million. So we have, in effect, \$1,622 million of the total of \$2.5 billion which would be affected by the Esch bill. So, there is about \$1 billion of manpower training programs that are not even touched by the substitute bill. I suggest it is wrong to give the impression to the Members of this House that it is going to provide comprehensive reorganization of manpower training programs when, in fact, it is not even going to do this at all.

I again think the chairman of the subcommittee has used great wisdom in separating the bill today from the total reorganization of manpower training programs. They do need a great deal more attention, and the chairman of the subcommittee has said we have not had sufficient public hearings on them. This is absolutely true.

I would also say that even beyond manpower training programs this House ought to consider the coordination of vocational education, technical education, and programs at the community colleges. Most of the manpower training programs in my State, and I judge in the rest of the States, are run through the secondary schools and through the community colleges.

Again, showing the good faith of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) and the staff of his committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) and the staff of his subcommittee who has jurisdiction over vocational education, as well as the subcommittee which it is my honor to chair, which has jurisdiction over the community colleges, are working together to try to put together in effect and, in fact—not just in appearance but, in fact, a greater reorganization of the manpower training programs, a far more comprehensive approach than is contained in the Esch substitute.

Therefore, I would suggest to you, today, that in my State a person can go into one manpower training program and finish that and after he has completed it he can enroll in another manpower training program and then still another and each time receive the stipend for his participation and could still end up as an applicant for welfare.

I would suggest that exactly the same thing would be true if the Esch substitute were approved. A person could enroll in the WIN program and then in other manpower training programs operated and conducted by other departments of the Government and agencies.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that because of the critical need for employment programs, the critical need for jobs in this

day and age when there is this potential social dynamite, that we pass this bill providing public service jobs where the Government is the employer of last resort, 150,000 jobs for each of 4 years—or the potential of 600,000 year-long jobs for people is far preferable than 600,000 people on the welfare rolls for even the 1 year each. This will give the Committee on Education and Labor the opportunity to have hearings to bring out a bill that would in fact—not just in words but would in fact—bring about a reorganization of all of the manpower training programs, vocational education, rehabilitation, the programs conducted by the community colleges and the secondary schools as well as many other programs.

In that way then I think we can bring some sense out of the chaos. We would provide not only training but we would provide meaningful work for the people today or tomorrow who might otherwise be on public assistance.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3613, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. The purpose of this act is to bring needed services to our citizens and, at the same time, provide jobs for the unemployed.

We all know that the state of the economy has placed millions out of work and onto unemployment rolls and welfare rolls. We also know that we need more medical personnel in our hospitals, more police, more people involved in pollution control, more educators, and more people in other necessary public service jobs. The National Civil Service League has indicated that there are thousands of public service jobs which need undertaking except that the State and local governments simply lack the funds.

Like the National League of Cities and the United States Conference of Mayors, organizations which support revenue sharing, I support H.R. 3613.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to include in the RECORD a letter I received from Samuel Merrick, a representative of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

The letter follows:

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
May 28, 1971.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: The Emergency Employment Act of 1971, H.R. 3613, will soon come to the House floor for a vote. On behalf of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, representing the nation's mayors and city officials throughout the country, we urge you to vote for this bill as reported out of the House Education and Labor Committee. A similar measure was passed earlier this year in the Senate with a bi-partisan vote of 62-10. The passage of this legislation in the House is critical to the nation's cities, both large and small, since the unemployment picture worsens each month. Today, on the one hand, thousands of our citizens are without jobs and on the other hand municipal services in the areas of sanitation, law enforcement, fire prevention, health and the like, are direly needed and presently not being provided. The need for the services, the jobs, are there. The unemployed people are there. The ele-

ment missing and critically needed at this time is federal funds to put unemployed citizens to work immediately within municipalities throughout America performing worthwhile tasks for all. H.R. 3613 authorizes these needed funds for public service jobs by providing \$200 million for the current fiscal year, \$750 million for FY 72, and \$1 billion for each of three succeeding years.

The unemployment problem now confronting mayors at the local level cannot be over-emphasized. It goes beyond those on welfare. Returning Vietnam veterans, recent lay-offs resulting from shifts in federal expenditures causing a loss of jobs in certain areas, the overall shortage of jobs in the private sector, coupled with the hard core unemployment problem that many cities faced all along, means the picture is bleak. With this background in mind, an affirmative vote in the House on H.R. 3613 is a major legislative goal of the Conference and the League.

The Parliamentary situation is complicated, however, by the offering of the Esch substitute, H.R. 8141, described as being backed by the Administration but significantly different from the grant consolidation proposal made by the Administration.

In our view, the Esch substitute should be rejected for the following reasons:

1. It fails to provide new money above and beyond funds authorized for conventional manpower programs. While H.R. 8141 would permit a public service element, the need cannot be met at the expense of ongoing programs, but must be authorized *on top of and in addition to* the already short funded manpower programs.

2. It seriously jeopardizes the shift of responsibility for conducting manpower programs from the federal to the local level. A key principle in manpower legislation adopted by the Congress last year and incorporated by the Administration suggested reform legislation this year is that local government should exercise control over the shape and direction of local manpower programs.

3. We are concerned over the funding formula contained in the Esch substitute. Secretary of Labor James Hodgson testified on May 6 before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty that his Department is having great difficulty in developing a formula to assure individual cities that their existing funding allocations will not be reduced. With the cities' need for funds in this area, (for current programs and public service jobs) staying even is unacceptable. Therefore, we are unable to endorse any formula until the Administration presents a clear reading of how such a formula would be applied.

Under these circumstances, the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors calls upon the Congress to enact H.R. 3613 without the Esch substitute.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL V. MERRICK,
Director, Congressional Relations.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, the Employment Act of 1946 committed this Nation to assuring every American the opportunity for useful, full-time employment at reasonable wages. We have periodically reaffirmed that commitment. Now, H.R. 3613, the proposed Emergency Employment Act of 1971, provides the Congress with the opportunity to deliver at least partially on that commitment.

The present administration keeps mouthing optimistic forecasts of a turn for the better in our national economy. The fact remains that nearly five million men and women in the United States are seeking jobs, and cannot find them. A year ago, 11 of the country's 150 stand-

ard labor markets reported "substantial" unemployment; today, 52 of the markets can claim that dubious honor. The current rate of unemployment is the highest since May 1962.

Meanwhile, hospitals, museums, day care centers, parks and playgrounds across the country have a desperate need for workers, but no funds with which to hire them. One national commission reports that more than 5 million potential public service jobs exist today.

So, Mr. Chairman, we find that unemployment in America is at its highest point in 9 years at the same time that State and local providers of public services find it financially impossible to meet growing needs for existing services and long-ignored needs for new ones.

H.R. 3613 notes the useful public work that needs to be done, notes the millions of Americans seeking useful employment, and seeks to perform the commonsense task of bringing the two together.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would provide funding for 150,000 necessary, decently paid, public service jobs. It will not wipe out our unemployment problem, if enacted, but it will be a tangible, positive beginning to resolving the problem. This House should not permit this opportunity to slip away.

I therefore urge the swift and overwhelming adoption of H.R. 3613, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971, as reported by the committee.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Chairman, I will vote today to keep the committee bill, H.R. 3616, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971, intact. I will vote against the Esch amendment.

My reasons are easily understood. The committee bill, which is similar to one I cosponsored, provides additional money for public service jobs now. Unemployment in my own district is over 6.5 percent. The committee bill attacks the unemployment problem head on by providing additional money to get men and women back to work in jobs that are necessary essential to improve State and local services to our citizens. H.R. 3616 does this and I will support it.

Contrast this with the Esch substitute which just lumps the existing manpower programs together into a bloc grant program. There is no additional money for jobs. This is the crux of the problem. It makes little sense to me to choose between job training programs already in effect, and new public service jobs. Both need to be utilized and both require funding. I do not believe that the mayors and Governors should be required to make this choice.

This is the point. The committee bill, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 provides 150,000 new jobs. The Esch substitute is tragically vague on the establishment of new jobs. I do not think that the mayors of the cities and towns in my district should have to choose between needed public service jobs and necessary job training programs. At a time of high unemployment both are needed.

Fortunately, the mayors of this Nation and, in particular the mayors of Connecticut, see the strengths of the

committee bill. For the information of my colleagues I will include a copy of my letters from the Connecticut Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities and the United States Conference of Mayors. These letters clearly demonstrate that the mayors who share the firing line with us are in full support of the committee bill. I will vote against the Esch substitute and all other amendments that would limit this vital Emergency Employment Act of 1971.

For those Members who feel this is the time to experiment with new bloc grant programs, I would like to cite some figures. National unemployment in April was 6.1 percent. Fifty-two of the Nation's 150 major labor markets are listed as suffering substantial unemployment. This unfortunately includes my own district. I have studied the figures, I have talked to my constituents and I do not see an end in sight.

Quite truthfully, I could not justify radical experimentation with bloc grants when unemployment is so tragically high. The new administrative burden that would be placed on the State and local governments would delay action for long periods of time while men and women continue out of work. This is totally unacceptable to me and to my constituents. I will vote for the bill that provides jobs immediately.

The letters referred to follow:

CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
New Haven, Conn., May 10, 1971.

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE COTTER: We are writing to urge you to vote for the Emergency Public Service Employment bill which provides federal subsidies for the creation of state and municipal jobs for the unemployed (H.B. 3613).

This bill would not only provide desperately needed jobs for the growing numbers of unemployed workers in Connecticut. It would also help our cities and towns perform vital services which they cannot now afford on their own.

As reported out by the House Education and Labor Committee, the bill has two provisions which would greatly enhance the ability of Connecticut municipalities to make effective use of unemployed workers. (1) H.B. 3613 provides 100% federal support for the public service jobs. This provision would greatly help municipalities whose budgets are strained to the breaking point. (2) Furthermore, H.B. 3613 sets no limitation on the duration of the jobs. This would prevent the holding out of false hopes to the unemployed and would allow the municipalities to most effectively use the workers.

These provisions of the bill should therefore be retained.

Municipalities are being forced to curtail many crucial programs and services, because of cutbacks in State and federal funding and the squeeze of spiraling property taxes. In many cases, however, these services would not have to be curtailed if the salaries of the staff could be subsidized under H.B. 3613. For example, Bridgeport may have to eliminate its special police force for public housing; Norwalk may eliminate its day care center; a drug abuse prevention program in North Haven, a senior citizen center in Wallingford, a housing code enforcement program in Hamden, an adult tutorial program in Bristol; and many other urgently needed

programs, all may have to be eliminated. The subsidies provided in H.B. 3613 might assure continuation of these important programs.

We strongly urge you to vote for H.B. 3613 as reported and to take all possible action to assure its passage.

We look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE F. HEIMANN,
President.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1971.

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COTTER: The Emergency Employment Act of 1971, H.R. 3613, will soon come to the House floor for a vote. On behalf of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, representing the nation's mayors and city officials throughout the country, we urge you to vote for this bill as reported out of the House Education and Labor Committee. A similar measure was passed earlier this year in the Senate with a bi-partisan vote of 62-10. The passage of this legislation in the House is critical to the nation's cities, both large and small, since the unemployment picture worsens each month. Today, on the one hand, thousands of our citizens are without jobs and on the other hand municipal services in the areas of sanitation, law enforcement, fire prevention, health and the like, are direly needed and presently not being provided. The need for the services, the jobs, are there. The unemployed people are there. The element missing and critically needed at this time is federal funds to put unemployed citizens to work immediately within municipalities throughout America performing worthwhile tasks for all. H.R. 3613 authorizes these needed funds for public service jobs by providing \$200 million for the current fiscal year, \$750 million for FY 72, and \$1 billion for each of three succeeding years.

The unemployment problem now confronting mayors at the local level cannot be over-emphasized. It goes beyond those on welfare. Returning Vietnam veterans, recent lay-offs resulting from shifts in federal expenditures causing a loss of jobs in certain areas, the overall shortage of jobs in the private sector, coupled with the hard core unemployment problem that many cities faced all along, means the picture is bleak. With this background in mind, an affirmative vote in the House on H.R. 3613 is a major legislative goal of the Conference and the League.

The parliamentary situation is complicated, however, by the offering of the Esch substitute, H.R. 8141, described as being backed by the Administration but significantly different from the grant consolidation proposal made by the Administration.

In our view, the Esch substitute should be rejected for the following reasons:

1. It fails to provide new money above and beyond funds authorized for conventional manpower programs. While H.R. 8141 would permit a public service element, the need cannot be met at the expense of ongoing programs, but must be authorized on top of and in addition to the already short funded manpower programs.

2. It seriously jeopardizes the shift of responsibility for conducting manpower programs from the federal to the local level. A key principle in manpower legislation adopted by the Congress last year and incorporated by the Administration suggested reform legislation this year is that local government should exercise control over the shape and direction of local manpower programs.

3. We are concerned over the funding formula contained in the Esch substitute. Secretary of Labor James Hodgson testified on May 6 before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty that his Department is having great difficulty in developing a formula to assure individual cities that their existing funding allocations will not be reduced. With the cities' need for funds in this area, (for current programs and public service jobs) staying even is unacceptable. Therefore, we are unable to endorse any formula until the Administration presents a clear reading of how such a formula would be applied.

Under these circumstances, the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors calls upon the Congress to enact H.R. 3613 without the Esch substitute.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL V. MERRICK,
Director, Congressional Relations.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3613, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. Along with the Accelerated Public Works Act approved by this House in April, passage of H.R. 3613 will clearly indicate the continuing commitment by Congress to the reduction of unemployment and the placement of jobless individuals into useful, productive work.

Despite constant optimism and reassurance on the part of the executive branch, unemployment continues at a tragically high level. Nationwide, the unemployment rate now stands at 6.1 percent, up from 3.3 percent in December, 1968. Presently there are 52 major labor market areas on the Secretary of Labor's substantial unemployment list—the highest number since 1962. In January, 1969, only 6 markets were experiencing the 6-percent rate of unemployment necessary to be placed on the Secretary's list.

In my own State of New Jersey, the jobless rate, according to the latest available figures, is 7.3 percent. The Newark labor market area has a 6.4-percent rate of unemployment; in the city of Newark itself almost 15 percent of the workforce is unemployed.

The Emergency Employment Act will combat unemployment by providing financial assistance to States, counties, and cities to hire community service personnel. Under the bill, funds would become available whenever the national rate of unemployment exceeds 4.5 percent for 3 consecutive months. Additionally, the legislation creates a special employment assistance fund of \$250 million for fiscal year 1972 for areas experiencing unemployment of 6 percent or more.

Mr. Chairman, it should be emphasized that this bill will not result in thousands of dead-end jobs. There exists an acute need for additional personnel in many public service fields such as education, health, sanitation, conservation, law enforcement, and fire protection. The Kerner Commission recommended the creation of 1 million public service jobs. The Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress in 1966 stated that there are 5.3 million jobs that could be filled in the public sector. A study done for the urban coalition indicates that

143,000 jobs could be quickly filled by the disadvantaged in cities of 100,000 or more alone if Federal funds were available for salary support.

The Emergency Employment Act is necessary both to alleviate the Nation's current high level of joblessness and to fill our need for individuals in a variety of important functions. I urge its overwhelming approval.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the Emergency Employment Act now appears virtually assured of passage. A few weeks ago, when this legislation was first before us, chances of salvaging its original provisions seemed remote. The decided majority vote to allow consideration of a substitute bill—a travesty of the original—was a disheartening sign.

The unexpected defeat of that substitute today restores my confidence in this Congress' ability to attack unemployment.

As I pointed out on May 18, the Emergency Employment Act promises to throw open 150,000 new community service jobs during its first year of operation alone.

It promises to halt the dizzying spiral of unemployment throughout the United States—unemployment that has soared past 8 percent in my own congressional district and as high as 15 percent in other sections of the country.

I will not take up this body's time with an exhaustive explanation of my support for this bill: the Record of May 18 contains my speech in support of its provisions.

Suffice it to say that the bill approaches unemployment in a straightforward and workmanlike way.

It creates jobs—jobs that not only give meaningful work to the idle, but that also help the country's communities in urgent projects like hospital construction and antipollution.

Needless to say, I urge its passage and the defeat of any crippling amendments.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I earnestly urge and hope that the House will decisively determine to accept and approve this bill before us, H.R. 3613, the Emergency Unemployment Act of 1971, instead of the substitute bill that will be proposed to replace it.

While both measures have certain and respective merits and the same basic objective, to provide jobs for the unemployed, I very firmly believe that H.R. 3613, the Emergency Unemployment Act, will achieve the mutually desired goal far more quickly than the substitute proposal; that it will be less complicated in operation, will be more nationally productive in its end results, and will prove to be a more prudent investment, than the substitute, of the taxpayers' funds.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, H.R. 3613 will authorize nearly \$4 billion in Federal funds over a 4-year period to enable cities, States, and counties to hire unemployed workers for job vacancies that these Government units presently do not have the money to fill.

This employment program would continue so long as the national unemploy-

ment rate is 4.5 percent or higher. On this score, I am gratified to observe that a provision, which I was pleased to recommend, has been included in the bill that will maintain the employment program in local pockets of high unemployment, such as some that may exist in my home area and State, with a 6 percent, or higher, jobless rate after the national rate has returned to 4.5 percent or below.

It is authoritatively estimated that the employment program projected by H.R. 3613 will provide 150,000 productive jobs almost immediately and up to 500,000 over the life of the program.

Mr. Chairman, the great urgency of this legislation is, unfortunately, too clear. Few, if any, will question that the present 6 percent rate of unemployment represents a very serious national problem which is rapidly approaching the critical point. More than 5 million Americans are now unemployed and in many localities throughout the United States, and in my own congressional district, an unemployment crisis, unfortunately, already exists.

Faced with this challenge, Mr. Chairman, and the need to choose between two proposed solutions, I think we should approve the one that obviously appears to more speedily and completely accomplish our common purpose, which is simply to provide essential public facilities and services to our citizens throughout the country by placing unemployed individuals in productive work while this current economic depression persists, with its imposition of such tremendous tragedy upon millions of American individuals and families.

In humane consideration of these individuals and families and in the national interest, I hope, therefore, that H.R. 3613 will be quickly and overwhelmingly adopted.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3613, The Emergency Employment Act of 1971.

The recent news of May 7 contained two new major developments which conclusively demonstrate the immediate need for the passage of this legislation.

One headline reported that the jobless rate in April had increased from 6 to 6.1 percent. This is generally accepted to mean that the economy's unemployment rate has settled—or topped out—at around 6 percent and that the economy is simply not moving. It is stagnant; it is at dead center—and millions of Americans who want jobs cannot find them. It means that we are experiencing a long period of unacceptable high unemployment. It means that we in the Congress should legislate now to get the economy moving and provide needed job opportunities immediately.

The second headline reported that for the first time in a decade the number of persons officially recorded as living in poverty has increased significantly. The number of Americans considered to be poor increased by about 1.2 million from the beginning of 1969 to the end of 1970. This is in stark contrast to the rest of the decade of the sixties when every year

found the number living in poverty significantly diminishing. There had been an average annual decline of 4.9 percent during the 1960's, but between 1969 and 1970 the number living in poverty increased by 5.1 percent. In other words, 13 percent of our people—some 25.5 million—have incomes that are below the official poverty level.

I believe that this increase in the number of poor Americans is strictly due to the downturn in the economy and the administration's calculated policies of high unemployment. At the start of 1969, the unemployment rate was 3.3 percent. Now it is 6.1 percent—and it has been around 6 percent for over 5 months now. As a result, thousands upon thousands of Americans have been out of work for so long that their unemployment compensation benefits are exhausted along with other forms of savings and income. Throughout the country, State unemployment compensation trust funds are developing serious trouble as the unemployed drain their resources. In fiscal year 1968, unemployment compensation benefits amounted to about \$2 billion. In this fiscal year, these payments will probably reach \$5.5 billion. As a result of this strain upon their resources, the trust funds of 16 States—as of last November—had fallen to a level recognized as dangerously low.

And this unemployment now has all the signs of continuing for some time at the present unacceptable levels. An article in the February 17, 1971, Wall Street Journal has, sadly, proven all too true:

Despite what some people are saying and most people are hoping unemployment isn't getting set for a nice, long decline. In fact, the rate of joblessness may rise in the next few months. And it is likely to remain high for several months after the expected increases end.

That's the inescapable conclusion emerging from talks with scores of major employers. . . . To be sure, there will be fewer companies making massive layoffs during the 1971 first half than in the final months of last year. But many companies are still whittling away, bit by bit, at their payrolls, and almost none is ready to rebuild work forces.

In my community of Cleveland, Ohio, unemployment has been soaring. Inner city areas are particularly hard hit, but the whole community feels the impact of the recession. The Ohio Employment Service, in their March 1971 report on the Cleveland metropolitan area stated that estimated unemployment jumped from 41,900 in December to 44,900 in March, raising the unemployment rate from 4.3 percent of the civilian labor force to 4.7 percent. In addition, the workweek dropped from 40.7 hours in December to 40.0 in March.

For these reasons I am supporting the passage of H.R. 3613, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. With nearly 5 million Americans unemployed, this bill will put people to work while providing vitally needed services to the country through public service employment. The act will make it possible for State and local officials, who cannot afford to do

so now, to hire people "to work on community beautification and betterment projects, to make additions to the work force in the vital area of public safety, to improve and expand recreation programs, public education, and to do many other things that will benefit their communities."

As noted in the committee report, persons are needed to perform clerical functions for police departments so that patrolmen can devote more time to providing safe streets. More persons need to be trained for environmental management and there is a shortage of nearly 200,000 paraprofessionals in the health field alone. The bill is specifically designed to prohibit the "leaf-raking" jobs that were an occasional byproduct of the emergency relief programs during the Great Depression of the 1930's. There are real jobs that need to be done and done now. Because of the defeat of tax levies in the Cleveland area, nearly 2,000 public sector jobs are being eliminated—but the need for the services cannot be eliminated and this bill will enable Cleveland to hire some of these unemployed people back.

Another special feature of this bill is that it provides extra assistance to areas with unusually high unemployment. This section will permit special assistance to any area which has had a rate of unemployment of 6 percent or more for 3 consecutive months. These areas can be areas within cities which are particularly hard hit. Thus it would permit special governmental service programs in areas like Hough in Cleveland where unemployment is considerably above 10 percent.

There are a number of safeguards built into the bill to prevent abuses and to target the jobs on those in particular need. For example, there is a veterans preference section for Vietnam veterans who are currently suffering an unemployment rate estimated at around 8 percent. Provision is made for training and employment retention and advancement so that deadend jobs are avoided and the program will lead to permanent employment once the present crisis is over. There is a prohibition on any kind of discrimination and a flat ban on political activities by those being hired. Persons employed under this act must be paid whichever is the highest of, first, the State minimum wage; second, the Federal minimum wage; or third, the prevailing wage for similar public occupations in the same locality.

It must be stressed that this is an emergency employment act. Once the national unemployment rate goes below 4.5 percent for 3 consecutive months, no more funds may be obligated. Until that time, the bill is estimated to create 150,000 jobs at an average annual cost per job of \$6,000.

The economy needs this spur. Our cities need the services it can provide. I urge the immediate enactment and funding of this important piece of emergency legislation.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to

review briefly the results of my own study of these two bills, the committee bill, H.R. 3613, which is called the Emergency Employment Act, and the substitute bill, H.R. 8141, which is an improved version of the administration's proposals for special revenue sharing in the area of manpower.

The decision between these two bills is difficult for two reasons. First, they are both basically good bills. We are not here presented with an obvious choice between constructive and obstructionist legislation. Both bills are designed to improve aspects of our Nation's employment and manpower training picture, and both are good enough to accomplish their stated goals. The second difficulty is that the two bills do not seek to accomplish the same goals—they are vastly different in both scope and method. We are not choosing here between a good apple and a bad one, but between a good apple and a good orange.

The committee bill has a limited and worthy purpose. It seeks to provide a large additional amount of Federal manpower funds to provide public service employment for 150,000 unemployed workers during periods when the national unemployment rate rises above 4.5 percent. The rate today is about 6 percent, so if this bill passes, and is signed by the President, it would go into effect immediately. The public service jobs to be funded under this bill would be in Federal, State and local governmental agencies, with some guarantees that they would not be dead-end jobs and with no guarantee that they would not be open-ended jobs, since no time limit is imposed by the committee bill. The committee bill does not address the problem of reforming the existing bill does not address the problem of reforming the existing categorical manpower training program now funded and directed from Washington by the Department of Labor, and it does not address the problem of decentralized local or State control, as opposed to Federal control of these programs.

The substitute bill is vastly different. It, too, provides for a large amount of additional money to be made available when unemployment rises above 4.5 percent, but it does not require that these additional funds be spent for public service employment by recipient States and localities. If a city would opt for public service employment, however, the substitute places a 104-week limit on the duration of any single public service job created or filled, subject to the granting of exceptions by the Secretary of Labor. While the committee bill and the substitute do provide authorizations for different amounts of money, the issue between them cannot be decided on this basis—since no one can predict whether the additional appropriation Congress would approve would even approach the half a billion dollars provided in the substitute for periods of high unemployment, let alone the higher figure authorized in the committee bill.

The major thrust of the substitute bill is to revamp all of the existing cate-

gorical manpower programs excepting the Job Corps, which very definitely would and should remain a nationally funded and directed program. Other programs would be folded into a concept of special revenue sharing, whereby the recipient States and localities would have a great deal more discretion than they presently do in shaping the manpower training programs required to fill local needs. Of course, certain Federal guideposts would have to be met, and whether the guideposts provided in H.R. 8141 are strong enough could only be determined after some experience with the program, and after further legislative review of operating special revenue-sharing programs.

I strongly believe in the idea that federally supported public service employment is appropriate in periods of high unemployment. In effect, a public service employee of a locality whose salary is paid by the Federal Government is benefiting from a revenue-sharing type program. He is providing a service to the local government which it needs and cannot afford to pay for out of its local tax base, and which is made possible only by a transfer of Federal tax dollars to the locality. Thus, I do not believe the supporters of the committee bill can claim to present a clear choice between categorical and revenue-sharing approaches to the problem, since the committee bill itself is a revenue-sharing program of limited scope.

I believe that a carefully drafted special revenue-sharing bill can improve the slow and sometimes unresponsive administration of categorical manpower programs from the Federal level. Any such attempt should contain minimum safeguards of Federal interests, minority interests, labor standards, and other guarantees that State and local recipients will not abuse Federal goals and principles in spending shared manpower funds.

I believe the substitute bill represents an honest attempt to provide such an approach to reform of current manpower programs. I believe it also provides an ample opportunity during unemployment emergencies like the present one, for an extra shot in the arm to the economy in the form of public service employment.

Because it affords both program reform and needed funds for public service employment, I shall cast my vote in favor of the Esch substitute, H.R. 8141.

Should the substitute fail to pass during consideration of the committee bill, I shall support the committee bill on final passage, because, while it lacks any approach to program reform, it does provide a viable and necessary means of funding public service employment, and thus, of reducing current unemployment.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 3613, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971.

Because of longstanding commitments to make a series of commencement appearances before high school graduating classes in our congressional district, I

regrettably missed the vote on the previous question on Tuesday, May 18 and the vote which followed, to amend the rule to permit the substitution of H.R. 8141.

Had I been present I would have voted against the previous question and for the amendment to the rule, not upon the theory that I embrace the philosophy of H.R. 8141 but because of my long-standing belief that the House should be able to work its will in regard to amendments and substitutions. For such reasons I have consistently voted against the closed rule or gag rule.

Mr. Chairman, to say, however, that the House should have the opportunity to consider alternate proposals on manpower programs and public service jobs does not mean that I have concluded that H.R. 8141 measures up to the committee bill, H.R. 3613.

The record will clearly show that over the years I have without exception supported the manpower training programs, beginning with the first Manpower Development and Training Act many years ago. While recognizing that one should never become a slave to consistency simply for the sake of being consistent, to vote for the Esch substitute, H.R. 8141 would amount to a kind of indictment against those programs which have worked so excellently over the years.

To support H.R. 8141 would mean the repeal of all existing manpower legislation. To support H.R. 8141 would be a vote of repudiation of all the good that has been done and accomplished by such worthwhile programs as the vocational education training programs which the State educational agencies have set up with such care and which have worked so well.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute, H.R. 8141, to the committee bill, H.R. 3613, has never been considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. It is a fact that it was not introduced until May 6, or 2 days after the Select Committee on Labor had completed 6 full days of hearings. It is also a fact that H.R. 8141 is not even the same manpower revenue sharing bill which was supported by some of the minority members of the committee. Nor is it the same bill testified to on March 10 by the Secretary of Labor.

Now, of course, we do not know whether the charge made during the debate of May 18 is true when it was said on the floor that H.R. 8141 was written one night by the President's strategy committee. Without knowing the veracity of this charge it is a statement of fact that the substitute we are asked to vote on today was not the subject of hearings by the Subcommittee on Education and Labor.

In our judgment, H.R. 8141 lacks the assurances of last years bill, H.R. 19519, the Comprehensive Manpower Act offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) which the House passed overwhelmingly by a vote of 275 to 80. That bill had the support of the American Vocational Association because it

provided that the educators should serve on the Manpower Council. There was a provision that the sponsors must use to the extent appropriate the services and facilities of vocational and technical schools and area skill centers in carrying out the institutional training and educational components of a comprehensive manpower plan.

Thus, it would seem that one of the prime complaints against H.R. 8141 is that its delivery system is not educationally sound. Every part of a program should be subjected to professional judgment to assure that every trainee has programs prepared by a qualified professional.

Described fairly, the substitute is only a manpower revenue-sharing bill devoid of the statutory assurances that the courses of instruction offered will be truly calculated to train the enrollee for the job sought. Certainly it lacks the assurances that the House insisted upon by a vote of 275 to 8 last year. Another deficiency in the substitute in my opinion is the sudden or precipitous and total shift of manpower programs from the Federal to local government level.

Now, I am not opposed to revenue sharing as such. After a full hearing I would be willing to give general revenue sharing. Here, however, the only requirement is that the local government is making an announcement as to how these programs will work. This way Washington completely relinquishes the Federal Government's power and responsibility to approve local plans and thereby protect and enforce the will of the Congress. I do not believe the substitute is workable.

About as good a statement of the case as we can make of H.R. 3613 is that it is a move that will come to the aid of our cities, both large and small, where the unemployment figures increase each month. The Emergency Employment Act of 1971 recognizes that there are thousands of citizens without jobs on the one hand, and there are jobs unfilled on the other hand.

The need for the services and the jobs are there, the missing element is Federal funds needed immediately to put these people to work performing worthwhile tasks. H.R. 3613 authorizes these needed funds—\$200 million for fiscal year 1971, \$750 million for fiscal year 1972 and more for the other 3 years.

Simply, Mr. Chairman, the importance of this piece of legislation can hardly be overemphasized. This could become one of the most important pieces of legislation needed today. It has nothing to do with welfare. Instead it has to do with unemployment because of recent reductions in the aerospace and military procurement programs. The picture in many of our cities is bleak. Due to the overall reduction of jobs in the private sector and with the hard core unemployed we need this Federal program now. But one segment of the unemployed that cannot and must not be forgotten is our returning Vietnam veterans. The Emergency Employment Act of 1971 when enacted

will become a major achievement of which we can all be proud of.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Employment Act of 1971".

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. ESCH

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Esch: Strike out everything after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 8141, as follows:

That this Act may be cited as the "Manpower Revenue Sharing Act of 1971".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) The Nation's prosperity, economic stability, and productive capacity are limited by a shortage of workers with sufficient skills to perform the demanding production, service, and supervisory tasks necessary in an increasingly technological society. There are also many workers who are unemployed or are employed below their capacity who, with appropriate skill development and training, could make a greater contribution to the national economy and share more fully in its benefits.

(2) Experience has shown that the administration and delivery of effective manpower programs are essentially local matters, requiring a more comprehensive, unified, and flexible approach and that State and local governments are in the best position to assure the active cooperation of employers, employees, and other public and private agencies, individuals, and organizations.

(3) The effectiveness of manpower programs would be improved by making resources for such purposes available to State and local governments to use with broad discretion in evaluating the needs of individual participants and allocating resources to meet those needs.

(4) The Federal Government should make available to State and local governments a wide range of assistance and support to enhance the effectiveness of manpower programs.

It is therefore the purpose of this Act to establish a flexible and decentralized national manpower program involving the efforts of all sectors of the economy and all levels of government, by sharing Federal revenues for the purpose of carrying out manpower training and employment activities designed to provide greater opportunities for training and related services necessary to assist individuals to develop their full economic and occupational potential.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year.

(b) The amounts appropriated to carry out titles I and II of this Act for any fiscal year shall be allocated as follows:

(1) 85 per centum shall be for training and employment activities carried out by States and eligible units of local general government under title I of this Act; and

(2) 15 per centum shall be for activities

carried out by the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") under title II of this Act.

TITLE I—STATE AND LOCAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS

USES OF SHARED REVENUES

SEC. 101. (a) Recipient units of government shall have broad discretion as to the various uses of revenues shared under this Act for manpower program purposes. Manpower programs shall constitute a developmental process, essentially transitional for each participant, consisting of whatever sequence or combination of manpower services, institutional training, on-the-job training, supported employment, and ancillary services which are needed by unemployed and underemployed persons, with priority afforded to those who are disadvantaged or who receive public welfare payments, to prepare for, secure, and hold self-sustaining public and private employment not supported by revenues shared under this Act. In carrying out such programs recipient units of government shall make maximum feasible use of existing educational institutions having a training capability, such as (but not limited to) area vocational schools, technical institutes, and junior and community colleges. The activities authorized under this title, among which revenues shared may be used at the discretion of recipients, are:

(1) Outreach, intake, counseling, testing, work evaluation and work sampling, employability development planning job coaching, job development (including job redesign and occupational restructuring), orientation, placement, and followup services;

(2) institutional training, including basic and remedial education, improvement in communications skills, and occupational skill training, with such training provided in languages other than English, where appropriate;

(3) on-the-job training for both entry and upgraded employees, providing for reimbursement of public and private employers for bona fide training and associated costs, such as where applicable, the temporary reduction in employee productivity in the course of such training;

(4) supported employment, which shall consist of—

(A) work experience and temporary employment in public and private nonprofit agencies, including that affording part-time work for students in ninth through twelfth grades, and

(B) transitional public service employment in Federal, State, and local government, which, within the period of support, will enable participants to move onto the employer's regular payroll or obtain other suitable public or private employment, not supported by revenues shared under this Act.

(5) ancillary services, where not available without reimbursement from agencies which normally provide such services, including assistance to involuntarily unemployed workers to voluntarily relocate, residential support, minor health services (including the furnishing of prosthetic devices), voluntarily received family counseling and planning, child care, bonding, and other special services reasonably related to enhancing the employability of participants in programs assisted under this title; and

(6) when deemed appropriate, recipient units of government may provide allowances or other financial assistance to individuals engaged in training or other activities under this Act for which they are not directly compensated by employers.

(b) Benefits (including services, employment, allowances, and other financial assistance) for each participant may be continued for a period of up to one hundred and four weeks: *Provided, however, That the Secre-*

tary may, upon the request of the recipient unit of government, review a program and upon his determination (taking into consideration any special factors in the labor market area served by such unit) that this requirement creates an undue hardship or would result in defeating one or more of the purposes of this Act he may waive it in whole or in part (or make such adjustments in it as he deems appropriate) with respect to the program of such unit.

(c) Recipients of revenues shared under this Act are responsible for assuring that manpower services provided therewith are coordinated to the fullest extent possible and each State shall be responsible for working out a system to assure such coordination within the State, including at both State and local levels coordination with similar services provided by other public or private agencies under other statutory authority, to the end that there is developed a comprehensive manpower program in each jurisdiction served.

(d) Activities carried out under this title shall not—

(1) Involve the use of funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting or resulting in the identification of such programs with any partisan or nonpartisan political activity or any other political activity associated with a candidate, or contending faction or group, in an election for public or party office.

(2) Result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for service.

DISTRIBUTION OF SHARED REVENUES

SEC. 102. (a) The amounts available for any fiscal year under this title shall be distributed by the Secretary among—

(1) States, for use in those parts of the State not within the jurisdiction of recipient units of local general government;

(2) units of local general government with a population of one hundred thousand or more persons which are (i) cities, or (ii) counties and other units of local general government within standard metropolitan statistical areas (qualifying population of which is exclusive of eligible cities) with powers substantially similar to those of a city;

(3) standard metropolitan statistical areas in which no single unit of government is eligible under clause (2) of this subsection, but where local units of general government with a combined population which constitutes at least 75 per centum of the total SMSA population form a consortium (hereinafter referred to as eligible units of local general government), recognized by the Secretary, to act for the entire area for purposes of this Act; and

(4) other combinations of units of general government which include at least one unit of local general government eligible under clause (2) of this subsection (hereinafter referred to as eligible units of local general government), recognized by the Secretary as manpower consortia, to act as one for purposes of this Act, which are authorized by State or local law to carry out the activities as provided by this Act.

(b) Revenues shared among State and eligible units of local general government shall be amounts calculated in accordance with the proportions, equally weighted, which the number of persons in the labor force, the number of unemployed persons, and the number of low-income individuals sixteen years of age or older residing in each such jurisdiction bear to such total number, respectively, in the United States: *Provided, That the funds to be distributed to manpower consortia formed pursuant to clause (4) of subsection (a) of this section which constitute a defined labor market area shall*

be an amount 10 per centum greater than that to which such jurisdiction would be entitled under the formula provided in this subsection. Eligible units of government whose fair share amounts are greater than their average base amounts would receive the higher of (1) double their average base amounts; or (2) one-half the amount calculated under the fair share formula, but not to exceed \$500,000: *Provided further*, That no unit would receive less than \$100,000, or more than the amount calculated under the fair share formula.

The excess of funds over the fair share amount would be used (1) to cover the shortfall incurred where the average base amount is greater than the fair share; and (2) to redistribute the remainder among all eligible units by the fair share formula. The average base amount is the amount of funds previously received for use in the jurisdictions of the eligible units of government consisting of a three-year average of the amounts received in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, June 30, 1970, and June 30, 1971, under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (as amended) and title I (parts B and E) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (as amended). The data used in applying the formula in this subsection shall be the annual data for the most recent year available, referable to the same time period for all jurisdictions. In lieu of an amount calculated in accordance with the foregoing provision of this subsection, the amount distributed to the Virgin Islands shall be \$1,000,000 and the amount distributed to Guam shall be \$300,000.

(c) Not less than three months prior to the beginning of any fiscal year, the Secretary shall determine the units of government eligible for shared revenues during the subsequent fiscal year upon receipt of evidence of authorization to carry out the activities provided by this Act under State or local law, and shall publish in the Federal Register the apportionment factors which govern the distribution of funds under subsection (b). As soon as practicable after funds are appropriated to carry out this Act for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the actual revenue shares required by subsection (b). All computations and determinations by the Secretary under subsection (b) of this section shall be final and conclusive.

(d) Until such time as a unit of local general government is authorized under State or local law and is eligible to receive funds and carry out activities as provided by this Act, or in the event such a unit refuses to accept such funds, the revenue shares to which it would have been entitled under subsection (b) of this section shall be added to the shared revenues of the State in which that unit is located for discretionary use in providing manpower programs under this title.

(e) Until such time as a State is authorized under State law and is eligible to receive funds and carry out activities as provided by this Act, or in the event it refuses to accept such funds, the shared revenues to which it would have been entitled under subsection (b) of this section shall be available for expenditure by the Secretary for purposes of this title.

PROGRAM STATEMENTS

SEC. 103. (a) Prior to the receipt of any funds under this title for any fiscal year (and at least two months prior to the beginning of the appropriate fiscal year), in order to facilitate coordination among units of government, to permit public examination of the effectiveness of activities carried out under this title and to enhance the public accountability of recipients of shared revenues—

(1) each State shall publish and make

available to the eligible units of local general government within its jurisdiction, and to the Secretary, a statement of program objectives and projected uses of funds; and

(2) each recipient unit of local general government (or combination of units) shall publish and make available to the State, and to the Secretary, a statement of program objectives and projected uses of funds.

(b) Statements of program objectives and projected uses of funds shall describe—

(1) the economic and labor market conditions and manpower needs for the area served;

(2) the number and characteristics of persons to be served;

(3) the types of activities which will be carried out under this title;

(4) the schedules of benefits (services, wages, allowances, other financial assistance) to be provided to participants;

(5) the offices and positions through which the activities are to be administered and the salaries thereof;

(6) the identity of agencies and organizations, public and private, carrying out services provided by this and other related Acts; and

(7) staff training and technical assistance needs.

(c) With respect to the annual program statement of each recipient unit of local general government, each State receiving funds under this Act shall provide to such unit of government not less than one month prior to the beginning of the appropriate fiscal year comments and recommendations regarding local program statements received under subsection (a)(2) of this section, including comments and recommendations about duplication of services and capacity, coordination, and integration with State-provided employment and manpower services.

(d) With respect to the annual program statement of each State, each recipient unit of local general government shall provide to the State not less than one month prior to the beginning of the appropriate fiscal year comments and recommendations regarding the State's program statement received under subsection (a)(1) of this section.

(e) The Secretary may provide to each unit of government such comments on its annual program statement as he deems appropriate.

(f) Each unit of government receiving funds under this title shall, prior to the beginning of the fiscal year, publish a final statement of program objectives and projected uses of funds amended as it deems necessary in the light of comments and recommendations which are provided under subsections (c), (d), and (e) of this section or are otherwise received.

(g) Accompanying each final program statement after the first one, each unit of government receiving funds under this title shall publish an annual report on the uses of such funds during the year then ending, which shall set forth expenditures made and the results achieved in relation to objectives, including the information required by subsection (b)(1) through (7) of this section and three-year projections of needs and requirements.

(h) Each unit of government receiving funds under this title (or under title III) shall provide assurances that preference in placement in programs financed under this Act will be given to unemployed or underemployed individuals who served in the Armed Forces in Indochina or Korea after August 4, 1964 (and who have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable), and that such unit of government shall (1) make a special effort to acquaint such individuals with the programs and to provide job counseling, training, placement, and other services designed to assist such individuals in

obtaining gainful employment; and (2) coordinate efforts on behalf of such individuals with those authorized by chapter 41 of title 38, United States Code (Job Counseling and Employment Placement Services for Veterans), or carried out by other public or private organizations or agencies.

RECORDS, AUDIT, AND REPORTS

SEC. 104. (a) All revenues shared with recipient units of government under this title shall be properly accounted for as Federal funds in the accounts of such recipients.

(b) In order to assure that revenues shared under this title are used in accordance with the provisions of this Act, each recipient unit of government shall—

(1) use such fiscal and accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure (i) proper accounting for payments received by it, and (ii) proper disbursement of such amounts;

(2) provide to the Secretary, on reasonable notice, access to, and the right to examine, any books, documents, papers, or records as he may reasonably require, and

(3) make such reports to the Secretary as he may reasonably require.

RECOVERY OF FUNDS

SEC. 105. (a) If the Secretary determines after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing that a recipient unit of government has failed to comply substantially with the provisions of this Act he shall—

(1) refer the matter to the Attorney General of the United States with a recommendation that an appropriate civil action be instituted; or

(2) notify the recipient unit of government that if corrective action is not taken within sixty days from the date of such notification, revenues shared with it will be reduced in the same or succeeding fiscal year by an amount equal to the amount of funds which were not expended in accordance with the provisions of this Act; or

(3) take such other action as may be provided by law.

(b) When a matter is referred to the Attorney General pursuant to subsection (a)(1) of this section, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court for such relief as may be appropriate, including injunctive relief.

(c) (1) Any recipient unit of government which received notice of reduction of revenues shared, under subsection (a)(2) of this section, may, within sixty days after receiving notice of such reduction, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such unit of government is located or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia a petition for review of the Secretary's action. The petitioner shall forthwith transmit copies of the petition to the Secretary and the Attorney General of the United States, who shall represent the Secretary in litigation.

(2) The Secretary shall file in the court the record of the proceeding on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. No objection to the action of the Secretary shall be considered by the court unless such objection has been urged before the Secretary.

(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm or modify the action of the Secretary or to set it aside in whole or in part. The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive. The court may order additional evidence to be taken by the Secretary, and to be made part of the record. The Secretary may modify his findings of fact, or make new findings, by reason of the new evidence so taken and filed with the court, and he shall also file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact shall be conclusive if supported by substantial evi-

dence on the record considered as a whole, and shall also file his recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of his original action.

(4) Upon the filing of the record with it, the jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

TITLE II—ACTIVITIES OF THE SECRETARY OF LABOR

SEC. 201. In order to maximize the effectiveness of activities carried out by recipient units of government under title I of this Act, the Secretary, either directly or through funds provided to public and private organizations, shall—

(a) contribute to the efficient exercise of discretionary powers under this Act of State and local governments, by developing capacity for and providing such training, staff development, and technical assistance as may be requested by States and recipient units of local general government;

(b) assist State and local governments to fulfill their responsibilities under this Act by carrying out a comprehensive program of power research and experimental, demonstration, and pilot programs to improve understanding and methods of meeting manpower, employment, and training problems;

(c) enhance the capacity of State and local governments to assess their manpower needs and set their own priorities by developing a comprehensive system of labor market information on a National, State, local, or other appropriate basis, which shall be made publicly available in a timely fashion;

(d) establish and carry out a national computerized job bank program, using electronic data processing and telecommunications systems to the maximum extent possible for the purpose of identifying sources of available manpower supply and job vacancies, providing an expeditious means of matching the qualifications of unemployed, underemployed, and disadvantaged persons with employer requirements and job opportunities, and referring and placing such persons in jobs;

(e) secure information and data designed to enable the Secretary to evaluate and measure the relative and, where programs can be compared appropriately, comparative effectiveness of the activities carried out under this Act;

(f) administer the Wagner-Peyser Act and the manpower provisions of title IV, part C of the Social Security Act in such a manner that services under such laws contribute to the fullest extent possible in the development of comprehensive manpower programs under this Act; and

(g) establish programs designed to assure that manpower programs contribute fully to national policy objectives, including services and activities such as authorized under title I of this Act.

SEC. 202. The Secretary shall make an annual manpower report to the President and the Congress pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training and to the effectiveness of programs authorized under this Act.

TITLE III—EMERGENCY TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 301. When the Secretary determines that the rate (seasonally adjusted) of national unemployment has risen to equal or exceed 4.5 per centum for three consecutive months, the Secretary is authorized to obligate from the funds appropriated for carrying out this title an amount up to \$500,000,000 for carrying out activities authorized under title I of this Act for the fiscal year in which such determination is made.

SEC. 302. The Secretary shall distribute funds available pursuant to section 301 of

this title among States and eligible units of local general government to provide training and other services authorized by title I to groups or communities of high unemployment.

SEC. 303. No further obligation of funds made available under section 301 of this title may be made subsequent to a determination by the Secretary that the rate of national unemployment (seasonally adjusted) has receded below 4.5 per centum for three consecutive months.

SEC. 304. Whenever the Secretary determines that the unemployment rate criteria prescribed in section 301 and in section 303 of this title have been met, he shall promptly notify the Congress and the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall publish such determination in the Federal Register.

SEC. 305. This title shall be effective upon the enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. The Secretary shall prescribe such rules, regulations, and standards as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and conditions of this Act, including standards to assure the compatibility on a nationwide basis of data systems used in carrying out activities under this Act in order to provide the public and the Congress with objective information on which to evaluate activities under this Act.

SEC. 402. Revenues shared under this Act shall be considered as Federal financial assistance within the meaning of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d).

SEC. 403. (a) Effective December 31, 1971, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and parts B and E of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, are repealed: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, revenues shared shall be calculated on the basis of Federal appropriations for the entire fiscal year under this Act and statutory provisions repealed by this subsection, and cumulative Federal obligations from the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, as of December 31, 1971, for grants or contracts consonant with the activities authorized under section 101(a) of this Act, within or attributable to the jurisdiction of each recipient unit of government will be charged against its shared revenues: *Provided further*, That each recipient unit may, at its discretion, assume and act on behalf of the Secretary with respect to the unexpended portion of any Federal obligation for a grant or contract for such activities as of December 31, 1971, under the statutory provisions repealed by this subsection, and may terminate or continue such grant or contract in accordance with its terms on its own responsibility. The grantee or contractor may terminate any assumed grant or contract within thirty days after such assumption without incurring penalties for default. In the event that a recipient unit of government declines to assume the obligation for any such grant or contract, it shall continue in accordance with its terms until termination. For the purpose of this proviso, all authority of the statutory provisions repealed by this subsection shall remain in effect, but not beyond December 31, 1972.

(b) Advance payments made prior to and including December 31, 1971, and unearned at the close of business on December 31, 1971, shall be either returned promptly to the Federal agency concerned, or offset against the first shared revenues to which the same unit of government becomes entitled under this Act.

(c) Unobligated balances of appropriations on the books of the Federal Government under the statutory provisions repealed by subsection (a) of this section shall be transferred to and merged with funds appropriated under the authority of section 3 of this Act.

SEC. 404. The amounts appropriated and allocated pursuant to this Act shall be paid to the recipient units of government at such intervals and in such installments as the Secretary may determine, taking account of the objective that the time elapsing between the transfer of funds from the United States Treasury and the disbursement thereof by a recipient unit of government shall be minimized: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall, with the concurrence of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, prescribe regulations for the purpose of avoiding an inordinate rise in Federal outlays in fiscal years 1972 and 1973 resulting from concurrent disbursements to (i) obligations incurred prior to December 31, 1971, under the statutory provisions repealed by section 403 (a), and (ii) revenues shared under this Act.

SEC. 405. In the event that cooperation or agreements between States is necessary in order to realize the full benefit of provisions of this Act, the consent of Congress is hereby given to such States to enter into such agreements.

SEC. 406. The Secretary shall not provide funds for activities of a health, education, or welfare character under title II of this Act unless he shall first have obtained the concurrence of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such activities shall include, but not be limited to, basic and general education; institutional training; health, child care, and related ancillary activities; and supported work and job restructuring in the health, education, and welfare professions.

SEC. 407. (a) The Secretary is authorized to exercise all powers necessary for the implementation of title II, including the power (1) to rent or renovate real property without regard to any other law or regulation governing rental or renovation of such property, provided he first advises the Administrator of General Services Administration of his intent to do so and the reasons therefor, (2) to purchase real property for training centers, (3) to accept and use gifts and voluntary services for the benefit of the program, (4) to enter into contracts or agreements, (5) to make such payments in advance or by way of reimbursement as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of the Act, and (6) to expend, without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation, funds made available for purposes of this Act for printing and binding.

(b) Enrollees in residential centers assisted under title II of this Act shall not be regarded as Federal employees for any purpose, except that such enrollees shall be deemed Federal employees for the purposes of (1) the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code; (2) the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.); and (3) subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code (relating to compensation for work injuries), except that the Secretary may prescribe rules and regulations, including variances from the provisions of this subchapter where he deems it appropriate and including the designation of appropriate salary levels to be used as a basis for computing benefits to such enrollees.

SEC. 408. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in any construction, alteration, or repair, including painting and decorating of projects, buildings, and works which are federally assisted, which shall include revenues shared, under this Act, shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to such labor standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950

(15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267) and section 2 of the Act of June 1, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

Sec. 409. (a) As used in this Act, the term "State" means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, or the Virgin Islands.

(b) For purposes of determining shared revenues under section 102 of this Act—

(1) the term "labor force" means the civilian labor force as defined and used by the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics;

(2) the term "unemployed persons" means those persons who are unemployed as defined and used by the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics;

(3) the term "low-income persons" means members of households or individuals living separately, whose income does not exceed criteria established by the Secretary, taking into consideration family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and other relevant factors;

(4) the term "standard metropolitan statistical area" means those population centers as defined by the Office of Management and Budget; and

(5) the term "labor market area" means a local economic complex as defined by the Secretary, within which workers may normally change their place of work without changing their place of residence.

(c) Where appropriate, the definitions in subsection (b) of this section shall be based on the latest published reports of the Department of Labor and the Office of Management and Budget on the date of enactment of this Act and of each subsequent year. The Secretary may by regulation change or otherwise modify the definitions in subsection (b) of this section in order to reflect any change or modification thereof made subsequent to such date by the Department of Labor or the Office of Management and Budget.

Sec. 410. The effective date of this Act, except as provided in section 305 of this Act, shall be January 1, 1972. Rules, regulations, guidelines, and other published interpretations or orders may be issued by the Secretary at any time after the date of enactment.

Mr. ESCH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I would not object if we have the opportunity to question the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. There have been assertions and counter-assertions that can only be responded to by direct questions, and direct responses to those direct questions. So at this time I will not object, and when the gentleman finishes his first 5 minutes then I will not object to the next 5 minutes with the understanding that the gentleman will respond to questions from the majority side.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, the bill which I present, H.R. 8141, has come through the legislative process of last 2 years. There is not a Member of the House, and I do not believe there is a member of any body of expertise in this country dealing in manpower training, that accepts the contention that the present system is working properly. The major intent of the substitute bill is to restructure and to redevelop manpower training programs to give local control. It would provide funds directly to cities and counties of over 100,000, or collection of funds on an annual basis to provide the development of their own manpower training programs, while reserving 15 percent of the funds for the Secretary of Labor to utilize in research and development and staff functions, such as a much-needed job bank that so many of us have been working on for 10, these many years.

Moreover, in contrast to the committee bill which adds but one more narrow categorical manpower authorization for public service employment, it takes the confused and overcentralized manpower training programs and makes them responsive to local conditions and to individual need.

What are the major defects of the committee bill? As I pointed out, and by the admission of the chairman of the subcommittee, the committee bill will provide for only 150,000 public service jobs at a cost of \$5 billion. Recognizing the number of unemployed in this country totaling 4.8 or 5 million, by their own admission, they will solve only 3 percent of the problem. By statistics it is shown there would be less than two individuals for each district that could receive funds under the committee bill.

To turn to the substitute bill, it provides for public service employment—indeed, \$500 million in the first year, as opposed to \$200 million in the committee bill. But it does so on the basis of a coordinated program at the local level. The problem of unemployment in the country is of national concern, but it is a local problem. And, therefore, the substitute bill reaches out to afford a solution to meet that problem.

Now, it has been suggested that under the substitute bill, the vocational education programs in the country would be adversely affected. This simply is without basis in fact. The substitute bill provides explicitly that to the maximum extent, the vocational and technical training centers and the vocational educators must be utilized in manpower training programs that are developed at the State and local level. I suggest to you that this is far more than what we have now in the present manpower training programs.

Moreover, the question was raised as to its impact on veterans. The committee bill under the amendment which I sponsored, gives preference to the Korean and Indochina veterans. The substitute bill provides not only for public service employment for veterans, but they will be given preference in all manpower training programs and not just public service employment.

Now, as to the other question relating to public service employment and the substitute bill. The mayors throughout the land have emphasized and I have indicated before, Mayor Stokes of Cleveland and the mayor of Baltimore and the mayor of Indianapolis, as well as Members on both sides of the aisle have said that the substitute bill is the best way and the most effective way not only to bring about public service employment immediately, but to establish a coordinated manpower program. So we stand at the crossroads here today. Does this House want to add one more categorical program that admittedly will not solve the problems of unemployment in this country? Or do we want to take this opportunity to fundamentally reform manpower training programs in the country in order to bring about a solution of the unemployment problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) be given 5 additional minutes to respond to questions.

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

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

Mr. BURTON. I certainly shall after I take, perhaps, 1 of my 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this issue is of great importance to every American community. I have repeated twice in what I hope were very unambiguous terms, and let me restate it the third time—we have asked the Department of Labor and have not received—we have asked the minority on the Education and Labor Committee and have not received—I repeat, have not received—the fiscal year by fiscal year actual expenditures and allocations for the past fiscal years of 1969 and 1970 and whatever estimates were used to derive the fiscal year 1971 expenditure and allocation amounts.

I repeat, we have asked for and have not received the fiscal year-by-fiscal year information. Now, why is that necessary? If you are a growth State or a growth community, it does not help you much what you spent in 1969 when it is averaged with 1970 and 1971. I want to know whether my community and my State—and if I do not get the information I have to assume that, when information is peculiarly in the hands of the administration, that every growth city and State in this country will be disadvantaged.

One other point. In the committee bill virtually every single, small State in the country is better off on the face of the tables—because they get an \$1.5 million automatic add-on to what they are getting now. So my basic point is this: We simply cannot countenance dealing with a matter of this importance by supporting the Esch proposal in its entirety. There are some elements in the sub-

stitute bill that I think may be more desirable than in our own bill, but I want to deal with them on their merits, one at a time. I do not want to have to take it all or nothing. That is not a reasoned legislative process. That is just nonsense.

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, but will you first answer whether or not my assertions are correct or incorrect about the individual fiscal year data?

Mr. ESCH. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I, too, want to follow the legislative process and to follow along any reasonable analysis, discussion, and dialog, and I hope we might do that. I think that it is a matter of specific statistics rather than emotion, and I hope we can proceed on that basis.

Mr. BURTON. I am sorry, I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. ESCH. Let me first answer the gentleman by saying that the base is determined on the 3 fiscal years, as he is well aware.

Mr. BURTON. I stated that.

Mr. ESCH. The statistics that I understand the Department of Labor has provided to the subcommittee chairman form the basis or the base for each State or each local community.

Mr. BURTON. I yielded initially for the purpose of enabling the gentleman to answer my question: Have we or have we not asked for, and have we or have we not received the individual fiscal year data?

Mr. ESCH. I would answer the gentleman that if he will read the bill carefully he will observe that it is of no consequence as to the individual years but rather it is the average of the last 3 years which makes a difference in the allocation.

If I may go on a bit further—

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentleman first specifically tell me, yes or no, have we requested the fiscal year data for 1969 and 1970, and how you base the 1971 cost allocations and expenditures? Yes or no.

Mr. ESCH. If my understanding is correct, you have requested on this floor—

Mr. BURTON. Have we received this information? Yes, or no?

Mr. ESCH. It is my understanding that it really does not matter. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will see that it does not matter whether you have the individual years or not.

Mr. BURTON. If it does not matter, why do you not let us decide for ourselves whether we are able to read and interpret the data? When you deal with averages such as those contained in the bill, you had better find out what all the component elements of the average are.

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

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

Mr. ESCH. If the gentleman will yield further, under the substitute bill the last 3 years' average—and surely there is no one who is going to play up the figures—

the State of California, for example, has received \$107 million. Under the substitute bill the State of California will receive \$138 million.

Mr. BURTON. I decline to yield further.

Mr. ESCH. San Francisco—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California declines to yield further.

Mr. BURTON. I will ask my California colleagues to consider that it was not what the average was for the 3 past years. The more critical yardstick is what will we get under the current law for the coming fiscal year? All I am asking for is to examine the individual component parts, and it is not just the State of California, it is every growth community in the country that is affected in this way.

Furthermore, I make the assumption that virtually every small State in the country, on the face of the record, is better off under the committee bill than the alternative because every small State gets at least \$1.5 million more money.

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

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

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

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

Mr. ESCH. In spite of the attempt at confusion by the previous speaker, the gentleman from California, it is clear that the allocation is based on the last 3 fiscal years. Furthermore, the formula is allocated so that if the population has increased during the last 10 years, rather than a State receiving less funds, it will receive more funds under the allocation.

Now, any attempt to confuse the issue of the allocation of funds should be rejected by this Committee. The specific figures, based on the 1960 census data, have been distributed to the subcommittee chairman. I know of no attempt at all to confuse the formula.

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

Mr. ESCH. I will not yield. I have not received that courtesy before. I will not return the courtesy.

I am sorry; I could not yield; I do not have the floor.

According to Mayor Lugar, as he indicates:

Contrary to Mr. Merrick's letter, the formula—while probably no closer to perfection than other Federal funding formula—clearly assures that no state and no city will receive less than they have been receiving for manpower programs.

I want to reemphasize that. The Secretary of Labor in his letter emphasized that also.

The real issue is whether or not we are going to change the manpower training programs. Let us not be confused by rhetoric from the west coast.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, again I reiterate that I find it interesting that last year, when we did reach an agreement with the majority for a comprehensive manpower reform bill as well as public employment, yet now we hear from the majority that this is too

complicated, we have to take them up one at a time. That was not true last year, as we hear from the majority.

We are told we are not, in the substitute, reforming all manpower programs. I submit that last year the bill reported by the full committee and passed by the House did not include WIN and some of the other programs. Why is it so important that we include all programs in the manpower reform when last year it was not all that important?

Again I submit we came very close last year to reaching a final agreement in the conference committee on a bill that could be supported by the administration. We got down, really, to that one last element, where we were going to have either the make-work type of almost permanent subsidized public employment or the kind of program that would be coordinated with manpower programs to give training and move people out of subsidized public employment into either full-time unsubsidized public employment or private employment.

It seems to me very clear, having abandoned the course we found workable last year, that this year we are considering these elements separately, perhaps in the hope that we will face the President with the problem of deciding whether to sign the bill or to veto it again.

Last year, when the President vetoed the bill the other body upheld that veto. I believe that shows the sentiment which exists in the Congress, when the other body sustained the veto of the President.

I would plead that we join together in trying to solve the problems of unemployment by adopting the Esch substitute, which has the public service employment as well as manpower reformation. Let us join together to try to solve the problems of unemployment, rather than to make a political issue out of this thing.

I would hope the Members would see fit to support the Esch substitute, something that could be supported by the administration and which could be implemented much quicker than that the majority would have us pass today. It could be implemented with more funds this year.

Rather than look at how many dollars one community may have gotten last year as opposed to how many dollars one may get next year, I hope we can look at the problem of unemployment and see how many people are going to be helped, how many people are going to get training, to upgrade their employment so that they can be relocated, to help solve the problem of unemployment in this country. I hope the Members will support the Esch substitute.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute bill. I said yesterday that it was a cruel hoax on the tremendous number of veterans who are coming back from Vietnam and looking for job opportunities only to find that there are no jobs available.

All you have to do is read section 2 of the substitute bill, H.R. 8141, to see what a cruel hoax it is if we are going to deal effectively with the problem of creating jobs for unemployed Americans. The language there is:

The Nation's prosperity, economic stability, and productive capacity are limited by a shortage of workers with sufficient skills to perform the demanding production, service, and supervisory tasks necessary in an increasingly technological society. There are also many workers who are unemployed or are employed below their capacity who, with appropriate skill development and training, could make a greater contribution to the national economy and share more fully in its benefits.

This is a mockery of the facts, Mr. Chairman. In America today we have 15.5 million Americans who are either unemployed, underemployed, or so-called working poor. You can talk about retraining people all you want, but you will be training them for nonexistent jobs.

The fundamental difference between the substitute bill and the Daniels bill is that the substitute bill offers to restructure the Nation's manpower program. We all agree that reforms are necessary in the manpower program. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), chairman of the subcommittee, has stated he is prepared to hold hearings and bring before this House an effective manpower reform bill. The gentleman from Oregon told you three subcommittees are now working on a bill which will bring necessary reforms in manpower training and that every Member of this House will have an opportunity to vote on this kind of a reform bill.

However, the issue before us today is whether or not we are going to give municipal authorities all over this country 150,000 new jobs to give veterans coming back from Vietnam and youngsters graduating from college the job opportunity they need. College students have never experienced a greater depression. College after college will tell you that youngsters graduating cannot find jobs.

This bill is also designed to take care of those who are dislocated from professional jobs. We are talking about professional workers in the aerospace industry and the other industries who are already trained. It is a mockery to say that you will retrain these people. For what? Non-existing jobs? Our soldiers are coming back fully trained; our college students are fully trained and our dislocated unemployed professionals are also fully trained. All they need is a job.

And that is what the Daniels bill does. It provides funds so as to immediately provide 150,000 new job opportunities.

The substitute bill will not create one single new job.

They tell you there are \$500 million in the substitute bill. That \$500 million is to continue existing manpower programs and will not create a single new job. As far as the substitute is concerned, I ask the author to tell me one new job that would be created by this bill. He answers that local communities will make that decision. Is there anybody foolish enough here to think anybody in the manpower administration will phase out their own jobs in order to create funds for new jobs for the unemployed of America? Of course not.

So I say to you, Mr. Chairman, this substitute is a cruel hoax. If you want to do

something about unemployment, then you will get behind the Daniels bill, which will have 150,000 jobs now.

All over this country mayors are sitting on a keg of human dynamite. There are young people who are out of work; workers who are unemployed. There are 6.5 million people who are unemployed, 6 percent of the Nation's labor force; another 6.5 million underemployed working a curtailed workweek, and still another 2.5 million working poor. And the sponsor of the substitute bill talks about prosperity. He talks about the fact that we have a shortage of workers.

Where has the gentleman been? Has he looked at the 6-percent unemployment statistics? Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the total percentage of unemployment now stands at 6 percent?

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

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

Mr. ESCH. Under title 3 of the substitute bill, it is very clear that in the first year \$500 million additional can be authorized for specifically public service jobs for training.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There is nothing in the gentleman's substitute that creates jobs. It merely provides additional funds for training people for jobs, upgrading skills, but it provides no manner for actually creating new jobs in the public sector.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman let me finish my statement?

Mr. PUCINSKI. No, I refuse to yield further.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from California made the statement on the floor that the 10 smallest States of the Union would not benefit from this bill, but that they would be worse off.

Under the substitute proposal as compared to the committee proposal, I would like to rise to say that that is categorically not true.

As a Representative of one of those 10 States, the State of Delaware, I can tell you how difficult it is to obtain funds from the Secretary of Labor, especially the kind of funds we need.

As a matter of fact the figures very clearly show that the State of Delaware in fact would be much better off under the substitute proposal. The average for the past 3 years shows that the State of Delaware has received an average of \$1.2 million per year, whereas, under the manpower revenue sharing proposal, the actual amount for next year would be \$2.6 million. That represents a substantial increase.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman's statement is accurate with reference to the State of Delaware. The gentleman from California stated that virtually every small State in the country would

be worse off. The exception from the rule is the gentleman's State of Delaware, not Alaska, Wyoming, and so forth. The gentleman is correct with reference to his constituency but not the rest.

Mr. DU PONT. I would like to more precisely comment upon the remarks of the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. DU PONT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ESCH. There is a major misunderstanding here which I think should be corrected for the Record. Rhode Island did receive \$4.5 million in the last 3 years but it would receive \$6.1 million under the substitute bill. Going down the list of States, North Dakota now receives approximately \$3 million, but would receive \$4.8 million under the substitute proposal. New Mexico, which is surely not one of the smaller States, receives \$3.1 million but under the substitute bill would receive \$3.62 million.

I appreciate the gentleman from Delaware yielding. I think the gentleman has made a good point. Despite the rhetoric, the statistics which have been pointed out indicate the States will be in better shape financially under the substitute bill than under the committee bill.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that I should respond more precisely to the statistics which have been given by the gentleman from California in his comments. He was in error with reference to my State, and I think for the Record it would be helpful if he would establish for the 10 small States the precise comparisons.

Mr. BURTON. In the first instance, the Rhode Island situation is incorrect. If there has been any growth between 1970 and 1971 then the State will get more money under the committee bill than under the Esch substitute, because the committee bill increases the amount at least by \$1.5 million to every single State.

I note that the gentleman did not belabor the fact that South Dakota for example, is going to be better off under the committee bill, or Wyoming and, virtually, as a simple rule of thumb all of the single-Member States except the State of Delaware as well as many of the two-Member States will be better off under the committee bill.

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

Mr. DU PONT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ESCH. South Dakota was mentioned earlier, but I might point out that under present conditions they receive \$3.9 million whereas under the substitute bill they would receive \$5.1 million.

Mr. BURTON. The point is that our bill adds another \$1.5 million to their current allocation—and this total exceeds \$5.1 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. BURTON. I just want to get into the situation with reference to South Dakota.

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman want the accuracy of his point established?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. DU PONT) has the floor.

Mr. DU PONT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Delaware yielding.

I repeat that as the population increases the work force increases, and under the substitute bill the States and the given localities will receive more. And notwithstanding the objections and the statements of the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON) to the contrary, the facts are that the individual States will receive more both in terms of authorization and also in terms of commitment by this administration; and second, as the population and the workforce increases, then they will likewise receive more. That is a point of fact, and should not be confused.

Again I appreciate very much the courtesy of the gentleman from Delaware yielding to me.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute bill. To my way of thinking—and I want my minority friends to hear this statement—the figures that have been circulated by the Department of Labor are grossly deceptive. I refer to figures distributed in a communication which compares the past 3-year average allocation to certain selected States for manpower programs with what is alleged to be the estimated allocations under H.R. 8141 for fiscal year 1972. The communication states that Alabama, for instance, over the past 3 years, received an average of \$22,160,165 each year and then they say under the manpower revenue-sharing allocation for Alabama, \$35,122,700. What the communication does not disclose is Alabama's allocation for fiscal year 1971 which should have been considerably larger than the 3-year average because of increased appropriations for manpower programs.

What the communication also does not disclose is that the funds in the committee bill H.R. 3613 are in addition to funds already authorized. H.R. 8141 repeals.

It has been stated and circulated that this bill in some way affects the Civil Rights Act. I want to say to you frankly that neither bill amends, supersedes, or adds to the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in federally financed programs, would have application to the operation of either H.R. 3163 or H.R. 8141. On the other hand, because H.R. 8141 embodies the concept of public manpower revenue sharing, and would involve the commingling of the Federal and State manpower funds, it may well be that title VI would be held to apply to all of the State-sponsored manpower programs.

Mr. Chairman, let me turn now to concerns I have about the substitutes affect on vocational education.

Under section 403 of H.R. 8141, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and parts B—Work and Training for Youth and Adults—and E—Mainstream—of the Economic Opportunity Act would be repealed. Authorizations for other manpower programs, such as Job Corps under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, are not extended by H.R. 8141 and would be allowed to expire June 30, 1971.

H.R. 8141 contains none of the assurances of vocational education involvement in the training components of manpower programs that are provided for in the existing legislation such as to be found in section 231 of the Manpower Development and Training Act—

(a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, pursuant to the provisions of this title enter into agreements with States under which the appropriate State education agencies will undertake to provide training needed to equip persons referred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 202, for the occupations specified in the referrals, except that with respect to education to be provided pursuant to referrals under subsection (b) or (j) of section 202, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make arrangements for the provision of the education to be provided under such subsection through other appropriate education agencies. Such State agencies shall provide for such training through public educational agencies or institutions or through arrangements with private educational or training institutions where such private institutions can provide equipment or services not available in public institutions, particularly for training in technical and subprofessional occupations, or where such institutions can, at comparable cost, (1) provide substantially equivalent training, or (2) make possible an expanded use of the individual referral method, or (3) aid in reducing more quickly unemployment or current and prospective manpower shortages. * * * The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall give preference to training and education provided through State vocational education agencies and other State education agencies. However, in any case in which he determines that it would permit persons to begin their training or education within a shorter period of time, or permit the needed training or education to be provided more economically, or more effectively, he may provide the needed training or education by agreement or contracts made directly with public or private training or educational facilities or through such other arrangements as he deems necessary to give full effect to this Act.

Under H.R. 8141, 85 percent of the funds appropriated for all manpower purposes under the authority of the bill would be allocated to the States and "eligible units of local general government." With respect to the 85 percent, no assurances are provided in the legislation for the involvement of State educational agencies in the development and operation of the manpower training programs.

Mr. Chairman, consideration on the floor of the House of the proposed substitute, H.R. 8141, creates a real danger of drastically altering the funding of on-

going vocational education programs, drastically shifting the responsibility for the development of manpower training programs in ways which cannot be adequately seen without the benefit of public hearing, public debate, and thorough study of the legislation.

The bill that the committee brought to the floor, H.R. 3613, was a bill limited in scope. It simply added a new manpower weapon; that is, the creation of a public service employment program. In an extraordinary step of amending the rule under which the legislation is being considered, the House is being called upon to repeal all of the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act and the specific repeal of the manpower provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act and the repeal by implication of other provisions of that act.

The committee is and will be extensively studying all manpower programs in view of their imminent expiration dates with a view to bringing to the floor appropriate legislation to extend and strengthen Federal manpower legislation.

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

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the American Vocational Association and the State vocational education leaders throughout America are against this legislation.

What is going to happen to our Job Corps centers? They cannot tell you what is going to happen to the Job Corps centers in the future or to any of the other manpower programs. What is going to happen to the State employment service offices? Answer that question.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ESCH. As I stated, under the substitute bill, the State employment services would stay the same and additionally, I would point out that the vocational educators—

Mr. PERKINS. How would this affect the functions of our State employment service agencies?

Mr. ESCH. It does not affect them, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. It does?

Mr. ESCH. It does not.

Mr. PERKINS. It does affect them in good conscience, because they do not know where they stand.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PICKLE. I would like a further explanation of what it does to the employment service within the State. The public service have worked out the best system. And that is the question to those who have authority to bypass the employment offices.

Mr. PERKINS. And they are completely ignored under the substitute bill. Under the substitute bill, the employment service can be completely bypassed

at the discretion of the recipient of the grant.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, how does this affect the Job Corps? Does this mean that once the appropriation is made that the programs must be carried on solely by the State and might then dwindle away or disappear?

Mr. PERKINS. It would depend on the type of programs that the States wanted. With respect to the specific authorization for the Job Corps the substitute would let it expire on June 30. H.R. 8141 is, remember, a comprehensive manpower bill as we are told by our colleagues across the aisle and the comprehensive plan does not call for extension of the Job Corps.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it bothers me when the facts are not presented correctly. I just want to say to the gentleman from Texas or to anyone else who might be interested that the Job Corps under the substitute carries on just as under present law.

Now many of you, maybe like me, would like to have seen the Job Corps moved to the State administration. That was in the administration's original proposal. But when the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) presented the substitute bill, he did not include the Job Corps as a part of the special revenue sharing for manpower. So I know that all of you, like the gentleman from Texas, is concerned about the Job Corps Center in his area. It would continue as at present. If you have any worries about the Department of Labor and the Secretary of Labor not providing for adequate assistance to the Job Corps, that exists under present law. That kind of uncertainty presently exists and will not change.

As for the Office of Employment Security it will operate under present law. It will not be necessary for the placement of employees who have gone through the job training programs of NDTA or those of title I of EOA to be placed on jobs through the Office of Employment Security under the Esch substitute. The employment security offices would remain as they are at the present time.

Another point has been raised here about vocational education. Vocational educators are concerned about the Esch substitute. There is no question about that. But the significant thing to me is that when I was talking to a vocational educator from my State. I found that they do not support the committee bill either.

What it boils down to is the fact that vocational educators like security if they can get it. I have worked with them and have been pushing hard for them, as has the gentleman from Kentucky. But I recall in 1963, when we wanted to remove the earmarking in the 1963 act from home economics, agriculture, distributive education, trades and industry, they were opposed. They wanted the earmarking

security. It is difficult for them to accept insecurity, having to fight for the money but in 1968 the vocational educators accepted it and funds are no longer earmarked except for home economics.

What this means is that under the MDTA program, where they have presently the security which that program has provided to vocational education, that same kind of statutory requirement does not exist in the Esch substitute. However, the requirement that mayors and Governors shall make maximum feasible use of vocational and technical schools and the junior and community colleges is added in the Esch substitute. It is added to that language that was in the administration proposal to make certain that when a local mayor or a Governor develops a program under the authority of the Esch substitute, they would have to take into consideration the availability of programs in these institutions.

I have confidence that when the mayors or the Governors are looking around for the institutional-type programs, the Governor will definitely turn to the State Department of Vocational Education as they have in the past.

Where will the mayors turn to? The stable programs, well accepted in their communities, will be in a good position to be funded by the mayors. The mayors may not fund the community action programs. But when it comes to vocational education, they will be confident that they will have a program that will do the job.

The same kind of confidence that has been expressed on the floor of the House, the same kind of confidence in vocational education that has been expressed in votes on amendments to the Vocational Education Act will also be expressed by the mayors.

The sentiment that has been expressed constantly to increase the amount of money over budget requests for vocational education exists in the communities around the Nation, in the cities and States. Mayors and Governors believe in vocational education just the way we do. I do not believe that vocational educators need to feel that they are going to lose the opportunity to utilize manpower program money in order to run their good institutional programs. We can give them that assurance.

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

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

Mr. COLLIER. Do I correctly understand that the committee bill will put to work only 3 percent of the total unemployed force today?

Mr. QUIE. That would be the case in the estimate of 150,000 jobs. That is correct.

Mr. COLLIER. So that with all the political window dressing to which we have been subjected today—and it will continue as everyone here knows—whether we vote now or an hour from now, the outcome of the vote will not be any different.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman in the well if funds for vocational education under the Esch amendment will not be earmarked? Is that true?

Mr. QUIE. No, they will not be earmarked and, of course, they are not earmarked under present law either.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, the debate has not brought out one point which I think is a big difference between the two bills.

Our Nation is today faced with a crisis of persistent high unemployment. Jobs—not manpower reform or so-called revenue sharing—is the central issue.

H.R. 3613, the committee bill faces this issue directly by providing employment opportunities now on an emergency basis as part of a larger program that in other legislation in this Congress would provide more jobs to veterans, to poverty stricken individuals, and to our youth this summer.

H.R. 8141, in contrast, is a diversionary move which deserves consideration but in a manner which would not delay relief to the victims of a sluggish economy, an unsound tax system, and poorly designed reconversion policies.

Abdication of our Federal responsibilities to so-called local decisions is a cruel deception. Federal policies—not the absence of local control—are responsible for the two and a half million persons who have lost their jobs since January 1969, the 2 million persons added to poverty, and the rising welfare rolls—22.5 percent in 1 year.

States rights and home rule have nothing to do with the 350,000 unemployed veterans for whom we—not local officials or private enterprise—are responsible.

Similarly, sharing \$5 billion in new revenues and consolidating a few manpower programs will not offset the \$24 billion in losses States and local government are now suffering annually because of national policies beyond their control.

In one region of the country the substitute is offered as a means of returning control to the States but in another region it is being sold as a commingling of Federal moneys with local revenues which would create civil rights and new employment opportunities for minorities. This has created strange bedfellows slumbering in the mirage of dividing a \$5 billion slush fund. If this proposal is adopted it will require a year to simply draft guidelines.

The committee's bill goes to the heart of the problem by providing jobs to individuals and relief to communities of persistent high unemployment.

H.R. 3613 contains a special employment assistance program for communities of persistent high unemployment—6 percent or more for 3 months. Section 6, page 21.

This provision will make eligible for assistance neighborhood areas within a

city or county which are islands of economic distress in otherwise prosperous general local governments.

Such distress areas may be, for example, in Appalachia, or in the State of Washington, or parts of southern California, in the Southeast, Deep South, or New England—or the persistent ones of Watts, Harlem, Hough, or other low-income ghettos where unemployment rates even in times of national prosperity seldom fall below 6 percent.

Potentially this concept could provide employment assistance for communities suffering from industrial dislocation, rapid technological change, or from foreign imports.

Section 403 of H.R. 8141 repeals both the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and the manpower programs of the Economic Opportunity Act. Among the latter are such programs as JOBS, CEP, NYC, Public Service Careers, and Mainstream. No assurance is given—or can be—that a single one of these will be continued.

While the Esch substitute authorizes public service jobs, purely discretionary, there is no guarantee that a State or city would use its manpower funds for this purpose, and if it did under the language of H.R. 8141 such employment would be made-work, dead-end, bed-pan jobs.

Since January 1969, millions of our citizens have been victims of both the economic slowdown and a manpower policy that eschews essential job-creation activities especially in the public sector. I cite as an example, the statement of George Shultz, then Secretary of Labor, testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee, October 16, 1969:

It is not our intent to create jobs in the public sector especially for the hard-core unemployed as a way of solving manpower problems. We believe that such jobs are not a solution to employment problems, and represent instead a failure to face up to the more difficult task of equipping individuals to compete for the ever-increasing number of real jobs that our economy is producing. We estimate that there will be 2 million job openings a year in clerical, sales, and operative occupations.

Instead of the 2 million job openings he predicted, our economy has suffered that many losses. And, ironically, the Government paid the training costs of many persons who were laid off or did not find jobs because of Government policies.

However, and this involves the issues of what jobs the administration is talking about, Mr. Shultz in testifying on the family assistance plan in the same testimony said:

It is a fact that our economy has a lot of jobs that pay low wages. We are not going to be remarking the economy in this program. We have to relate to the labor market. We can only put people in the jobs that exist.

Later in Virginia, the President referred to these as "bed-pan" jobs.

We should reject also the economic policy of the desirability or inevitability of large numbers of unemployed workers, even the so-called full employment rate of 4 percent. At this rate, over 3,200,000 persons would be unemployed of which

minorities would suffer a disproportionate number at a double rate.

We must, therefore, brand as totally unacceptable a permanent manpower program that aims to provide only transitional, short-term jobs that must inevitably be made-work projects and temporary relief.

As an alternative, I would urge adoption of a massive Federal job-creation program in the public service fields where Government responsibilities lie and with these minimal requirements:

First. At least 500,000 productive jobs in 1971—one-half a fiscal year.

Second. A permanent program available, on a continuing basis to specific areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment, without regard to national unemployment rates.

Third. Jobs must have prospect of permanence, social desirability, self-improvement, adequate wages—and with supportive services including education, child-care centers, transportation, housing, and health.

Fourth. Local contributions from States and cities should not be required except "in kind" and as a recognition of "Federal revenue sharing" concept.

I would also reject as unacceptable any proposal to turn the delivery system of manpower services over to the Governors. This I construe as an abdication of the Federal responsibility. Unemployment is largely a problem resulting from manipulated factors in the economy and is not confined by State boundaries.

Also, the poor and minorities have suffered from Governor vetoes of OEO programs, the States handling of educational moneys, the agricultural commodity distribution system, the law enforcement assistance program, and the operation of Federal-State employment offices.

If in truth "equal employment opportunity is the primary goal of the Nation's manpower," as was stated in the President's 1970 manpower report, then I submit my recommendations clearly fall within that context.

Equally required, however, are enforcement and strengthening of equal employment opportunities programs established under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, other related legislation, and Executive orders, which forbid discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, or national origin.

Frequently such efforts have been thwarted by the administration. The Attorney General's office has opposed giving the Equal Opportunity Commission cease and desist power comparable to other regulatory agencies. Officials of executive departments, and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance in the Department of Labor have stubbornly approved contracts not in legal compliance. And even the President's own Executive orders pertaining to the Federal civil service—Nos. 11246 and 11478—have been consistently ignored. The Department of Defense, for example, has only three Negroes occupying supergrade positions out of a total of over 500 such positions.

In a memorandum to Federal agencies only 2 months after he took office, the President stated:

I want to emphasize my own official and personal endorsement of a strong policy of equal employment opportunity within the Federal Government. I am determined that the executive branch of the Government lead the way as an equal opportunity employer.

In spite of this declared policy and Executive orders, Negroes and women employees are still heavily concentrated in lower grades.

There is urgent need for us to clarify and to enunciate a manpower policy, including the consolidation issue. Likewise, we should deal with the issue of whether revenue sharing, which we are already doing, should be freed from Federal guidelines and national priorities.

But these are not simple issues that can be decided in an afternoon of open debate or divorced from tax revision, fiscal and economic policies, and even grave constitutional questions relating to revenue sharing as now being proposed.

For these reasons, the committee bill to create immediate jobs should be adopted. And the provisions of the Esch substitute should be given further and careful consideration in committees appropriately charged with the diverse subject matter.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Esch substitute.

Mr. Chairman, it has always been apparent that when a proponent finds it is necessary to fudge on the figures and to shave definitions in response to questions and play the game of technical semantics in preference to straight answers he generally does not have a very strong case. In the time that I have worked with the two gentlemen, on the other side on our committee who have been throwing these assertions around I have never seen them shave so closely or fudge so much.

I am a little disappointed that the gentleman from Michigan, the author of this substitute, is so totally out of touch with the realities of what is going on in the labor market of our State. I cannot understand, since his district is adjacent to mine, why he seems to be totally unaware of the real problem which will not be helped by the continued training of people, for jobs that do not exist in Michigan. Our main problem is the fact that 100,000 people who were employed in Michigan 1969 have become unemployed for long enough to have completely exhausted both their Federal and State unemployment benefits.

His good friend and mine, the Republican Governor of Michigan, is the authority for the pressing need for jobs in our State, and I will be glad to provide the details that he has sent to me on that.

I wish he had taken the time to talk to the Governor about this, because I do not believe he will find him on the side of those that he asserts to be wholeheartedly supporting his substitute and opposed to the committee bill.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I will yield, if I have time, when I am through.

Mr. ESCH. For a question?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. We are supposed to be able to trust the gentleman from Minnesota when he tells us what the people in vocational education want because in the past he has always been very close to them—but he has apparently not been getting along with them as well as in the past, because in response to the question to the gentleman from Kentucky (Dr. CARTER) Mr. QUIE fudged a little bit when he responded to the question: "Do we have the assurances in the legislation that the vocational education people want?" Mr. QUIE's answer was "No. They are against both bills."

I cannot imagine how Mr. QUIE could really assert, and I hope, if I am wrong, that he will come back to the microphone and reassert what I thought he said when he indicated that they were opposing both bills. On May 28 of this year the executive director of the American Vocational Association, Lowell Burkett, wrote to Chairman CARL PERKINS of the Committee on Education and Labor and pointed out that he was distressed because of the misrepresentations being made about the position of the vocational education people on this legislation. I will read from that letter:

In recent days questions have been raised as to the consistency of the position of the American Vocational Association with respect to the manpower-public service employment bill currently pending before the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, there are those who have erroneously characterized both the AVA position and the AVA Executive Director's statement of such policy.

The position of our Association with regard to manpower legislation has not changed; on the contrary, it appears to us that dramatic shifts have occurred with respect to the position of the Administration, the Labor Department, and some Minority members of the House Committee on Education and Labor over the central issue of responsibility and accountability for the Federal Manpower program. This letter is sent to clear up whatever misunderstandings may remain concerning the philosophy or position which guides the American Vocational Association with respect to manpower legislation.

I submit that the two gentlemen I have just identified are the two members of the Committee on Education and Labor who have turned 180 degrees from their previously consistently held position on the role of the vocational education people with regard to manpower training.

Mr. Burkett finishes his letter with this statement, and this goes directly to the assertion of the gentleman from Minnesota:

In view of the fact that public service employment (H.R. 3613) is outside the purview of vocational education and training, we have taken no position on this measure. Our position on H.R. 8141 is consistent with our past position on manpower legislation. We oppose H.R. 8141 because it is substantially devoid of the statutory assurances that, in our professional judgment are essential to the conduct of Federal Manpower programs. The bill is almost totally lacking in these assurances which the U.S. House of Representatives insisted upon last year.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the propo-

nents of the Esch substitute have been less than candid in their assertions of support for their proposition. We cannot afford to legislate in the field of manpower training in anything but a straightforward and honest presentation of facts without possibility of misunderstanding. I, therefore, urge a vote of "No" on the Esch substitute and then a "Yes" for passage of the committee bill.

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

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill.

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

Mr. REID of New York. Yes, I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ESCH. I appreciate the gentleman from New York yielding. Just for clarification, it should be pointed out that the distinguished Governor of the State of Michigan has communicated with me supporting the Esch substitute and rejecting the committee bill.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think there are several reasons why the committee bill should be supported. I think that the Federal Government has a responsibility to take action now to assist the 5 million Americans—representing more than 6 percent of the labor force—who are now unemployed.

Second, there is a very great need in some parts of the United States for public service employment that is of a permanent and lasting character. This is true in the city of New York, it is true in upstate cities of New York like Rochester, Buffalo, Utica, and Rome where there is a critical shortage of professionals in the fields of health, library science, education, environment, among others. There is an equally critical need for additional personnel in the police departments and fire departments. Many cities simply do not have the money to hire skilled personnel to perform these vital public services, and it is the citizens who suffer from reductions in services.

Some of these cities are presently considering the needs for some layoffs because they do not have the funds for critical public service employment.

Third, Mr. Chairman, I would point out that while there is much merit in the Esch bill there as yet have been no hearings whatsoever on it.

Fourth, the Esch substitute would consolidate a dozen programs totaling over \$1.5 billion and involving 1 million people at a time when we have an increasingly high rate of unemployment.

I do not think anyone can tell you what the effect of the substitute would be in terms of the unemployed who are seeking work or training, including skilled professionals who are seeking retraining in new fields. A complete change in manpower programs now could be an administrative nightmare. The city of Buffalo has gone from an unemployment rate of 6.8 percent to 6.9 percent between January and March of this year. Utica and Rome have gone from 7.6 percent to 8 percent. Plattsburgh is up to 11 per-

cent. Considerably higher than even these figures are the unemployment rates for teenagers and members of minority groups, and there are 350,000 Vietnam veterans who cannot find work after their discharge from service. There are men and women without jobs, behind these statistics—men and women who cannot wait while a new manpower structure gets in gear.

So, in my judgment this is not the moment to completely reshuffle programs involving 1 million people without some careful study by the Committee on Education and Labor and by this House. That is not to say that the principle of the consolidation of some programs is not valid. I would submit that it is, but it is sufficiently important in my judgment to warrant hearings and for the committee to be able to report in greater detail than is now possible what would be involved.

One aspect of the Esch substitute that has received little attention; for example, is that in repealing the Manpower Development and Training Act, the substitute would also eliminate the authority the Federal Government now has to operate certain national emphasis programs and to establish certain guidelines based on national principles and purposes. The intention of many of these national programs—apprenticeship, Outreach, buddy program, and so forth—has been to encourage integration of unions and to discourage use of training funds for sweatshop or run-away shop conditions. Without Federal authority to impose these guidelines and run these national programs, these important principles and purposes may well fail to get the emphasis they require on a local level.

I would like to say also that New York City and Mayor Lindsay support the committee bill, as does the U.S. Conference of Mayors, but, equally, the National League of Cities supports the administration's approach.

Mr. Chairman, it would be my hope, and I believe we have the assurances from the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), that if the committee bill is supported, there will be broad hearings on the need for a study of the overall manpower training programs.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I can assure the gentleman that that is my intention. I inserted that fact earlier when the House was considering the rule.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for that reassurance.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would make one other point clear. The administration bill, the Esch substitute, does not—I repeat—does not have a triggering device on local unemployment which would make additional public service employment funds available in critical local situations.

That is, unlike the committee bill, the Esch substitute does not provide additional public service employment funds in local areas which are faced with criti-

cal unemployment situations. The only additional funds in the Esch substitute for public service employment could be released on the basis of a national trigger—there is no separate local trigger as there is in the committee bill. I regard this as a major omission.

The committee bill does have a special section so that in localities around the United States where unemployment is high, even though the national trigger was not activated, there would be funds for critical local unemployment, and this is just not in the administration's substitute bill.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from New York is making an extremely important point in the difference between the two bills, and that is that under the committee bill a local area could be defined as an area with a high rate of unemployment, and immediately qualify for immediate assistance. So I congratulate and thank the gentleman from New York for making that point.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank my distinguished colleague for pointing up the desperate problem in New York State, and the unemployment there that goes in some places in New York City among minority male teenagers, up as high as 35 and 40 percent. New York City cannot accept a pig in a poke. We need real relief—and we need it now.

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

(On request of Mr. Esch, and by unanimous consent, Mr. REID of New York was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to close by emphasizing the point that my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER), has made. I do not believe that anybody in this House fully understands that New York City is faced with potentially losing not just jobs that are peripheral jobs, but jobs in vital public services such as in the hospitals, the police department, and in the fire department. There are simply no funds available for some of these key jobs. In some cases, the choice is between continuing vital hospital services and the vital services of the police and fire departments, or not continuing them, absent some very marked changes in Albany.

Frankly, I believe that the administration is opposed to public service employment of a lasting and meaningful character. This reflects, in my view, a failure to understand that 6 million Americans need jobs and a failure to understand that there are important and vital jobs in our States and cities and towns that need to be done. These are not jobs raking leaves; they are jobs that often involve saving lives. Given our high unem-

ployment rate and given the positions that must be filled, I think that the Federal Government has a unique opportunity to bring these two elements together. There is a clear need nationally for public service employment legislation, and I hope that this will be considered on its merits.

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

Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the remarks made by the gentleman from New York, Mr. REID, who preceded me. I further believe that to varying degrees the statements the gentleman made are true throughout nearly every section of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take the floor and to take the time of other Members, but it seems to me that this is one of the most important bills we will be called upon to consider. It further seems to me that the choice between the committee bill and the substitute bill is also one of the most important choices we will be called upon to make this year.

What the gentleman from New York, Mr. REID, has said about the need for public service employment and the staggering amount of unemployment in some areas is certainly true. Five million unemployed Americans represents a massive waste of manpower, and signifies want in the midst of plenty. Most of all, they speak to us of the immeasurable loss of human dignity that any breadwinner suffers when he is unable to support himself and his family.

The challenge presented here in this Chamber today is to change the direction of national policy and reverse the cumulative drain on the energies and abilities of millions of willing but hopeless Americans. We cannot, as Representatives of the people, continue to ignore their needs. The overwhelming necessity for passage of H.R. 3613 is clearly indicated by the deep persistence of unemployment throughout the land. If there is anyone in this Chamber who is still unconvinced of the crisis the Nation faces, let him but glance at the lengthening list of areas of substantial and persistent unemployment.

No State is immune from the blight. We are all affected by the spread of massive joblessness to 52 major labor areas and 687 smaller areas. The substitute bill, it seems to me, has no place in the debate on the proposition which has brought this matter to the floor. It does not guarantee a single additional job for an unemployed person. It substitutes a training program aimed at possible future employment for the immediate creation of jobs for many thousands of Americans. Its sponsors cannot indicate what jobs these people will be trained for. The substitute bill blunts the cutting edge of the legislation reported by the committee and reflects a lack of sense of urgency and an unwillingness to respond to a national crisis.

If I understand it correctly, the committee has had no hearings on the substitute bill—at least, no lengthy hearings. We have not submitted it to a comprehensive examination on its merits and

an examination of its effects. We have no record by which we can vote on it with reasonably well-informed judgment.

What we do have is massive nationwide support for public service employment, from Governors, from mayors, from civic and trade organizations, from labor and from responsible economic experts—and from the American people themselves.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, our mandate is clear. Our duty is inescapable. We have here in this Chamber an opportunity today to demonstrate that the system works and that it works in the interest of each individual and the Nation as a whole.

Let us not abrogate our responsibility, but rather address ourselves to the larger concerns which demand a response. The committee bill is an important step toward economic recovery in this Nation, at a time when economic recovery is more important than it has ever been for 30 years.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I could fully agree with what the distinguished Speaker of the House has just said, that we are called upon this afternoon to make one of the most important decisions that we will make during this session of the 92d Congress. However, it seems to me the fundamental error that has been made on the majority side of the aisle—and I have heard it time and time again, both from the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. O'HARA, when he spoke, and the distinguished gentleman from Oregon, Mr. GREEN, when she spoke—that they were only too willing to concede that there are some very serious and some very fundamental shortcomings in our present manpower training programs. However, they argue that we must forgo any changes in those programs at this time in order to enact an alternative program of public service employment.

I got some figures when they crossed my desk the other day that showed the explosive growth that has been taking place in these manpower programs in the last decade.

We were spending in 1962 \$2.3 billion for manpower programs according to the U.S. Budget Bureau, and in 1972, that figure had grown by more than 50 percent to \$3.8 billion.

So we are talking of some very considerable sums of money indeed when we are talking about the manpower training programs of the Federal Government.

But the fundamental error, I would repeat, that is being made on the other side of the aisle is to pose this question in such a way that Members are made to feel that they are obliged to choose between public service employment on the one hand and the reformation and restructuring and reorganization of manpower training programs on the other hand.

As one who has listened carefully both during the debate that took place 2 weeks

ago under the rule and today under general debate and under the 5-minute rule, I cannot believe that this represents a correct analysis at all. We have an opportunity here today to do both. We have an opportunity to enact a substitute bill that will make available immediately \$500 million for public service employment, and I am happy that that is a feature of the Esch substitute, and also begin the necessary and overdue restructuring of our manpower training programs.

I would agree with the distinguished speaker and the others who believe that there are some very serious unmet social needs, particularly in our great metropolitan areas, and that public service employment can play a part in meeting those needs. But again I think that compounding the error that was so prevalent throughout the 1960's, the majority side of the aisle is trying to paint this as a panacea. As has been repeated over and over again, when you are dealing with about 3 percent of the total unemployment problem as you are when you talk about creating 150,000 public service jobs, the committee bill is not a panacea that will solve the unemployment problem in this country.

What we have to do, I think, is to do more than we did during the 1960's, when we developed our manpower programs that focused almost exclusively on the young, on the marginal, on the unemployed workers, and we trained them for semiskilled jobs that were already in short supply. What we need today in the 1970's is to develop the kind of programs that are geared to the actual structure of the job market, and what I think this means is to concentrate and to focus on the upgrading of the currently unemployed blue-collar workers for the highly skilled white-collar jobs in areas where shortages exist today. Do not train them for the jobs at the bottom of the ladder that are already in short supply. Try to do something about reshaping, restructuring, and reordering our present manpower programs so that throughout this whole spectrum we can do something about training people and equipping them for jobs that will be available.

Let me point out again that I think the gentleman from Wisconsin, my friend Mr. STEIGER, made one of the most valid points of all that has been made during this argument today, and that is, do not lower public service employment. I think, really, you are not dignifying public service employment at all, and it is an important field, as I have already tried to make clear. But you are not dignifying public service employment as you should, when you suggest that you are going to be shuffling people in and out of those jobs on a constantly moving unemployment rate.

If this kind of employment is available—and I think in many cases it may be—then the employees ought to be permanent employees entitled to all the dignity and all of the prerequisites and emoluments that that kind of office requires. So I would repeat: I think in the substitute bill we have a chance to do more than just enact a public-service

employment bill. We have a chance to change our manpower training programs as well.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill, and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to Members who voted for the bill last year, and the question is then asked—why are they not supporting the bill this year with the reorganization of manpower training programs? There were a good many Members on this side of the aisle that did not support the bill last year—and I was one of those. As I viewed it, the President was right in vetoing it.

First, it provided that community action agencies could run manpower training programs and public employment programs. I objected to that. Mr. DANIELS, chairman of the subcommittee, wisely eliminated that provision in this year's bill. In fairness, it is not in the Esch bill either. There was no veteran's preference in last year's committee bill. There were many other reasons for my opposition to it. But let me state one additional reason which was very important to me.

State departments of vocational education and vocational education people all over the United States were opposed to last year's bill. Today, with the substitute bill, vocational education people all over the country are opposed to the substitute bill. Neither bill, neither the Daniels bill nor the Esch bill, I think it is accurate to say, make any changes in coordinating vocational education with training programs. I said a few moments ago in the general debate that three of the subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor are working on a reorganization of manpower training, and I completely agree with the gentleman from Illinois, who just spoke, that with 22 manpower training programs and 34 auxiliary services, they ought to be coordinated. It is inexcusable to have the situation which we have today—one of duplication, overlapping, and high administrative costs.

But a comprehensive reorganization of manpower training programs is a bill you will have a chance to vote on in probably a couple of months. In that time we ought not only to reorganize the manpower training programs but we ought to make specific reference in the bill to vocational education and to technical training institutes so that they are fully utilized.

At the present time the Esch bill has the same weakness as the bill last year. It would allow mayors to set up a dual system of training. I repeat, that was one of the weaknesses in last year's bill and there is nothing in the Esch bill this year that would prevent it.

Now let me go to some other points which have been touched on.

Reference has been made that this would reach only 3 percent of the unemployment problem. May I say, these are public employment jobs. If we are able to create 150,000 public employment jobs for each year of 4 years, that is going to make a considerable dent.

It has also been said we are creating only 150,000 jobs for \$5 billion. It is not necessarily true that one person is going to stay on the job 4 years. It is just as possible we will be creating 600,000 jobs instead of 150,000, over the period of 4 years. I suggest that 600,000 jobs, each of a year's duration, is not an inconsequential number. It may take just that many off the relief rolls.

I agree with my friends over here many, many times. I must say we do not always agree on this side.

I must admit I am rather sympathetic to revenue sharing, but this is not a revenue-sharing bill. If, as the people on the minority side say, this administration is concerned about unemployment, then I suggest that we approve the Daniels bill, which will create 150,000 public service jobs for each of 4 years, and that this administration release immediately the \$12.5 billion it is holding. There is \$5.5 billion in highway construction; that will create a lot of jobs at the present time. I am told there is something around \$950 million they are holding back in housing. That would create a lot of jobs. There are other jobs to be created in the accelerated public works program. All of these could help to reduce the high unemployment rate.

There has also been circulated a comparison of the amounts that the various States would receive under the Esch bill and under the Daniels bill, or under the Esch bill and what the States are receiving under manpower training. Those Members who have those comparative lists should consider, I suggest, that it is not fair to compare what a State is now receiving under manpower training and what it would receive under the Esch bill as a reason to vote against the Daniels bill, because each State would continue to receive under the Daniels bill all the dollars it is now receiving under manpower training—and in addition to that the \$5 billion would be divided among the various States. That is the comparison which ought to be made; not of the Esch bill versus the Daniels bill, but of the Esch bill versus the Daniels bill plus what is now being received under manpower training, if we are to be fair about it.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by again saying what I said at the beginning: The reorganization of manpower training programs is essential, but it is not accurate to say that the Esch bill reorganizes them. Out of the \$2.5 billion we are now spending it only touches about half of the manpower training programs in existence. It will still be possible for people to enroll in one after the other and still be applicants for welfare assistance.

The Esch bill does not even go to all the manpower training bills before our own committee, to say nothing of making an effort to coordinate them with the other programs that have come out of

other committees. That is a congressional reform job which badly needs doing.

I would hope today, considering the critical unemployment, the Members would vote for the Daniels bill, which would go to meet the critical unemployment problem. Then, a couple of months from now, Members will have an opportunity to vote on a real reorganization of manpower training programs, making maximum use of our technical training institutes, the vocational education departments in every State in the Union and our community colleges. That way I believe we will be far along the road toward a better program for the American people.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making an inquiry of my distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle, as to how many more speakers there are, in order that we may fix a time to close debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, it looks like we have two.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, reserving the last 5 minutes for myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult in this period of time to attempt to try to assess and to answer the number of charges made against the Esch substitute.

Let me very briefly say first that I do not know how anybody could suggest that we should bring together all of the present manpower programs, particularly those that lie outside the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor. I do not think that is a feasible task, laudable though it might be, and I do not think it is a reason to support or to oppose a particular piece of legislation.

Second, again let me reiterate the point that I tried to make earlier. I think the basic, fundamental principle of the issue today is a very simple one. It is whether or not you will continue to inhibit the ability of an individual unemployed or underemployed to receive a full range of services. If you vote for the Esch substitute, you make it possible for there to be a flexibility at the State and local level to offer job creation as well as job training in one package. If you vote against it, then you are continuing the same kind of single-purpose categorical program which has been a part of our program thus far and which will be added to by the Daniels bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point I would like to make in my time, namely, I would like to call attention of the members of the committee to a telegram sent by Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, chairman

of the board, Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America and one of America's most distinguished citizens. He says:

OPPORTUNITIES INDUSTRIALIZATION
CENTER, WASHINGTON INSTITUTE,
FOR EMPLOYMENT TRAINING, INC.,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1971.

Hon. MARVIN L. ESCH,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As you know, I have gone on record in support of the administration's manpower revenue legislation. As I have indicated publicly I am convinced that the mayors of our cities and the citizens closest to the problems should be given the financial resources to solve those problems through the revenue sharing method as quickly as possible.

In the field of manpower this can be accomplished if we have bipartisan support for the administration's proposal that you are sponsoring.

I hope that many of our friends will support this view since the tragedy of rising unemployment and the urgent need for job training resources of our concentrated communities require immediate action, if national crises are not to become national disasters.

Rev. LEON H. SULLIVAN,
Chairman of the Board, Opportunities
Industrialization Centers of
America (O.I.C.)

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, some of the gentlemen on the other side have talked about the permanent nature of the program. I, too, would like to see a permanent public service jobs program. Unfortunately, ours does not do that, but it ties in to the unemployment rate in this Nation. However, the gentlemen on the other side who are asking for a permanent program are certainly out of step with the administration, because that is precisely the reason the President gave last year for vetoing the program we passed last year.

In his testimony before the Senate this year the Secretary of Labor said the following:

Transitional, short-term public service employment can be a useful component of the nation's manpower policies. But public employment not linked to real jobs or not devoted to helping the individual to equip himself for labor market opportunities is not a solution for manpower shortages nor for the individual.

Under the Manpower Revenue Sharing Act public service jobs must be transitional opportunities.

Now, I think it is rather inconsistent for the Secretary of Labor to have testified before the other body and say one thing and the gentleman from his party to be on the floor of this House pointing out the deficiencies of the program we are proposing because it does not do precisely what the Secretary says it should not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the Committee on Education and Labor I was deeply in-

involved in this legislation. I consider the Esch substitute far superior to the Daniels bill.

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

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

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, as we come down to the vote I think it should be clear that there are major inconsistencies in the committee bill. The committee bill will in no way solve the problem of unemployment in this country.

It has been stated on the floor by the Members of the committee of the majority party that there need be no change now in the manpower training programs. Obviously the manpower training programs are not functioning now.

The substitute bill will provide public service employment, but additionally it will get to the heart of the matter by changing the manpower training program and giving control of it to the local units of government, the counties, the cities and States to develop a manpower training program that will work and meet the needs of the given locality. That is exactly what the substitute bill would do.

Nothing that has been stated on the floor during these past hours refutes the argument that the manpower training programs must be revised now. Nothing has been stated that indicates the unemployment problem will be solved by the committee bill. The only answer, I believe, is to adopt the substitute.

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I, too, find it very anomalous to hear from my friends and colleagues on the minority side insist that they want to dignify public service employment. We have had a constant theoretical battle with our minority friends over whether these public service programs should be permanent, or whether they should be temporary and marked "inferior to private sector employment."

I remember last year in conference there was a bitter fight, not between the House conferees and Senate conferees, but between Members of the majority and the minority on the question of whether public service employment should be a temporary thing; whether the yo-yo should apply to the individual, whether there should be 2-year termination of public service employment as the minority insisted or whether public service employment could be looked upon as a lifetime career of dignity and intrinsic worth to society—as we indeed do, in these chambers.

I notice that while my colleagues voted to have a 2-year limitation placed on employment, none of them feel we should so limit public service employment for Members of Congress, or the executive branch of Government in Washington or, indeed, for the more than 400,000 police professionals who are protecting our lives and property across the land.

I would also like to suggest to the mi-

nority that if they are unhappy with the majority bill which only contemplates serving 3 percent of the unemployed, I, for one, would be willing and eager to raise that figure to 15 percent under a \$5 billion program. And indeed, and my colleagues would be freely available to consult with Mr. George Schultz, Mr. Arnold Weber, Mr. John Erlichman, and other Presidential advisers to determine, in this laudable effort to reorder national priorities, which military, public works, highway, agricultural subsidy, and other programs could be stretched out, whittled down, cut back, or eliminated entirely—in order to create a public service employment program with real clout.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I merely rise to point out that the substitute bill has never had one single day of public hearings. I know of no more irresponsible manner to legislate than to be called upon to vote on a bill that has never seen one day of public hearings.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PUCINSKI yielded his remaining time to Mr. BOGGS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have taken up and considered most of the significant arguments which can be made with reference to this matter. However, a question came up as to the formula under the Esch substitute.

Mr. Chairman, at least we have this assurance under the Esch substitute formula that no State shall receive less than they did the average of the 3 years before, and no community which has a population of 50,000 or above in a standard metropolitan statistical area or political subdivision of 100,000 shall receive less either. A look at the tables will indicate that most of those eligible will receive a substantial increase.

Glancing through the tables, they indicate what each State or eligible unit of local government will receive from the formula. However, under the committee bill there is assurance that each State will receive, not less than \$1.5 million. However, beyond that we have no idea how it will be distributed. 80 percent shall be apportioned among the States in an equitable manner, it says, but we really do not know what it will be, actually, because it says merely in an equitable manner, and we do not know what an equitable manner may be.

This seems to be another one of the project grant proposals where political clout undoubtedly will have some effect on the amount of money each area will receive. And so it actually will be operated the way the project grant proposals have been operated in the past.

There is no assurance of what will be available and art of grantsmanship will be further expanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS).

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the Speaker dealt, with great eloquence, upon the unemployment situation in our country, and I would like to elaborate on

the very fine presentation he made, because the story is a very sad one.

Take the question of long-time unemployment. A year ago there were 520,000 who were unemployed for 15 weeks or more. Today that number is 1,179,000, or a 127-percent increase.

Take the case of the veterans, the boys coming back from Vietnam and elsewhere—the unemployment rate is well over 10 percent.

There are many sections of our country such as Newark, Seattle, and others where the unemployment rate runs 10 to 14 percent. Among young people, unemployment is exceedingly high, and among blacks equally high.

This bill does not pretend to cure the unemployment problem, but it does help in the one situation where we have a problem with municipal jobs. It does help to put 150,000 people back to work—and in meaningful work.

However, this bill has to be considered with other bills that this Congress is considering, and soon will be considering.

For instance, soon we will be considering the conference report on the accelerated public works bill. We would hope that bill will be supported on both sides of the aisle.

Further, soon we will be considering the conference report on the accelerated public works bill. We would hope that that bill will be supported on both sides of the aisle.

Further, soon we will be considering the welfare reform bill, and the social security reform bill. All of these bills before the Congress are designed to help cure unemployment, stimulate the economy, and make jobs in private enterprise available. After all, the great source of jobs has to be in private enterprise, and if private industry can be stimulated through bills such as the accelerated public works bill, then we will be really hitting at unemployment. Congress is seeking to do just that.

We have many problems in this great Nation today. It is one thing to sit down and do nothing about them, it takes a lot of energy when one tries to do something about them. That is what we are seeking to do by this bill—to hit at the very heart of these problems.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the substitute bill will be defeated, and that the committee bill will be sustained.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I support the Esch amendment for H.R. 3613, because it reverses the flow of power and control to the Federal Government and relies to an extent to the good judgment and wisdom of government at the local level. As a former State legislator, I know and have confidence in decisions of officials at State and local levels. I also fully support the revenue sharing provided in the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) to close debate.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise here to ask for the defeat of the Esch substitute to the committee bill.

Much has been said here about unemployment. I do not know of any Mem-

ber on this side of the aisle, or even on that side of the aisle, who has taken the floor and spoken on this bill, or outside of this Chamber, who has maintained that the emergency employment bill reported by our committee would cure unemployment. No one has maintained that it would be a panacea, but still the facts remain that under the economic policies being pursued by this administration, we do have an unusually high rate of unemployment.

Last month it was at 6.1 percent. And if you check the statistics of the Department of Labor you will find that that rate is the highest rate in more than a decade.

On Friday of this week, the Department of Labor will release further figures for the past month. And I would not be surprised if the unemployment rate was at least 6 percent, if not higher. Therefore, I am not going to talk any further about that.

But I would like to direct my remarks to the substitute.

The real reason that this House should reject this amendment is that it is a revolutionary proposal that has not been subject to adequate scrutiny through the regular process. But let me mention also some of the substantive objections to the amendment as it is now written.

It is interesting to note that this substitute is the third version of manpower revenue sharing that we have had in the short period since March 4 when the President sent up his manpower revenue-sharing message. On March 16, the gentleman from Minnesota introduced the administration's bill, H.R. 6181. This bill had such obvious defects that an amended measure was offered as a substitute to the emergency employment bill in the subcommittee and later in the full Committee on Education and Labor by the gentleman from Michigan. However, even these amendments did not cure the most obvious defects; so H.R. 8141, which is before us as the pending amendment, contains additional amendments to the original proposal. It was introduced on May 6, after the Emergency Employment Act was reported from the committee.

Let me just list some of the obvious defects in the amendment, even assuming that one accepts the principle of revenue sharing.

First, the bill has a formula for distributing funds among State and local governments, but no one can tell us how that formula would work.

My subcommittee formally requested the Secretary of Labor to supply a table showing how funds would be distributed, but the only response we have had is a letter from the Secretary of Labor, dated June 1, 1971, stating that he has only preliminary data on which to base his estimate. We do not have data to show how any community will do in 1972 compared to 1971.

I do not believe that this House, any more than my subcommittee, should adopt a proposal whose effect is unknown. On May 6, the very day that H.R. 8141 was introduced, the Secretary of Labor testified before a Senate subcommittee and asked for an opportunity to testify on a revised allocation formula at a later

date. No such testimony has yet been submitted.

Second, the bill fails to give proper recognition to the role of education agencies in manpower programs. As the American Vocational Association has stated—

H.R. 8141 totally lacks the assurance of educational quality which was contained in last year's Steiger bill, H.R. 19519, the Comprehensive Manpower Act which the House of Representatives passed overwhelmingly (275-80) with the full support of the AVA, the Nixon administration, and the majority and minority leadership of the House Education and Labor Committee.

Third, the bill provides for duplication by the cities of the functions traditionally carried out by the State employment services and could seriously interfere with the effective operation of State employment agencies.

Fourth, the bill is lacking in essential standards. It does not prohibit use of funds for sectarian purposes. It has no standards for administrative efficiency, nor does it have any standards for job referrals. The welfare reform bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee and supported by the administration has protections against referrals to jobs paying less than prevailing wages and to jobs vacant because of a strike. I cannot understand why the administration thinks such safeguards appropriate under one manpower program but not under another.

Fifth, the bill provides in section 101 (a) that priority shall be given to the disadvantaged, including welfare recipients, and in another section—section 103 (f)—that preference shall be given to veterans. No reconciliation between these two sections is attempted.

Sixth, the bill does not even decategorize the existing manpower programs under the Labor Department, because it retains the WIN program, the Wagner-Peyser program, and the Job Corps. Furthermore, there continues to be manpower programs operated by the Veteran's Administration, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Defense, the Agriculture Department, and the Interior Department.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have said enough to show that the adoption of the Esch amendment would be mischievous in the extreme. The amendment is bad in principle; it has not been thought out and presents more problems than it solves. I do not believe that any Member would actually like to see H.R. 8141 enacted into law.

Let us recognize the amendment for what it is—a snare to prevent us from enacting the emergency employment bill—a realistic proposal to counteract unemployment. The amendment deserves to fail on the merits. It must fail so that we can take effective action immediately on behalf of the unemployed workers of this Nation. A vote for the amendment is a vote to do nothing about unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch).

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ESCH, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, and Mr. QUIE.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 182, noes 204, not voting 48, as follows:

[Recorded Teller Vote No. 113]

AYES—182

Abbutt	Fountain	Pettis
Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	Poage
Anderson, Ill.	Frenzel	Poff
Andrews, Ala.	Frey	Powell
Andrews, N. Dak.	Goodling	Price, Tex.
Archer	Gross	Quie
Arends	Grover	Quillen
Ashbrook	Gubser	Rallsback
Baker	Gude	Rarick
Belcher	Haley	Reid, Ill.
Bell	Hall	Rhodes
Betts	Halpern	Riegle
Blester	Hammer-	Robinson, Va.
Blackburn	schmidt	Robison, N.Y.
Bow	Hansen, Idaho	Rousselot
Bray	Harsha	Ruth
Brinkley	Harvey	Sandman
Broomfield	Hastings	Satterfield
Brotzman	Hillis	Scherle
Brown, Mich.	Hogan	Schmitz
Brown, Ohio	Horton	Schneebeli
Broyhill, Va.	Hosmer	Schwengel
Buchanan	Hunt	Scott
Burke, Fla.	Hutchinson	Sebellus
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.	Shoup
Byron	Jonas	Shriver
Caffery	Keating	Skubitz
Carter	Keith	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Kemp	Smith, N.Y.
Chamberlain	King	Snyder
Clancy	Kuykendall	Spence
Clausen,	Kyl	Springer
Don H.	Landgrebe	Stafford
Cleveland	Latta	Stanton,
Coller	Lennon	J. William
Collins, Tex.	Lent	Steele
Colmer	Lloyd	Steiger, Ariz.
Conable	Lujan	Steiger, Wis.
Conte	McCloskey	Talcott
Coughlin	McClure	Teague, Calif.
Crane	McCollister	Terry
Daniel, Va.	McDonald,	Thomson, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	Mich.	Thone
Davis, Wis.	McEwen	Vander Jagt
Delaney	McKevitt	Veysey
Dellenback	McKinney	Waggonner
Dennis	Mailliard	Wampler
Derwinski	Mann	Ware
Dickinson	Martin	Whalley
Dowdy	Mathias, Calif.	Whitehurst
Downing	Mayne	Widnall
Duncan	Michel	Wiggins
du Pont	Miller, Ohio	Williams
Edwards, Ala.	Mills, Md.	Wilson, Bob
Erlenborn	Minshall	Wyatt
Esch	Mizell	Wylder
Eshleman	Montgomery	Wyllie
Findley	Morse	Wyman
Fish	Mosher	Young, Fla.
Fisher	Myers	Zion
Ford, Gerald R.	Nelsen	Zwach
Forsythe	Passman	
	Pelly	

NOES—204

Abourezk	Bevill	Celler
Abuz	Biaggi	Chappell
Adams	Bingham	Chisholm
Addabbo	Blanton	Clay
Albert	Blatnik	Collins, Ill.
Alexander	Boggs	Conyers
Anderson,	Boland	Corman
Calif.	Bolling	Cotter
Annunzio	Brademas	Daniels, N.J.
Ashley	Brasco	Danielson
Aspin	Brooks	Davis, S.C.
Aspinall	Burke, Mass.	de la Garza
Badillo	Burlison, Mo.	Dellums
Barrett	Burton	Denholm
Begich	Byrne, Pa.	Dingell
Bennett	Cabell	Donohue
Bergland	Casey, Tex.	Dorn

Dow	Kazen	Rangel
Drinan	Kee	Rees
Eckhardt	Kluczynski	Reid, N.Y.
Edmondson	Koch	Reuss
Edwards, Calif.	Kyros	Rodino
Eilberg	Link	Roe
Evans, Colo.	Long, Md.	Rogers
Fascell	McCormack	Roncallo
Flood	McFall	Rooney, Pa.
Foley	McKay	Rosenthal
Ford,	Macdonald,	Rostenkowski
William D.	Mass.	Roush
Fraser	Madden	Roy
Fulton, Pa.	Mahon	Roybal
Fulton, Tenn.	Mathis, Ga.	Ryan
Fuqua	Matsunaga	St Germain
Gallifanakis	Mazzoli	Sarbanes
Garmatz	Meeds	Saylor
Gaydos	Melcher	Scheuer
Gettys	Mikva	Seiberling
Gibbons	Miller, Calif.	Sikes
Gonzalez	Mills, Ark.	Sisk
Grasso	Minish	Slack
Gray	Mink	Smith, Iowa
Green, Oreg.	Mitchell	Staggers
Green, Pa.	Molchan	Stanton,
Griffin	Monagan	James V.
Griffiths	Moorhead	Steed
Hagan	Morgan	Stephens
Hamilton	Moss	Stubblefield
Hanley	Murphy, Ill.	Sullivan
Hanna	Murphy, N.Y.	Symington
Hansen, Wash.	Natcher	Taylor
Harrington	Nedzi	Thompson, N.J.
Hathaway	Nichols	Tierman
Hawkins	Nix	Udall
Hays	Obey	Ullman
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Hara	Van Deerlin
Heckler, Mass.	O'Konski	Vanik
Helstoski	O'Neill	Vigorito
Henderson	Patman	Waldie
Hicks, Mass.	Patten	Watts
Hicks, Wash.	Pepper	White
Holifield	Perkins	Whitten
Howard	Peyser	Wilson,
Hull	Pickle	Charles H.
Hungate	Pike	Wolf
Jacobs	Podell	Wright
Johnson, Calif.	Preyer, N.C.	Yates
Jones, N.C.	Price, Ill.	Yatron
Jones, Tenn.	Pryor, Ark.	Young, Tex.
Karh	Pucinski	Zablocki
Kastenmeier	Randall	

NOT VOTING—48

Anderson,	Evins, Tenn.	Metcalfe
Tenn.	Flowers	Pirnie
Baring	Flynt	Purcell
Broyhill, N.C.	Gallagher	Roberts
Burleson, Tex.	Gaiamo	Rooney, N.Y.
Camp	Goldwater	Runnels
Carey, N.Y.	Hébert	Ruppe
Carney	Ichord	Shibley
Clark	Jarman	Stokes
Clawson, Del.	Jones, Ala.	Stratton
Culver	Landrum	Stuckey
Dent	Leggett	Teague, Tex.
Devine	Long, La.	Thompson, Ga.
Diggs	McClory	Whalen
Dulski	McCulloch	Winn
Dwyer	McDade	
Edwards, La.	McMillan	

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

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

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 2. The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) there are great unfilled public needs in such fields as environmental quality, health care, housing and neighborhood improvement, recreation, education, public safety, maintenance of streets, parks, and other public facilities, rural development, transportation, beautification, conservation, and other fields of human betterment and public improvement;

(2) to meet the urgent need for greater public services and the equally urgent need for public service employment which will provide meaningful jobs for unemployed or underemployed persons, it is necessary to devote resources to public service employment and related training and manpower services;

(3) times of high unemployment severely limit the work opportunities available to

low-income persons, especially those from socioeconomic backgrounds generally associated with substantial unemployment;

(4) expanded work opportunities must keep pace with the increased number of entrants in the labor force, including the many young people who are entering the labor force, persons who have recently been separated from military service, and older persons who desire to enter or reenter the labor force;

(5) many of the persons who have become unemployed as a result of technological changes and shifts in the pattern of Federal expenditures could usefully be employed in providing needed public services; and

(6) providing resources for public service employment during an economic slowdown can help as an economic stabilizer both to ease the impact of unemployment for the affected individuals and to reduce the pressures which tend to generate further unemployment.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this section of the committee substitute amendment be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the gentleman say the "section" or the "committee substitute"?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Section.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to this section? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Labor shall enter into agreements with eligible applicants in accordance with the provisions of this Act in order to make financial assistance available in times of high unemployment for the purpose of meeting the full cost of providing employment for unemployed and underemployed persons in jobs providing needed public services, and training and manpower services related to such employment which are otherwise unavailable.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

SEC. 4. Financial assistance under this Act may be provided by the Secretary only pursuant to applications submitted by eligible applicants who shall be—

- (a) units of Federal, State, and general local government; or
- (b) public agencies and institutions which are subdivisions of State or general local government, and institutions of the Federal Government; or
- (c) Indian tribes on reservations.

AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of carrying out this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated \$200,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$750,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and \$1,000,000,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years.

(b) (1) No further obligation of funds appropriated under this section may be made subsequent to a determination by the Secretary that the rate of national unemployment (seasonally adjusted) has receded below 4.5 per centum for three consecutive months except as provided in paragraph (2).

(2) If, at any time subsequent to the Secretary's determination under the preceding subsection, the rate of national unemployment equals or exceeds 4.5 per centum for

three consecutive months, the Secretary shall, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1), resume the obligation of funds appropriated under this section until a new determination has been made under paragraph (1).

(3) Any funds appropriated under this section unobligated at the end of a fiscal year in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) shall be transferred to the Special Employment Assistance Fund established by section 6.

(4) In determining the rate of national unemployment for the purposes of this section only, persons who were, at the time of their employment under this Act, being counted as unemployed in determining the rate of national unemployment, shall continue to be so counted.

(c) Whenever the Secretary makes any determination required by subsection (b), he shall promptly notify the Congress and shall publish such determination in the Federal Register. At such time, the Secretary shall recommend to the Congress any further steps he deems appropriate.

SPECIAL EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury a fund to be known as the Special Employment Assistance Fund (hereinafter referred to as the "Fund"). Amounts appropriated pursuant to section 5 which are not available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of that section shall be deposited in such Fund to be available for obligation without fiscal year limitation in accordance with the provisions of this section. In addition, there is authorized to be appropriated for deposit in the Fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the sum of \$250,000,000, and, for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, such sums as may be necessary to assure that at the end of such year the sum in the Fund will be at least \$250,000,000. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to utilize sums deposited in the Fund to provide assistance under this section.

(b) The Secretary shall enter into agreements with eligible applicants meeting the criteria set forth in subsection (c) in order to make financial assistance available, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, for the purpose of providing employment for unemployed and underemployed persons in jobs providing needed public services.

(c) For the purpose of this section eligible applicants shall be units or combinations of units of general local government, or public agencies and institutions which are subdivisions of such units, or Indian tribes on reservations, which have areas within such units or combinations thereof where the rate of unemployment equals or exceeds 6 per centum for three consecutive months.

APPLICATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Financial assistance under this Act may be provided by the Secretary only pursuant to an application which is submitted by an eligible applicant and which is approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this Act. Any such application shall set forth a public service employment program designed to provide employment and, where appropriate, training and manpower services related to such employment which are otherwise unavailable, in times of high unemployment, for unemployed and underemployed persons in jobs providing needed public services in such fields as environmental quality, health care, public safety, education, transportation, recreation, maintenance of parks, streets, and other public facilities, solid waste removal, pollution control, community betterment, rural development, conservation, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and community improvement.

(b) An application for financial assistance for a public service employment program under this Act shall include provisions setting forth—

(1) assurances that the activities and services for which assistance is sought under this Act will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant, identifying any agency or agencies designated to carry out such activities or services under such supervision;

(2) a description of the area to be served by such programs, and a plan for effectively serving on an equitable basis the significant segments of the population to be served, including data indicating the number of potential eligible participants and their income and employment status;

(3) assurances that special consideration will be given to the filling of jobs which provide sufficient prospects for advancement or suitable continued employment by providing complementary training and manpower services designed to (A) promote the advancement of participants to employment or training opportunities suitable to the individuals involved, whether in the public or private sector of the economy, (B) provide participants with skills for which there is an anticipated high demand, or (C) provide participants with self-development skills, but nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed to preclude persons or programs for whom the foregoing goals are not feasible or appropriate;

(4) assurances that preference in filling public service jobs will be given to unemployed or underemployed persons who served in the Armed Forces in Indochina or Korea after August 4, 1964 (and who have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable); and that the applicant shall (i) make a special effort to acquaint such individuals with the program, and (ii) coordinate efforts on behalf of such persons with those authorized by chapter 41 of title 38, United States Code (Job Counseling and Employment Services for Veterans) or carried out by other public or private organizations or agencies;

(5) assurances that, to the extent feasible, public service jobs shall be provided in occupational fields which are most likely to expand within the public or private sector as the unemployment rate recedes;

(6) assurances that due consideration be given to persons who have participated in manpower training programs for whom employment opportunities would not be otherwise immediately available;

(7) a description of the methods to be used to recruit, select, and orient participants, including specific eligibility criteria, and programs to prepare the participants for their job responsibilities;

(8) a description of unmet public service needs and a statement of priorities among such needs;

(9) description of jobs to be filled, a listing of the major kinds of work to be performed and skills to be acquired, and the approximate duration for which participants would be assigned to such jobs;

(10) the wages or salaries to be paid participants and a comparison with the prevailing wages in the area for similar public work;

(11) where appropriate, the education, training, and supportive services (including counseling and health care services) which complement the work performed;

(12) the planning for and training of supervisory personnel in working with participants;

(13) a description of career opportunities and job advancement potentialities for participants;

(14) procedures for an annual review by an appropriate agency of the status of each person employed in a public service job under this Act; and procedures pursuant to which, in the event that any such participant and

the reviewing agency find that the participant's current employment situation will not provide sufficient prospects for advancement or suitable continued employment, maximum efforts shall be made to locate employment or training opportunities providing such prospects, and the participant shall be offered appropriate assistance in securing placement in the opportunity which he chooses after appropriate counseling;

(15) assurances that agencies and institutions to whom financial assistance will be made available under this Act will undertake analysis of job descriptions and a reevaluation of skill requirements at all levels of employment, including civil service requirements and practices relating thereto, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary;

(16) assurances that the applicant will, where appropriate, maintain or provide linkages with upgrading and other manpower programs for the purpose of (A) providing those persons employed in public service jobs under this Act who want to pursue work with the employer, in the same or similar work, with opportunities to do so and to find permanent, upwardly mobile careers in that field; and (B) providing those persons so employed who do not wish to pursue permanent careers in such field, with opportunities to seek, prepare themselves for, and obtain work in other fields;

(17) ways in which the program shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement, including civil service requirements which restrict employment opportunities for the disadvantaged;

(18) assurances that not more than one-third of the participants in the program will be employed in a bona fide professional capacity (as such term is used in section 13 (a) (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938), except that this paragraph shall not be applicable in the case of participants employed as classroom teachers, and the Secretary may waive this limitation in exceptional circumstances; and

(19) such other assurances, arrangements, and conditions, consistent with the provisions of this Act, as the Secretary deems necessary, in accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe.

APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS

Sec. 8. An application, or modification or amendment thereof, for financial assistance under this Act may be approved only if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the application meets the requirements set forth in this Act;

(2) an opportunity has been provided to the Governor of the State to submit comments with respect to the application to the applicant and to the Secretary; and

(3) an opportunity has been provided to officials of the appropriate units of general local government to submit comments with respect to the application to the applicant and to the Secretary.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

Sec. 9. (a) The amounts appropriated under section 5 of this Act for any fiscal year shall be allocated by the Secretary in such a manner that of such amounts—

(1) not less than 80 per centum shall be apportioned among the State in an equitable manner, taking into consideration the proportion which the total number of unemployed persons in each such State bears to such total numbers, respectively, in the United States, but not less than \$1,500,000 shall be apportioned to any State, except that not less than \$1,500,000 shall be apportioned among the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and

(2) the remainder shall be available as

the Secretary deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title.

(b) The amount apportioned to each State under clause (1) of subsection (a) shall be apportioned among areas within each such State in an equitable manner, taking into consideration the proportion which the total number of unemployed persons in such area bears to such total numbers, respectively, in the State.

(c) As soon as practicable after funds are appropriated to carry out this Act for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the apportionments required by subsections (a) (1) and (b) of this section.

TRAINING AND MANPOWER SERVICES

Sec. 10. For the purpose of providing training and manpower services for persons employed in public service employment programs assisted under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to utilize, in addition to any funds otherwise available under federally supported manpower programs, not to exceed 15 per centum of the amounts appropriated under section 5.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 11. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program or activity under this Act unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe, that—

(1) the program will result in an increase in employment opportunities over those which would otherwise be available and will not result in the displacement of currently employed workers (including partial displacement such as reduction in the hours of non-overtime work or wages or employment benefits), and will not impair existing contracts for services or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

(2) persons employed in public service jobs under this Act shall be paid wages which shall not be lower than whichever is the highest of (A) the minimum wage which would be applicable to the employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, if section 6(a) (1) of such Act applied to the participant and if he were not exempt under section 13 thereof, (B) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment, or (C) the prevailing rates of pay in the same area for persons employed in similar public occupations;

(3) notwithstanding clause (C) of paragraph (2), no person employed in public service jobs under this Act shall be paid at a rate in excess of \$12,000 per annum;

(4) all persons employed in public service jobs under this Act will be assured of workman's compensation, retirement, health insurance, unemployment insurance, and other benefits at the same levels and to the same extent (neither more nor less favorable) as other employees of the employer and to working conditions neither more nor less favorable than such other employees enjoy;

(5) the provisions of section 2(a) (3) of Public Law 89-286 (relating to health and safety conditions) shall apply to such program or activity;

(6) no funds will be used for the acquisition of, or for the rental or leasing of supplies, equipment, materials, or real property;

(7) the program will, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development and upward mobility of individual participants; and

(8) every participant shall be advised, prior to entering upon employment, of his rights and benefits in connection with such employment.

(b) For programs which provide work and training related to physical improvements, special consideration shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families or

which will contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

(c) Where a labor organization represents public employees who are engaged in similar public work in the same area to that proposed to be performed under any program for which an application is being developed for submission under this Act, such organization shall be notified and afforded a reasonable period of time in which to make comments to the applicant and to the Secretary.

(d) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this Act have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

(e) The Secretary may make such grants, contracts, or agreements, establish such procedures, policies, rules, and regulations, and make such payments, in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, or otherwise allocate or expend funds made available under this Act, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(f) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this Act unless the grant, contract, or agreement with respect thereto specifically provides that no person with responsibilities in the operation of such program will discriminate with respect to any program participant or any applicant for participation in such program because of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, political affiliation, or beliefs.

(g) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this Act which involves political activities; and neither the program, the funds provided therefor, nor personnel employed in the administration thereof, shall be, in any way or to any extent, engaged in the conduct of political activities in contravention of chapter 15 of title 5, United States Code.

(h) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this Act unless he determines that participants in the program will not be employed on the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship.

SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY

Sec. 12. As the rate of unemployment approaches the objective of section 5(b), the Secretary shall establish procedures to assure that maximum efforts will be made to locate employment or training opportunities not supported under this Act for each person employed in a public service job under this Act and that, on the basis of a review as described in section 7(b) (14), the participant shall be offered appropriate assistance in securing placement in the opportunity which he chooses after appropriate counseling.

SPECIAL REPORT

Sec. 13. The Secretary shall transmit at least annually a detailed report setting forth the activities conducted under this Act, including information on the extent to which participants in such activities subsequently secure and retain public or private employment or participate in training or employability development programs.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 14. (a) As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

(2) "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(b) As used in section 11 of this Act the term "area" means—

(1) where the applicant is an eligible unit

of government or an Indian tribe, that geographical area over which the applicant exercises general political jurisdiction, or

(2) where the applicant is a public agency or institution which is a subdivision of an eligible unit of government, that geographical area over which such unit of government exercises general political jurisdiction.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 15. This Act shall be effective upon enactment and the determinations to be made under section 5(b) shall take into account the rate of unemployment for a period of three consecutive months even though all or part of such period may have occurred prior to the enactment of this Act.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ESCH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ESCH: Page 28, in line 6 strike out "and"; strike out "19" in line 7 and insert in lieu thereof "20"; and after line 6 insert the following:

"(19) assurance that no individual shall be employed in a public service employment job for a period exceeding two years, except that the Secretary may upon the request of the applicant review a program and upon his determination (taking into consideration any special factors in the labor market area served by the applicant) that this requirement creates an undue hardship or would result in defeating one or more of the purposes of this Act he may waive it in whole or in part (or make such adjustments in it as he deems appropriate) with respect to the program of such applicant; and"

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, the intent of this amendment is to limit for 2 years duration the length of time an individual could be employed under the public service employment bill.

This issue has been thoroughly discussed in our subcommittee and the full Committee on Education and Labor. It was defeated in those two committees, but I believe it is very significant that we should recognize the fact that the House should work its will on this amendment in order to make sure that we have not permanent public service employees but transitional public service employees.

The intent of this amendment is to provide that public service employment jobs shall be limited for a period of 2 years, except that the Secretary may upon the request of the applicant review a program and upon his determination, taking into consideration any special factors in the labor market area served by the applicant, that this requirement creates an undue hardship or would result in defeating one or more of the purposes of this act he may waive it in whole or in part or make such adjustments in it as he deems appropriate with respect to the program of such applicant.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this amend-

ment is a major amendment and I hope the Committee will accept it.

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

Mr. ESCH. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Does not the automatic trigger do pretty much what you are trying to do? In other words, if unemployment decreases, this bill phases out and the job phases out with it.

Is not that more or less what you are trying to do now?

Mr. ESCH. I would answer the gentleman in this fashion: For 10 or 11 of the last 12 or 13 years unemployment has been above the 4.5 percent which would trigger the assistance and that this condition has persisted in this and several previous administrations. So the purpose of the amendment is to take care of the problem by assuring that a person would not remain indefinitely in these jobs.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a time limit is practicable only if one distrusts the Secretary of Labor. He must approve the program and should not if all the safeguards insuring that people leave the program as fast as possible are not present. I am ready to vest this discretion in the Secretary of Labor. I would think that Members on the other side of the aisle should have no less confidence in the Secretary's determination to find regular jobs for these people as quickly as possible.

Furthermore, the objective is to move people out of public service employment as rapidly as possible. The 2-year maximum could easily become a 2-year normal.

The period of time necessary to place people in regular jobs will vary according to the local situation. We should trust the local governments to design programs responsive to their problems.

The administration has endorsed 3-year public service employment for welfare recipients. Many of the people under my bill will be welfare recipients and others just as difficult to place. It is recognized in the welfare measure that 3 years may be necessary in some cases, so why limit employment to 2 years?

The committee report notes that contracts are expected to be of 1 year's duration. Only if the unemployment rate remains high, will the second year's contract be signed. At that time, the Secretary has an opportunity to review whether the locality is moving people off public service employment fast enough?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Commit-

tee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3613) to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 437, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. ESCH

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Esch moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3613 to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions that it forthwith report the bill back to the House with the following amendment: Strike everything after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Manpower Revenue Sharing Act of 1971".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) The Nation's prosperity, economic stability, and productive capacity are limited by a shortage of workers with sufficient skills to perform the demanding production, service, and supervisory tasks necessary in an increasingly technological society. There are also many workers who are unemployed or are employed below their capacity who, with appropriate skill development and training, could make a greater contribution to the national economy and share more fully in its benefits.

(2) Experience has shown that the administration and delivery of effective manpower programs are essentially local matters, requiring a more comprehensive, unified and flexible approach and that State and local governments are in the best position to assure the active cooperation of employers, employees, and other public and private agencies, individuals, and organizations.

(3) The effectiveness of manpower programs would be improved by making resources for such purposes available to State and local governments to use with broad discretion in evaluating the needs of individual participants and allocating resources to meet those needs.

(4) The Federal Government should make available to State and local governments a wide range of assistance and support to enhance the effectiveness of manpower programs.

It is therefore the purpose of this Act to establish a flexible and decentralized national manpower program involving the efforts of all sectors of the economy and all

levels of government, by sharing Federal revenues for the purpose of carrying out activities designed to provide greater opportunities for training and related services necessary to assist individuals to develop their full economic and occupational potential.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 3 (a) For the purpose of carrying out this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year.

(b) The amount appropriated to carry out titles I and II of this Act for any fiscal year shall be allocated as follows:

(1) 85 per centum shall be for training and employment activities carried out by States, and eligible units of local general government under title I of this Act; and

(2) 15 per centum shall be for activities carried out by the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") under title II of this Act.

TITLE I—STATE AND LOCAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS

USES OF SHARED REVENUES

SEC. 101 (a) Recipient units of government shall have broad discretion as to the various uses of revenues shared under this Act for manpower program purposes. Manpower programs shall constitute a developmental process, essentially transitional for each participant, consisting of whatever sequence or combination of manpower services, institutional training, on-the-job training, supported employment, and ancillary services which are needed by unemployed and underemployed persons, with priority afforded to those who are disadvantaged or who receive public welfare payments, to prepare for, secure, and hold self-sustaining public and private employment not supported by revenues shared under this Act. In carrying out such programs recipient units of government shall make maximum feasible use of existing educational institutions having a training capability, such as (but not limited to) area vocational schools, technical institutes, and junior and community colleges. The activities authorized under this title, among which revenues shared may be used at the discretion of recipients, are:

(1) outreach, intake, counseling, testing, work evaluation and work sampling, employability development planning, job coaching, job development (including job redesign and occupational restructuring), orientation, placement, and followup services;

(2) institutional training, including basic and remedial education, improvement in communications skills, and occupational skill training, with such training provided in languages other than English, where appropriate;

(3) on-the-job training for both entry and upgraded employees, providing for reimbursement of public and private employers for bona fide training and associated costs, such as where applicable, the temporary reduction in employee productivity in the course of such training;

(4) supported employment, which shall consist of—

(A) work experience and temporary employment in public and private nonprofit agencies, including that affording part-time work for students in ninth through twelfth grades, and

(B) transitional public service employment in Federal, State, and local government, which, within the period of support, will enable participants to move onto the employer's regular payroll or obtain other suitable public or private employment, not supported by revenues shared under this Act;

(5) ancillary services, where not available without reimbursement from agencies which

normally provide such services, including assistance to involuntarily unemployed workers to voluntarily relocate, residential support, minor health services (including the furnishing of prosthetic devices), voluntarily received family counseling and planning, child care, bonding, and other special services reasonably related to enhancing the employability of participants in programs assisted under this title; and

(6) when deemed appropriate, recipient units of government may provide allowances or other financial assistance to individuals engaged in training or other activities under this Act for which they are not directly compensated by employers.

(b) Benefits (including services, employment, allowances, and other financial assistance) for each participant may be continued for a period of up to one hundred and four weeks: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary may, upon the request of the recipient unit of government, review a program and upon his determination (taking into consideration any special factors in the labor market area served by such unit) that this requirement creates an undue hardship or would result in defeating one or more of the purposes of this Act he may waive it in whole or in part (or make such adjustments in it as he deems appropriate) with respect to the program of such unit.

(c) Recipients of revenues shared under this Act are responsible for assuring that manpower services provided therewith are coordinated to the fullest extent possible and each State shall be responsible for working out a system to assure such coordination within the State, including at both State and local levels coordination with similar services provided by other public or private agencies under other statutory authority, to the end that there is developed a comprehensive manpower program in each jurisdiction served.

(d) Activities carried out under this title shall not—

(1) involve the use of funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting or resulting in the identification of such programs with any partisan or nonpartisan political activity or any other political activity associated with a candidate, or contending faction or group, in an election for public or party office.

(2) result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for service.

DISTRIBUTION OF SHARED REVENUES

SEC. 102. (a) The amounts available for any fiscal year under this title shall be distributed by the Secretary among—

(1) States, for use in those parts of the State not within the jurisdiction of recipient units of local general government;

(2) units of local general government with a population of one hundred thousand or more persons which are (i) cities, or (ii) counties and other units of local general government within standard metropolitan statistical areas (qualifying population of which is exclusive of eligible cities) with powers substantially similar to those of a city;

(3) standard metropolitan statistical areas in which no single unit of government is eligible under clause (2) of this subsection, but where local units of general government with a combined population which constitutes at least 75 per centum of the total SMSA population form a consortium (hereinafter referred to as eligible units of local general government), recognized by the Secretary, to act for the entire area for purposes of this Act; and

(4) other combinations of units of general government which include at least one unit of local general government eligible under clause (2) of this subsection (hereinafter referred to as eligible units of local general government), recognized by the Secretary

as manpower consortia, to act as one for purposes of this Act,

which are authorized by State or local law to carry out the activities as provided by this Act.

(b) Revenues shared among State and eligible units of local general government shall be amounts calculated in accordance with the proportions, equally weighted, which the number of persons in the labor force, the number of unemployed persons, and the number of low-income individuals sixteen years of age or older residing in each such jurisdiction bear to such total number, respectively, in the United States: *Provided,* That the funds to be distributed to manpower consortia formed pursuant to clause (4) of subsection (a) of this section which constitute a defined labor market area shall be an amount 10 per centum greater than that to which such jurisdiction would be entitled under the formula provided in this subsection. Eligible units of government whose fair share amounts are greater than their average base amounts would receive the higher of (1) double their average base amounts; or (2) one-half the amount calculated under the fair share formula, but not to exceed \$500,000: *Provided further,* That no unit would receive less than \$100,000, or more than the amount calculated under the fair share formula.

The excess of funds over the fair share amount would be used (1) to cover the shortfall incurred where the average base amount is greater than the fair share; and (2) to redistribute the remainder among all eligible units by the fair share formula. The average base amount is the amount of funds previously received for use in the jurisdictions of the eligible units of government consisting of a three-year average of the amounts received in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, June 30, 1970, and June 30, 1971, under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (as amended) and title I (parts B and E) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (as amended). The data used in applying the formula in this subsection shall be the annual data for the most recent year available, referable to the same time period for all jurisdictions. In lieu of an amount calculated in accordance with the foregoing provision of this subsection, the amount distributed to the Virgin Islands shall be \$1,000,000 and the amount distributed to Guam shall be \$300,000.

(c) Not less than three months prior to the beginning of any fiscal year, the Secretary shall determine the units of government eligible for shared revenues during the subsequent fiscal year upon receipt of evidence of authorization to carry out the activities provided by this Act under State or local law, and shall publish in the Federal Register the apportionment factors which govern the distribution of funds under subsection (b). As soon as practicable after funds are appropriated to carry out this Act for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the actual revenue shares required by subsection (b). All computations and determinations by the Secretary under subsection (b) of this section shall be final and conclusive.

(d) Until such time as a unit of local general government is authorized under State or local law and is eligible to receive funds and carry out activities as provided by this Act, or in the event such a unit refuses to accept such funds, the revenue shares to which it would have been entitled under subsection (b) of this section shall be added to the shared revenues of the State in which that unit is located for discretionary use in providing manpower programs under this title.

(e) Until such time as a State is authorized under State law and is eligible to receive funds and carry out activities as provided by this Act, or in the event it refuses to ac-

cept such funds, the shared revenues to which it would have been entitled under subsection (b) of this section shall be available for expenditure by the Secretary for purposes of this title.

PROGRAM STATEMENTS

SEC. 103. (a) Prior to the receipt of any funds under this title for any fiscal year (and at least two months prior to the beginning of the appropriate fiscal year), in order to facilitate coordination among units of government, to permit public examination of the effectiveness of activities carried out under this title and to enhance the public accountability of recipients of shared revenues—

(1) each State shall publish and make available to the eligible units of local general government within its jurisdiction, and to the Secretary, a statement of program objectives and projected uses of funds; and

(2) each recipient unit of local general government (or combination of units) shall publish and make available to the State, and to the Secretary, a statement of program objectives and projected uses of funds.

(b) Statements of program objectives and projected uses of funds shall describe—

(1) the economic and labor market conditions and manpower needs for the area served;

(2) the number and characteristics of persons to be served;

(3) the types of activities which will be carried out under this title;

(4) the schedules of benefits (services, wages, allowances, other financial assistance) to be provided to participants;

(5) the offices and positions through which the activities are to be administered and the salaries thereof;

(6) the identity of agencies and organizations, public and private, carrying out services provided by this and other related Acts; and

(7) staff training and technical assistance needs.

(c) With respect to the annual program statement of each recipient unit of local general government, each State receiving funds under this Act shall provide to such unit of government not less than one month prior to the beginning of the appropriate fiscal year comments and recommendations regarding local program statements received under subsection (a) (2) of this section, including comments and recommendations about duplication of services and capacity, coordination, and integration with State-provided employment and manpower services.

(d) With respect to the annual program statement of each State, each recipient unit of local general government shall provide to the State not less than one month prior to the beginning of the appropriate fiscal year comments and recommendations regarding the State's program statement received under subsection (a) (1) of this section.

(e) The Secretary may provide to each unit of government such comments on its annual program statement as he deems appropriate.

(f) Each unit of government receiving funds under this title shall, prior to the beginning of the fiscal year, publish a final statement of program objectives and projected uses of funds amended as it deems necessary in the light of comments and recommendations which are provided under subsections (c), (d), and (e) of this section or are otherwise received.

(g) Accompanying each final program statement after the first one, each unit of government receiving funds under this title shall publish an annual report on the uses of such funds during the year then ending, which shall set forth expenditures made and the results achieved in relation to objectives, including the information required by subsections (b) (1) through (7) of this section and three-year projection of needs and requirements.

(h) Each unit of government receiving funds under this title (or under title III) shall provide assurances that preference in placement in programs financed under this Act will be given to unemployed or underemployed individuals who served in the Armed Forces in Indochina or Korea after August 4, 1964 (and who have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable), and that such unit of government shall (1) make a special effort to acquaint such individuals with the programs and to provide job counseling, training, placement, and other services designed to assist such individuals in obtaining gainful employment; and (2) coordinate efforts on behalf of such individuals with those authorized by chapter 41 of title 38, United States Code (Job Counseling and Employment Placement Services for Veterans), or carried out by other public or private organizations or agencies.

RECORDS, AUDIT, AND REPORTS

SEC. 104. (a) All revenues shared with recipient units of government under this title shall be properly accounted for as Federal funds in the accounts of such recipients.

(b) In order to assure that revenues shared under this title are used in accordance with the provisions of this Act, each recipient unit of government shall—

(1) use such fiscal and accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure (i) proper accounting for payments received by it, and (ii) proper disbursement of such amounts;

(2) provide to the Secretary, on reasonable notice, access to, and the right to examine, any books, documents, papers, or records as he may reasonably require, and

(3) make such reports to the Secretary as he may reasonably require.

RECOVERY OF FUNDS

SEC. 105. (a) If the Secretary determines after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing that a recipient unit of government has failed to comply substantially with the provisions of this Act, he shall—

(1) refer the matter to the Attorney General of the United States with a recommendation that an appropriate civil action be instituted; or

(2) notify the recipient unit of government that if corrective action is not taken within sixty days from the date of such notification, revenues shared with it will be reduced in the same or succeeding fiscal year by an amount equal to the amount of funds which were not expended in accordance with the provisions of this Act; or

(3) take such other action as may be provided by law.

(b) When a matter is referred to the Attorney General pursuant to subsection (a) (1) of this section, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court for such relief as may be appropriate, including injunctive relief.

(c) (1) Any recipient unit of government which received notice of reduction of revenues shared, under subsection (a) (2) of this section, may, within sixty days after receiving notice of such reduction, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such unit of government is located or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia a petition for review of the Secretary's action. The petitioner shall forthwith transmit copies of the petition to the Secretary and the Attorney General of the United States, who shall represent the Secretary in litigation.

(2) The Secretary shall file in the court the record of the proceeding on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. No objection to the action of the Secretary shall be considered by the court unless such objection has been urged before the Secretary.

(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm or modify the action of the Secretary or to set it aside in whole or in part. The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive. The court may order additional evidence to be taken by the Secretary, and to be made part of the record. The Secretary may modify his findings of fact, or make new findings, by reason of the new evidence so taken and filed with the court, and he shall also file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact shall be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, and shall also file his recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of his original action.

(4) Upon the filing of the record with it, the jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

TITLE II—ACTIVITIES OF THE SECRETARY OF LABOR

SEC. 201. In order to maximize the effectiveness of activities carried out by recipient units of government under title I of this Act, the Secretary, either directly or through funds provided to public and private organizations, shall—

(a) contribute to the efficient exercise of discretionary powers under this Act of State and local governments, by developing capacity for and providing such training, staff development, and technical assistance as may be requested by States and recipient units of local general government;

(b) assist State and local governments to fulfill their responsibilities under this Act by carrying out a comprehensive program of manpower research and experimental, demonstration, and pilot programs to improve understanding and methods of meeting manpower, employment, and training problems;

(c) enhance the capacity of State and local governments to assess their manpower needs and set their own priorities by developing a comprehensive system of labor market information on a National, State, local, or other appropriate basis, which shall be made publicly available in a timely fashion;

(d) establish and carry out a national computerized job bank program, using electronic data processing and telecommunications systems to the maximum extent possible for the purpose of identifying sources of available manpower supply and job vacancies, providing an expeditious means of matching the qualifications of unemployed, underemployed, and disadvantaged persons with employer requirements and job opportunities, and referring and placing such persons in jobs;

(e) secure information and data designed to enable the Secretary to evaluate and measure the relative and, where programs can be compared appropriately, comparative effectiveness of the activities carried out under this Act;

(f) administer the Wagner-Peyser Act and the manpower provisions of title IV, part C of the Social Security Act in such a manner that services under such laws contribute to the fullest extent possible in the development of comprehensive manpower programs under this Act; and

(g) establish programs designed to assure that manpower programs contribute fully to national policy objectives, including services and activities such as authorized under title I of this Act.

SEC. 202. The Secretary shall make an annual manpower report to the President and the Congress pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training and to the effectiveness of programs authorized under this Act.

TITLE III—EMERGENCY TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 301. When the Secretary determines that the rate (seasonally adjusted) of national unemployment has risen to equal or exceed 4.5 per centum for three consecutive months, the Secretary is authorized to obligate from the funds appropriated for carrying out this title an amount up to \$500,000,000 for carrying out activities authorized under title I of this Act for the fiscal year in which such determination is made.

SEC. 302. The Secretary shall distribute funds available pursuant to section 301 of this title among States and eligible units of local general government to provide training and other services authorized by title I to groups or communities of high unemployment.

SEC. 303. No further obligation of funds made available under section 301 of this title may be made subsequent to a determination by the Secretary that the rate of national unemployment (seasonally adjusted) has receded below 4.5 per centum for three consecutive months.

SEC. 304. Whenever the Secretary determines that the unemployment rate criteria prescribed in section 301 and in section 303 of this title have been met, he shall promptly notify the Congress and the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall publish such determination in the Federal Register.

SEC. 305. This title shall be effective upon the enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. The Secretary shall prescribe such rules, regulations, and standards as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and conditions of this Act, including standards to assure the compatibility on a nationwide basis of data systems used in carrying out activities under this Act in order to provide the public and the Congress with objective information on which to evaluate activities under this Act.

SEC. 402. Revenues shared under this Act shall be considered as Federal financial assistance within the meaning of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d).

SEC. 403. (a) Effective December 31, 1971, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and parts B and E of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, are repealed: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, revenues shared shall be calculated on the basis of Federal appropriations for the entire fiscal year under this Act and statutory provisions repealed by this subsection, and appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, as of December 31, 1971, for grants or contracts consonant with the activities authorized under section 101(a) of this Act, within or attributable to the jurisdiction of each recipient unit of government will be charged against its shared revenues: *Provided further*, That each recipient unit may, at its discretion, assume and act on behalf of the Secretary with respect to the unexpended portion of any Federal obligation for a grant or contract for such activities as of December 31, 1971, under the statutory provisions repealed by this subsection, and may terminate or continue such grant or contract in accordance with its terms on its own responsibility. The grantee or contractor may terminate any assumed grant or contract within thirty days after such assumption without incurring penalties for default. In the event that a recipient unit of government declines to assume the obligation for any such grant or contract, it shall continue in accordance with its terms until termination. For the purpose of this proviso, all authority of the statutory provisions repealed by this section shall remain in effect, but not beyond December 31, 1972.

(b) Advance payments made prior to and

including December 31, 1971, and unearned at the close of business on December 31, 1971, shall be either returned promptly to the Federal agency concerned, or offset against the first shared revenues to which the same unit of government becomes entitled under this Act.

(c) Unobligated balances of appropriations on the books of the Federal Government under the statutory provisions repealed by subsection (a) of this section shall be transferred to and merged with funds appropriated under the authority of section 3 of this Act.

SEC. 404. The amounts appropriated and allocated pursuant to this Act shall be paid to the recipient units of government at such intervals and in such installments as the Secretary may determine, taking account of the objective that the time elapsing between the transfer of funds from the United States Treasury and the disbursement thereof by a recipient unit of government shall be minimized: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall, with the concurrence of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, prescribe regulations for the purpose of avoiding an inordinate rise in Federal outlays in fiscal years 1972 and 1973 resulting from concurrent disbursements pursuant to (i) obligations incurred prior to December 31, 1971, under the statutory provisions repealed by section 403(a), and (ii) revenues shared under this Act.

SEC. 405. In the event that cooperation or agreements between States is necessary in order to realize the full benefit of provisions of this Act, the consent of Congress is hereby given to such States to enter into such agreements.

SEC. 406. The Secretary shall not provide funds for activities of a health, education, or welfare character under title II of this Act unless he shall first have obtained the concurrence of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such activities shall include, but not be limited to, basic and general education; institutional training; health, child care, and related ancillary activities; and supported work and job restructuring in the health, education, and welfare professions.

SEC. 407. (a) The Secretary is authorized to exercise all powers necessary for the implementation of title II, including the power (1) to rent or renovate real property without regard to any other law or regulation governing rental or renovation of such property, provided he first advises the Administrator of General Services Administration of his intent to do so and the reasons therefor, (2) to purchase real property for training centers, (3) to accept and use gifts and voluntary services for the benefit of the program, (4) to enter into contracts or agreements, (5) to make such payments in advance or by way of reimbursement as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of the Act, and (6) to expend, without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation, funds made available for purposes of this Act for printing and binding.

(b) Enrollees in residential centers assisted under title II of this Act shall not be regarded as Federal employees for any purpose, except that such enrollees shall be deemed Federal employees for the purposes of (1) the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code; (2) the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.); and (3) subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code (relating to compensation for work injuries), except that the Secretary may prescribe rules and regulations, including variances from the provisions of this subchapter where he deems it appropriate and including the designation of appropriate salary levels to be used as a basis for computing benefits to such enrollees.

SEC. 408. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in any construction, alteration, or repair, including painting and decorating of projects, buildings, and works which are federally assisted, which shall include revenues shared, under this Act, shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to such labor standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267) and section 2 of the Act of June 1, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

SEC. 409. (a) As used in this Act, the term "State" means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, or the Virgin Islands.

(b) For purposes of determining shared revenues under section 102 of this Act—

(1) the term "labor force" means the civilian labor force as defined and used by the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics;

(2) the term "unemployed persons" means those persons who are unemployed as defined and used by the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics;

(3) the term "low-income persons" means members of households or individuals living separately, whose income does not exceed criteria established by the Secretary, taking into consideration family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and other relevant factors;

(4) the term "standard metropolitan statistical area" means those population centers as defined by the Office of Management and Budget; and

(5) the term "labor market area" means a local economic complex as defined by the Secretary, within which workers may normally change their place of work without changing their place of residence.

(c) Where appropriate, the definitions in subsection (b) of this section shall be based on the latest published reports of the Department of Labor and the Office of Management and Budget on the date of enactment of this Act and of each subsequent year. The Secretary may by regulation change or otherwise modify the definitions in subsection (b) of this section in order to reflect any change or modification thereof made subsequent to such date by the Department of Labor or the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 410. The effective date of this Act, except as provided in section 305 of this Act, shall be January 1, 1972. Rules, regulations, guidelines, and other published interpretations or orders may be issued by the Secretary at any time after the date of enactment.

Mr. ESCH (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the recommittal motion be considered as read and be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) is seeking recognition under the rule for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if this is the exact text of H.R. 8141 that was made in order by the amendment to the rule.

Mr. ESCH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. O'HARA. Then I would like to inquire of the Speaker, if the fact that an amendment was made in order, a particular amendment otherwise not germane, was made in order under the 5-minute rule, by provisions of the resolution from the Committee on Rules, would that make the same nongermane amendment in order as a motion to recommit with instructions?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) has been recognized on his motion to recommit with instructions. Any challenge to the motion would now come too late.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch) may continue to debate his motion to recommit with instructions.

Mr. ESCH. I thank the Speaker.

I think it is clear what we are voting on now is again the substitute bill, and in case there is any question, there is an opportunity to include not only public service employment which the committee bill does have, but also an opportunity to revamp and restructure the manpower training programs of this country.

If there is unemployment in the country, and there is, the committee bill will not solve that unemployment. Only a restructuring of the manpower training program will do that.

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

Mr. ESCH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Now, as you know, we just went through a teller vote in which the substitute was defeated. It is my hope that the substitute could be adopted on the motion to recommit. But if it is not, I would ask my colleagues to vote no on the bill, so that the committee can begin working on comprehensive manpower legislation, including public service employment, right away, rather than having to go through the process of going down to the White House and coming back up here again at some later time. It is of the utmost importance that we revamp the manpower legislation so that it will fit the needs of the country. That is why I ask you, if the motion to recommit does not prevail, that you vote against the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to subscribe to the recommendation made by the gentleman from Minnesota which I believe likewise has the endorsement of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Esch).

The motion to recommit is the Esch substitute which lost on a teller vote with clerks by a margin of 204 to 182. This Esch substitute is good legislation. It ought to be enacted into law. If it is

defeated and the committee bill prevails, I predict we will be considering this same legislation, not next week in a conference report, but in a couple of months from now in a new effort. On the other hand this legislation could be on the statute books if the substitute were to prevail. If you want to solve the problem of public service employment—if you wish to revamp the manpower training legislation, you ought to approve the substitute. Otherwise you are going to be faced with an issue dragging out week after week after week with no resolution of the problem.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Michigan. I subscribe to what he and the ranking Member of our committee have said. I want to make sure that the Members of the House understand that the committee bill will not solve the problem of unemployment in this country. By their own admission it will only solve 3 percent of the problem, and it is about time that we got into the real question of revamping manpower training and the substitute will do that. If not, then let us defeat the bill and go back to the committee and bring out something realistic instead of something which will not meet the needs of the country.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion to recommit with instructions.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit. We have heard the same arguments that we have gone over all afternoon. The committee has already voted to reject the substitute. We need to take time to study any reorganization of our manpower programs. None of us wants to see worthy manpower programs discarded until we understand clearly what is proposed to replace them.

The so-called revenue sharing in manpower is something that has got to be studied thoroughly by the committee. Let me summarize the basic issue.

H.R. 3613 makes no changes in existing manpower programs. H.R. 8141 repeals all existing programs and writes new manpower legislation to take its place, drastically altering the method of distributing funds and leaving up to the Secretary of Labor authority to write his own formula with respect to the distribution of such funds and provides no legislative assurance that States and local communities will not suffer cutbacks in Federal support for manpower training programs. H.R. 3613 would simply create a new program of public service employment to complement existing manpower programs—an essential tool if the problems of unemployment in many areas of the country are to be effectively solved. Public service opportunities are needed now to cushion the impact of higher unemployment and it is, therefore, essential that the House pass today H.R. 3613.

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

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the

chairman for yielding. It does not seem to me that there is any logic in demanding that we have in one package a manpower reorganization and a public employment bill. They should be two separate bills and each one should be considered on its merits.

May I add another thing. It seems to me that with a high unemployment rate, a rate of more than 6 percent, it would be the height of folly for this body to turn down what is in effect a job program and say to the unemployed people, "Go on welfare." This is the choice that you have today. Are the people who are unemployed going down and applying for food stamps? Are they going to the welfare offices and applying to get on the relief rolls? Or are you going to give them a chance to have a job that is constructive, that contributes to the economy, that gives the individual dignity? That is really the issue.

So let us vote for the Daniels bill, which will create jobs and will create them immediately without any further delay, and let us turn down this business that the relief rolls are a better alternative.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentlewoman is exactly correct.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it not true that a vote for the motion to recommit is a vote against creating jobs for veterans coming back from Vietnam and who urgently need them?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the bill has been lengthily and fairly debated. We have not only debated the bill in the House for approximately 3 hours, when all issues were explored, the committee bill, but also the Esch substitute. In addition thereto, we had the benefit of the views of many Members of the House on the rule, which was seriously debated. So I think all Members are well aware of the issue. The motion to recommit with instructions is nothing more than an endeavor to kill the committee bill.

I urge all of my colleagues in this House to support the previous action of the committee and to vote down the motion to recommit.

Mr. PERKINS. I think we can all agree that we do not want to see the manpower programs torn up and our vocational schools disorganized until we can establish some guidelines in carefully-thought-out legislation. Instead of coming to the floor and offering a substitute that would destroy our manpower programs under the guise of revenue sharing, which is no way to legislate, we should proceed in the well-recognized manner which is proper.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion to recommit is voted down overwhelmingly.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. 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.

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 183, nays 201, answered "present" 1, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—183

Abbutt	Fountain	Passman
Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	Pelly
Anderson, Ill.	Frenzel	Pettis
Andrews, Ala.	Frey	Poage
Andrews,	Gettys	Poff
N. Dak.	Goodling	Powell
Archer	Gross	Price, Tex.
Arends	Grover	Quie
Ashbrook	Gubser	Quillen
Baker	Hailsback	Rallsback
Belcher	Haley	Rarick
Bell	Hall	Reid, Ill.
Betts	Halpern	Rhodes
Blester	Hammer-	Riegler
Blackburn	schmidt	Robinson, Va.
Bow	Hansen, Idaho	Robinson, N.Y.
Bray	Harsha	Rousselot
Brinkley	Harvey	Ruth
Broomfield	Hastings	Sandman
Brotzman	Hillis	Satterfield
Brown, Mich.	Hogan	Scherle
Brown, Ohio	Horton	Schmitz
Broyhill, N.C.	Hosmer	Schneebell
Broyhill, Va.	Hull	Schwengel
Buchanan	Hunt	Scott
Burke, Fla.	Hutchinson	Sebellus
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.	Shoup
Byron	Jonas	Shriver
Caffery	Keating	Skubitz
Carter	Keith	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Kemp	Smith, N.Y.
Chamberlain	King	Snyder
Clancy	Kuykendall	Spence
Clausen,	Kyl	Springer
Don H.	Landgrebe	Stafford
Cleveland	Latta	Stanton,
Collier	Lennon	J. William
Collins, Tex.	Lent	Steele
Colmer	Lloyd	Steiger, Ariz.
Conable	Lujan	Steiger, Wis.
Conte	McCloskey	Talcott
Coughlin	McClure	Teague, Calif.
Crane	McCullister	Terry
Daniel, Va.	McDonald,	Thomson, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	Mich.	Thone
Davis, Wis.	McEwen	Vander Jagt
Dellenback	McKevitt	Veysey
Dennis	McKinney	Waggonner
Derwinski	Mailliard	Wampler
Dickinson	Mann	Ware
Dowdy	Martin	Whalley
Downing	Mathias, Calif.	Whitehurst
Duncan	Mayne	Widnall
du Pont	Michel	Wiggins
Edwards, Ala.	Miller, Ohio	Williams
Erlenborn	Mills, Md.	Wilson, Bob
Esch	Minshall	Wyatt
Eshleman	Mizell	Wydler
Findley	Montgomery	Wylie
Fish	Morse	Wyman
Fisher	Mosher	Young, Fla.
Ford, Gerald R.	Myers	Zion
Forsythe	Nelsen	Zwach

NAYS—201

Abourezk	Burke, Mass.	Edmondson
Abzug	Burlison, Mo.	Edwards, Calif.
Adams	Burton	Eilberg
Addabbo	Byrne, Pa.	Evans, Colo.
Alexander	Cabell	Fascell
Anderson,	Casey, Tex.	Flood
Calif.	Celler	Foley
Annunzio	Chappell	Ford,
Ashley	Chisholm	William D.
Aspin	Clay	Fraser
Aspinall	Collins, Ill.	Fulton, Pa.
Badillo	Conyers	Fulton, Tenn.
Barrett	Corman	Fuqua
Begich	Cotter	Galfianakis
Bennett	Daniels, N.J.	Garmatz
Bergland	Danielson	Gaydos
Bevill	Davis, S.C.	Gibbons
Blaggi	de la Garza	Gonzalez
Bingham	Delaney	Grasso
Blanton	Dellums	Gray
Blatnik	Denholm	Green, Oreg.
Boggs	Dingell	Green, Pa.
Boland	Donohue	Griffin
Bolling	Dorn	Griffiths
Brademas	Dow	Hagan
Brasco	Drinan	Hamilton
Brooks	Eckhardt	Hanley

Hanna	Miller, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Hansen, Wash.	Mills, Ark.	Roush
Harrington	Minish	Roy
Hathaway	Mink	Roybal
Hawkins	Mitchell	Ryan
Hays	Mollohan	St Germain
Hechler, W. Va.	Monagan	Sarbanes
Heckler, Mass.	Moorhead	Saylor
Helstoski	Moss	Scheuer
Henderson	Murphy, Ill.	Seiberling
Hicks, Mass.	Murphy, N.Y.	Sikes
Hicks, Wash.	Natcher	Sisk
Hollfield	Nedzi	Slack
Howard	Nichols	Smith, Iowa
Hungate	Nix	Staggers
Jacobs	Obey	Stanton,
Johnson, Calif.	O'Hara	James V.
Jones, N.C.	O'Neill	Steed
Jones, Tenn.	Patman	Stephens
Karh	Patten	Stubblefield
Kastenmeier	Pepper	Sullivan
Kazen	Perkins	Symington
Kee	Peyster	Taylor
Kluczynski	Pickle	Thompson, N.J.
Koch	Pike	Tiernan
Kyros	Podell	Udall
Landrum	Preyer, N.C.	Ullman
Link	Price, Ill.	Van Deerlin
Long, Md.	Pryor, Ark.	Vanik
McCormack	Pucinski	Vigorito
McFall	Purcell	Waldie
McKay	Randall	Watts
Macdonald,	Rangel	White
Mass.	Rees	Whitten
Madden	Reid, N.Y.	Wilson,
Mahon	Reuss	Charles H.
Mathis, Ga.	Rodinc	Wolf
Matsunaga	Roe	Wright
Mazzoli	Rogers	Yates
Meeds	Roncalio	Yatron
Melcher	Rooney, Pa.	Young, Tex.
Mikva	Rosenthal	Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING—48

Anderson,	Evins, Tenn.	Metcalfe
Tenn.	Flowers	Morgan
Baring	Flynt	Pirnie
Burleson, Tex.	Gallagher	Roberts
Camp	Gialmo	Rooney, N.Y.
Carey, N.Y.	Goldwater	Runnels
Carney	Hébert	Ruppe
Clark	Ichord	Shipley
Clawson, Del	Jarman	Stokes
Culver	Jones, Ala.	Stratton
Dent	Leggett	Stuckey
Devine	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	McClory	Thompson, Ga.
Dulski	McCulloch	Whalen
Dwyer	McDade	Winn
Edwards, La.	McMillan	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. O'Konski against.
Mr. Burleson of Texas for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee against.

Mr. Winn for, Mr. McDade against.

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.

Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Carey of New York against.

Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. Gialmo against.

Mr. McMullan for, with Mr. Shipley against.

Mr. McClory for, with Mr. Stokes against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Whalen.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Stuckey.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Ichord.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Flowers.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Carney with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Runnels.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Metcalfe.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 245, nays 141, answered "present" 1, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—245

Abourezk	Galfianakis	Natcher
Abzug	Garmatz	Nedzi
Adams	Gaydos	Nix
Addabbo	Gibbons	Obey
Alexander	Gonzalez	O'Hara
Anderson,	Grasso	O'Neill
Calif.	Gray	Patman
Andrews,	Green, Oreg.	Fatten
N. Dak.	Green, Pa.	Pelly
Annunzio	Griffiths	Pepper
Arends	Gude	Perkins
Ashley	Hagan	Peyster
Aspin	Halpern	Pickle
Aspinall	Hamilton	Pike
Badillo	Hanley	Poage
Barrett	Hanna	Podell
Begich	Hansen, Idaho	Preyer, N.C.
Bell	Hansen, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Bennett	Harrington	Pucinski
Bergland	Harsha	Purcell
Bevill	Harvey	Rallsback
Blaggi	Hathaway	Randall
Blester	Hawkins	Rangel
Bingham	Hays	Rees
Blanton	Hechler, W. Va.	Reid, N.Y.
Blatnik	Heckler, Mass.	Reuss
Boggs	Helstoski	Riegler
Boland	Hicks, Mass.	Rodino
Bolling	Hicks, Wash.	Roe
Brademas	Hillis	Roncalio
Brasco	Hollfield	Rooney, Pa.
Brooks	Horton	Rosenthal
Burke, Mass.	Howard	Rostenkowski
Burlison, Mo.	Hungate	Roush
Burton	Jacobs	Roy
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Calif.	Roybal
Byron	Jones, N.C.	Ryan
Caffery	Jones, Tenn.	St Germain
Carter	Karh	Sandman
Casey, Tex.	Kastenmeier	Sarbanes
Celler	Kazen	Saylor
Chisholm	Keating	Scheuer
Clausen,	Kee	Schwengel
Don H.	Keith	Seiberling
Clay	Kluczynski	Shoup
Collins, Ill.	Koch	Shriver
Conte	Kyros	Sikes
Conyers	Landrum	Sisk
Corman	Lennon	Skubitz
Cotter	Link	Slack
Coughlin	Long, Md.	Smith, Iowa
Daniels, N.J.	Lujan	Smith, N.Y.
Danielson	McCloskey	Stafford
Davis, S.C.	McCormack	Staggers
de la Garza	McFall	Stanton,
Delaney	McKay	J. William
Dellums	McKinney	Stanton,
Denholm	Macdonald,	James V.
Dingell	Mass.	Steed
Donohue	Madden	Steele
Dorn	Mailliard	Stephens
Dow	Matsunaga	Stokes
du Pont	Mazzoli	Stubblefield
Eckhardt	Meeds	Sullivan
Edmondson	Melcher	Symington
Edwards, Calif.	Mikva	Taylor
Eilberg	Miller, Calif.	Teague, Calif.
Evans, Colo.	Mills, Ark.	Thompson, N.J.
Fascell	Minish	Thomson, Wis.
Flood	Mink	Thone
Foley	Mitchell	Tiernan
Ford,	Mollohan	Udall
William D.	Monagan	Ullman
Fraser	Moorhead	Van Deerlin
Fulton, Pa.	Morgan	Vander Jagt
Fulton, Tenn.	Morse	Vanik
Fuqua	Mosher	Veysey
Galfianakis	Moss	Vigorito
Garmatz	Murphy, Ill.	Waldie
Gaydos	Murphy, N.Y.	Watts

White	Wright	Yatron
Widnall	Wyatt	Young, Tex.
Wilson,	Wylie	Zablocki
Charles H.	Wyman	
Wolff	Yates	

NAYS—141

Abbitt	Fisher	Mizell
Abernethy	Ford, Gerald R.	Montgomery
Anderson, Ill.	Frelinghuysen	Myers
Andrews, Ala.	Frenzel	Nelsen
Archer	Frey	Nichols
Ashbrook	Gettys	Passman
Baker	Goodling	Pettis
Belcher	Griffin	Poff
Betts	Gross	Powell
Blackburn	Grover	Price, Tex.
Bow	Gubser	Quile
Bray	Haley	Quillen
Brinkley	Hall	Rarick
Broomfield	Hammer-	Reid, Ill.
Brotzman	schmidt	Rhodes
Brown, Mich.	Hastings	Robinson, Va.
Brown, Ohio	Henderson	Robinson, N.Y.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hogan	Rogers
Broyhill, Va.	Hosmer	Rousselot
Buchanan	Hull	Ruth
Burke, Fla.	Hunt	Satterfield
Byrnes, Wis.	Hutchinson	Scherie
Cabell	Johnson, Pa.	Schmitz
Cederberg	Jonas	Schneebeil
Chamberlain	Kemp	Scott
Chappell	King	Sebelius
Clancy	Kuykendall	Smith, Calif.
Cleveland	Kyl	Snyder
Collier	Landgrebe	Spence
Collins, Tex.	Latta	Springer
Colmer	Lent	Steiger, Ariz.
Conable	Lloyd	Steiger, Wis.
Crane	McClure	Talcott
Daniel, Va.	McCollister	Terry
Davis, Ga.	McDonald,	Waggonner
Davis, Wis.	Mich.	Wampler
Dennis	McEwen	Ware
Derwinski	McKevitt	Whalley
Dickinson	Mahon	Whitehurst
Dowdy	Mann	Whitten
Downing	Martin	Wiggins
Duncan	Mathias, Calif.	Williams
Edwards, Ala.	Mathis, Ga.	Wilson, Bob
Erlenborn	Mayne	Wydler
Esch	Michel	Young, Fla.
Eshleman	Miller, Ohio	Zion
Findley	Mills, Md.	Zwach
Fish	Minshall	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING—46

Anderson,	Evins, Tenn.	McMillan
Tenn.	Flowers	Metcalfe
Baring	Flynt	Pirnie
Burleson, Tex.	Fraser	Pryor, Ark.
Camp	Gallagher	Roberts
Carey, N.Y.	Gaiamo	Rooney, N.Y.
Carney	Goldwater	Runnels
Clark	Hébert	Ruppe
Clawson, Del	Ichord	Shipley
Culver	Jarman	Stratton
Dent	Jones, Ala.	Stuckey
Devine	Leggett	Teague, Tex.
Drinan	Long, La.	Thompson, Ga.
Dulski	McClory	Whalen
Dwyer	McCulloch	Winn
Edwards, La.	McDade	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Burleson of Texas against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Carney.
Mr. Leggett with Del Clawson.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Gaiamo with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Drinan with Mr. Metcalfe.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Baring.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 437, the Committee on Education and Labor is discharged from further consideration of the bill S. 31.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DANIELS OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 31 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 3613, as passed.

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

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. 3613) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 31, EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1971

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to S. 31 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PERKINS, DANIELS of New Jersey, MEEDS, WILLIAM D. FORD, BURTON, HAWKINS, GAYDOS, SCHEUER, BIAGGI, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Messrs. QUITE, ESCH, STEIGER of Wisconsin, ESHLEMAN, RUTH, FORSYTHE, VEYSEY, and ERLNBORN.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on the occasion of the vote on final passage of H.R. 3613, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. I voted against the Esch amendment and against the motion to recommit. If I had been able to be present, I would have voted for passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 114 I was unavoidably detained on official business. Had I been present on the vote on the motion to recommit I would have voted "nay".

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS MONDAY, JUNE 14, FOR OBSERVANCES COMMEMORATING FLAG DAY

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Monday, June 14, will mark the 194th anniversary of Flag Day. For many years the House has had proper observances commemorating Flag Day here in the House Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Monday, June 14, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of observing and commemorating Flag Day in such manner as the Speaker may deem appropriate.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO MAKE ARRANGEMENTS FOR FLAG DAY CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state for the information of the House that, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, the Chair has informally designated the following Members to constitute a committee to make the necessary arrangements for appropriate ceremonies in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement just adopted: The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. NICHOLS), the gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

CREATING ADDITIONAL POSITIONS, AND PROVIDING A SYSTEM OF OVERTIME PAY, FOR THE U.S. CAPITOL POLICE UNDER THE HOUSE

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-244) on the resolution (H. Res. 449), creating additional positions on the U.S. Capitol Police Force for duty under the House of Representatives and provid-

ing a system of overtime pay for the U.S. Capitol Police under the House, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 449

Resolved, That (a) in addition to the number of positions on the United States Capitol Police force, and of personnel detailed to such police force from the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, existing on the date of the adoption of this resolution, there are hereby authorized to be established two hundred fourteen positions on the United States Capitol Police force, for duty under the House of Representatives, as follows:

- (1) one hundred seventy-nine positions of private;
- (2) eleven positions of sergeant;
- (3) four positions of lieutenant;
- (4) two positions of plainclothesman;
- (5) six positions of technician (dog handler); and
- (6) twelve positions of technician (station clerk; radio dispatcher; fingerprint-photographic specialist; or such other technical and specialized designations as may be deemed necessary).

(b) Each appointment to any such additional position shall be made by the Capitol Police Board, subject to prior approval of the Committee on House Administration, without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the position. Each person appointed to any such additional position shall have, prior to such appointment, at least one year of police experience or of equivalent experience.

SEC. 2. Each officer or member of the United States Capitol Police force—

(1) whose pay is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives; and

(2) who, at any time during the period beginning March 1, 1971, and ending at the close of June 30, 1971, performs or has performed duty, in a manner satisfactory to the Chief of the United States Capitol Police force, in addition to the number of hours of his regularly scheduled tour of duty:

is entitled, subject to the approval of the Committee on House Administration, to pay for each such additional hour of duty, in lieu of compensatory time off from his regularly scheduled tour of duty, as follows:

(A) private; sergeant; plainclothesman; technician (dog handler); or other technician—at a rate equal to one and one-half times his hourly rate of pay; and

(B) lieutenant or captain—at a rate equal to his hourly rate of pay.

The hourly pay of such officer or member is determined by dividing his annual rate of pay by 2080.

SEC. 3. Each officer or member of the United States Capitol Police force—

(1) whose pay is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives; and

(2) who, at any time during any period occurring after June 30, 1971, with respect to which the United States Capitol Police Board shall have determined that emergency conditions and circumstances exist or existed which require the performance of duty by officers and members of the United States Capitol Police force in addition to the number of hours of their regularly scheduled tours of duty, performs or has performed duty, in a manner satisfactory to the Chief of the United States Capitol Police force in addition to the number of hours of his regularly scheduled tour of duty;

is entitled to pay for each such additional hour of duty, in lieu of compensatory time off from his regularly scheduled tour of duty, as follows:

(A) private; sergeant; plainclothesman;

technician (dog handler); or other technician—at a rate equal to one and one-half times his hourly rate of pay; and

(B) lieutenant or captain—at a rate equal to his hourly rate of pay.

The hourly pay of such officer or member is determined by dividing his annual rate of pay by 2080.

SEC. 4. (a) The rate of pay of each position of plainclothesman and each position of technician authorized by the first section of this resolution to be established on the United States Capitol Police force for duty under the House of Representatives and of each position of plainclothesman established pursuant to H. Res. 1211, Ninetieth Congress, adopted October 11, 1968, shall be a single per annum gross rate equal to the sum of—

(1) the single per annum gross rate of pay of the position of private on the United States Capitol Police force; and

(2) an amount equal to three times the multiple dollar figure, as currently in effect from time to time, at which the pay of the position of private on such force is fixed.

(b) Subsection (c) of House Resolution 1211, Ninetieth Congress, adopted October 11, 1968, and enacted as permanent law by the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1970 (83 Stat. 359; Public Law 91-145), shall not be effective in the Ninety-second Congress on and after the date of adoption of this resolution; and, effective on the date of enactment of the provisions of this resolution as permanent law, the provisions of such subsection (c) are repealed.

SEC. 5. There shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, until otherwise provided by law, such sums as may be necessary to pay the rates of pay (including overtime pay) and the costs of uniforms and equipment, and to cover other necessary expenses, incident to carrying out the purposes of this resolution.

Mr. GRAY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

On Page 3, Lines 15 and 16, strike the words "United States Capitol Police Board" and insert in lieu thereof "Committee on House Administration".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in order to provide more adequate security at the Capitol Building your Committee on House Administration brings up for consideration House Resolution 449, which has four main provisions.

The first provision would add 214 men to the Capitol police force of the House side.

The second provision would establish a small six-man canine corps, to be used for sniffing of explosives and for other duties.

The third provision would provide for overtime pay for the Capitol Police, who have been working a 6-day week with no

overtime pay since the March 1 bombing of the Capitol.

The fourth provision would establish a permanent method of handling future emergencies for payment of overtime pay by designating the Committee on House Administration as the authority for such declaration.

It is a very simple resolution. We feel it is a modest step in the direction of tightening up security.

These recommendations came to our committee unanimously from the Capitol Police Board, which is composed of the Sergeant at Arms of the House, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, the Architect of the Capitol and the Chief of Police of the Capitol.

We all know that the Nation's spotlight has been on the Capitol Building particularly since March 1 when a dastardly act was committed by the planting of a bomb on the Senate side of the Capitol.

We have instituted certain security measures in addition to those authorized by this resolution. I will be glad to enumerate those very briefly, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members.

There have been seven major security actions taken in addition to the resolution before you. First, all entranceways into the Capitol Building are being manned during the period when they are not secured. Second, we have increased the security personnel by temporarily canceling 1 excused day off for all men and placed them on a 6-day work week. Third, we initiated the procedure of examining all parcels, et cetera, at all points of entry. Fourth, we have a more uniform system of issuing employee identification cards, which has been very beneficial. Fifth, all outstanding expired identification cards are being collected as presented to officers at check points. Sixth, the present practice of uniformity in closing hours for the office buildings has also been very beneficial for security purposes. Seventh, standard sign-in procedures are being adhered to by all employees with greater efficiency as employees become better trained in the procedure.

These are seven major measures instituted by the Chief of Police and the police board in addition to House Resolution 449.

This is a modest step forward. For example, we asked for 214 positions for the police in this resolution. A survey conducted by the Chief of Police shows that we could really use 600. So your committee has been very prudent in cutting it down by two-thirds. We feel that this is a very bare bones minimum of what the Chief of Police can get by with and still provide adequate security at the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield to any Member for a question.

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

Mr. GRAY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. This 214 increase is for the House side alone. Is that correct?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is eminently correct.

Mr. KYL. Can we then assume that

there will be an increase also for the Capitol section under the Architect and also for the Senate side?

Mr. GRAY. The jurisdiction is delineated as between the House and Senate. We do not have Center Capitol Building Police per se. We will have a 214 personnel increase on the House side, and the Senate side will also, I understand, propose about 140 additional men. This has not been firmed up, and we do not have any exact figures on that from them.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRAY. Yes. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. KYL. Can the gentleman tell us how many people there are now on the Capitol police force on the two sides of the Capitol?

Mr. GRAY. Yes. I will be delighted to give the gentleman those figures. At the present time we have on the House side two captains, eight lieutenants, 22 sergeants, six plainclothesmen, no technicians, 317 privates, making a total of 359, which is the complement of the House police. The increase we have asked for here is an additional four lieutenants, 11 sergeants, two plainclothesmen, six technicians who will be dog handlers, 12 technicians, and 179 privates, making a total of 214. If this is approved today, we will have a total force on the House side of 569.

Mr. KYL. A total of 569 on the House side?

Mr. GRAY. If this 214 is approved.

Mr. KYL. How many officers and men are there in the force on the Senate side?

Mr. GRAY. The total will be brought up, if the increase that they have asked for is granted—and I say it is not official yet on the Senate side, but we are anticipating a leveling off at 1,000 men on the House and the Senate sides. We will have 569 on the House side, and you can just subtract that from the total figure to arrive at what the Senate will have.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman yield a little further?

Mr. GRAY. I will be delighted to.

Mr. KYL. In addition to these regular employees of the Capitol, how many Metropolitan Police are now utilized on the Hill?

Mr. GRAY. I would say to my distinguished friend from Iowa that this does include the Metropolitan Police. We are now paying them out of the contingency fund of the House. Therefore, the figures which I have used represent the total force on Capitol Hill.

The only addition to that would be if we had a bomb threat and we had to use the District of Columbia Department's Canine Corps or have to call in additional regular forces from the Metropolitan Police to cover such activities as the May Day activities which we recently experienced.

Mr. KYL. In other words, if we get the increases that the committee seeks here and in the other body, there will be 1,000 people employed on the Hill as police and that 1,000 figure will include the Metropolitan Police who are stationed

here either on a temporary or full-time basis?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman has stated the situation very well.

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

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding.

I merely wanted to compliment the gentleman and his colleagues for being expeditious in this matter of overtime pay. Some of us have felt that this has been a very serious and gross dereliction of duty on the part of the House. I want to compliment the leadership of the House and more particularly this subcommittee and its distinguished chairman for expeditiously attending to this need. I compliment them upon bringing up this bill and I hope the House will approve it overwhelmingly.

Mr. GRAY. I thank my distinguished friend from Texas for those remarks.

I might say while we are on the subject of overtime pay, we must not forget if we talk about 1,000—if we should reach that point—we are talking about three shifts around the clock for the protection of the Capitol area.

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

Mr. GRAY. I am glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What will be the jurisdiction of this 1,000-man force if it is eventually brought up to 1,000? What will be the area covered by them?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman raises a very important point and I am glad he has done so. This includes the Capitol Hill complex, all of the House office buildings, the Capitol itself, the Senate office buildings, and all of the buildings under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, does that include the Supreme Court?

Mr. GRAY. No; they have their own police force. They are not under our jurisdiction. That is a separate branch of the Government.

Mr. GROSS. And, this is exclusive of the Library of Congress?

Mr. GRAY. It is exclusive of the Library of Congress except where the jurisdictions overlap such as when we have policemen out here directing traffic on that corner and on the corner of New Jersey Avenue. Of course, they handle a lot of traffic for the Library of Congress. However, for their own security purposes, they do that with their own police force.

Mr. GROSS. Is this designed to bring within its jurisdiction this visitors center that is still apparently in a state of limbo? Has there been anything done on that?

Mr. GRAY. That would be under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Police Department.

Mr. GROSS. But not the Capitol Police?

Mr. GRAY. Not the Capitol Police. We do not go that far with our jurisdiction.

Our jurisdiction ends just a little bit north of the Senate office buildings.

Mr. GROSS. How would you keep a 1,000-man force from falling over each other in that restricted area which you have just described?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GRAY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HAYS. I wanted to point out the fact before the gentleman from Iowa asked that question—and it is even more apropos now—that these people work in three shifts so, you divide 1,000 by 3 and you have 333. Then, they only work 5 days a week and when you divide 333 into a 5-day week so that each one will have 2 days off, you wind that figure down to about 225 men per shift. So, the figure is not so impressive as it seems. I think you can deploy 225 police in this Capitol Building complex without having them falling over each other.

As a matter of fact, there have been several incidents which have taken place in the Rayburn House Office Building at night because there were not enough police to patrol that building. So we would not have too many police, especially considering the number of nutty people who are walking around and throwing bombs and making threats. This is the focal point, the Capitol complex, for the entire Nation.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain one thing further. Since we have gone on a 6-day workweek we have closed down the police school.

We have had all kinds of articles, just reams and reams of articles in the papers all over the country complaining about the so-called patronage police force not having enough training. So the Committee on House Administration has insisted that we have a 2-month training course. The police academy is closed down now, and the Chief estimates that it will take about 100 men to start up the school. So then, out of the 1,000 you will have 100 that are going to be in training when we take on more men into the police force. So we are not going to have much more than 200 at the most on duty at any one given time.

If we are going to have an all-professional police force, and everybody seems to want an all-professional police force, then we have got to have a cadre of instructors, and we have to have enough people in training that are going to be off duty in order to train the new officers. And because these police only start at \$8,600 there is a pretty good attrition, and it is hard to keep people here. They keep coming and going, so we will have to be continually training police if we are going to have any semblance of a professional force.

So I do not think it is fair to say that we are going to have over 1,000 policemen running over each other. The fact of the matter is we do not have 1,000, because the total we have now is only a little over 600. I was only trying to be completely frank, and the only thing we

have tried to do is to comply with the requests of the Chief of Police. So this would be approximately 600 on the House side. It may never reach 1,000 men. But even if it does, we will not have too many policemen running over each other, because, as the Chairman of the Committee on House Administration has pointed out, you must have three shifts. And while we are cranking up the school there will be additional men involved in that, but this is necessary if we are going to have a professional police force here, so as to protect the life and property around the Nation's Capitol.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is it envisioned that there is going to be an academy of some kind in connection with augmenting the police force?

Mr. GRAY. I am glad the gentleman has brought up that point.

We have in the District of Columbia a Police Academy, and it has been the policy for some years to use that Academy, and we would use that Academy for the six positions of technicians, or dog handlers. They would have to be trained in the District Academy because we do not have any facilities in our school for that type of training; we do not have the expertise necessary, so they will be trained there. We would utilize the academy downtown whenever it is practical.

As far as a police training school, it is not going to be a big, grandiose thing like an academy, but it is something that will require instructors, and it is something that will require time off from regular duties in order to instruct the new officers. This is what I had reference to when I said a police training school on the Hill.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, then the gentleman is saying that it is not proposed to build a separate, additional police academy on the Hill?

Mr. GRAY. There is not one cent for that in this resolution. I am glad the gentleman from Iowa brought that point up, because there is not a penny in here for a training school, per se, only men.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman think that will be an automatic matter of consequence, because of increasing these forces to the extent that it has been proposed to increase them?

Mr. GRAY. That is a very good question, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa, and the answer is an unequivocal "No." The school was in effect prior to the time we had to take the men off the 40-hour week and put them onto a 6-day week that occurred after the March bombing.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield still further, it seems to me that this heavily augmented police force is going to need expanded headquarters some place around the area he has described. The distinguished Speaker has said that he has no rooms to offer anyone.

Mr. GRAY. These men will be walking their beat; 179 of them would be privates, and they will be out walking their beats, they will be in the various office buildings, and different places, so they will not need quarters per se.

Mr. GROSS. One final question, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. GRAY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I note this language says "is entitled, subject to the approval of the Committee on House Administration, to pay for each such additional hour of duty, in lieu of compensatory time off from his regularly scheduled tour of duty."

It is not intended by this language to outlaw the use of compensatory time, is it? It provides the option of either, I would hope it was either compensatory time or the overtime pay.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman from Iowa is eminently correct. We did not want the House to pass a resolution making it automatically mandatory that overtime be paid. We only want to pay the overtime cash in lieu of compensatory pay when there is an emergency. We feel that the Committee on House Administration would be the best ones to determine, after consultation with the Chief, and with the Speaker, and others, as to when such an emergency would exist. So we feel we should have control over the subject.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. The obvious justice that is manifest in the bill leads one to but one conclusion, and that is to support it and to vote for it.

A number of questions were raised just prior to my speaking, and I would like to address myself to several of those questions.

First, so far as the training of police officers is concerned, we have heard over the decades that it is essential that an officer be trained. Ordinarily that was dealing with the pragmatics of being a police officer. In the last decade a new dimension has entered into his work and into his training, and that is the sensitivity of his relationship to the people. They say that the thin blue line has a great responsibility. It has acquired additional responsibility. It has become the object of and the subject of and the target of many peoples. It is the symbol of authority and hence it is the direct target of those who attack authority. They say an officer has no sensitivity—he does not relate to the people on the street and hence to compensate for that, we urge that that sensitivity problem be addressed.

As for the question about opening the schools so far as that is concerned, I can only suggest very strongly that it be done quickly and without further delay. Because in the absence of such quick action we are not putting forth the type of police officer that is required in this day and age.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to deal with the police officers' problems—not directly germane to the bill—but the problems that touch the police officer in the Capitol and touch

on the police officer throughout the world. It amazes me, in view of the advocates of so many noble causes, where injustices arise, where we have killings in My Lai—that we hear very few voices being raised in defense of the police officer. In spite of the onslaught on police officers and the coldblooded executions that are being committed of the police officers in the Nation, it confounds me that the bleeding hearts of the Nation are still. These police officers are human beings—they are fathers, they are husbands, they are taxpayers, and they believe and they care for life, and they are concerned for their children and their families and their neighbors. But somehow the voices of those from whom we have heard so much are muted. That puzzles me. But I have confidence that the Nation will respond to the needs that exist. In the city of New York recently we had several killings—two of them were coldblooded executions—they were not killings in hot combat, which is part and parcel of the peril of the everyday life of the police officer, which is something which has come to be anticipated and accepted by their families and themselves. They were coldblooded executions. Very few voices were heard in connection with this.

Of course, there are some in this country who seek to divide us all of the time. They would have you believe that there is a racial connotation here. The fact of the matter is that of the last seven who were killed five of them were black. They were not killing a black man or a white man—they were killing police officers—the symbol of authority in this Nation.

Here in Washington day after day the Capitol becomes more of a target of the establishment, and of the authority of Government. It is essential that it be adequately protected.

It is essential that we pass this bill. It is essential that we do far more because of the responsibility of people in public life, long since abandoned by them because of their shortsighted political view. And to permit the erosion of authority brings us to this point—we are now tasting the bitter fruit of yesterday's omissions and permissiveness. It is essential that we pass this bill and address ourselves to all of the problems affecting police officers.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the Chairman for introducing this bill and urge the Congress to deal with this problem on a massive approach, because without the protection of the law enforcement officer and without their integrity being preserved and without their effectiveness being increased rather than diminished, and so diminishing their morale, the very future and safety and tranquility of the individual taxpayer in this Nation is imperiled, and the spending of the dollar is diminished.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wish to commend our colleague in the well for the statement he has made. He makes it with a great deal of compassion because for many years he served as a member of the New York City police force. Recently I was

in New York and drove through the district in which he was commander. Even to this day they speak reverently of the manner in which he discharged his duties as police commander of that community. Our colleague has put in perspective the needs of policemen all over America. But I am sure my colleague would have to agree with me that while we commend the committee for bringing this bill to us—and the gentleman from Illinois understands the enormity of the problem reflected by this bill—it is a tragic reflection on our times that it takes 1,000 policemen and 6 police dogs to protect our Nation's Capitol.

Mr. BIAGGI. I cannot agree with you more. But we have to be realistic and deal with the times.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one more eminently qualified to speak on this subject than the gentleman from New York, who was a highly respected and decorated member of the police force of New York. I wish to thank him for his kind remarks.

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

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask a few questions of the gentleman from Illinois. Will the employment of the new policemen eliminate once and for all the patronage in the employment of college students?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman raises a very important point. We in the Committee on House Administration have instructed the Capitol Police force and the Chief that all policeman on his force shall be adequately trained and shall submit to at least 2 months of police training. The resolution calls for no consideration of political affiliation to be given in acquiring members of the force.

Mr. HUNT. No. 2, does the bill take into consideration any retroactive pay for those men who had so much overtime accrue to them as a result of past disturbances?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman raises another very important point. The answer is "Yes." This resolution makes overtime pay retroactive to March 1, the date the emergency was created. It pays privates to sergeants 1½ times pay for overtime and Lieutenants on up to the Chief, regular time for overtime from March 1 on. The emergency ends on June 30.

With reference to any subsequent emergency—and we hope we have none—should we have, the House Committee on Administration will determine whether or not overtime pay should be paid.

Mr. HUNT. As far as the selection of recruits is concerned that would be entering your academy, have you set up a table of qualifications age wise, physical wise, and mental and character examinations?

Mr. GRAY. That also is a very important point, and I might say that we on the committee were both embarrassed and chagrined to find out, when my distinguished colleague from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) propounded the question of the Chief, that at the present time we do not require a physical as a prerequisite to hiring on the police force. I can as-

sure you that from now on they will have to have a physical.

Mr. HUNT. How about the rest of the question I propounded about other investigation as to their prior record and character?

Mr. GRAY. That is answered in the affirmative. The Chief of Police now estimates that if this resolution is adopted, he has between 75 and 100 recruits that have been checked out very thoroughly that could go on the force immediately and again crank up our training school. The answer is "Yes," they are checked out, their background, references, police records, and so forth.

Mr. HUNT. Has any thought been given to the selection of returning GI's with a combat status, those who have been in combat areas, and if so, what inducement is being made to them to bring them into the Police Department, considering the fact that they may have had service either with the military police or the CID?

Mr. GRAY. Those are being given top priority. We are using all the recruiting facilities available, including the District of Columbia and the Executive Protective Service, which is another police agency which protects the White House and the embassies, and if they have someone who comes to them that they think would like to work "on the Hill," and they do not have an opening, they refer them to the Capitol Police. It is a reciprocity type recruiting effort. The answer is "Yes," we are giving priority to that subject.

Mr. HUNT. Will the gentleman make the qualifications for members of the force a matter of record when they are finally worked out?

Mr. GRAY. I will be delighted to do so.

Mr. HUNT. I wish to compliment you for your action on this bill. We have for many years required policemen to take an oath to protect society. At the same time we have treated them unfairly. We have kept them understaffed, undermanned, and underpaid.

The action of the committee is justifiable in this respect, and I am most happy to join with the gentleman on the passage of this resolution.

Mr. GRAY. I thank my friend for his valuable contribution.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman for bringing this resolution before the House. What concerns me is a situation that perhaps developed during the demonstrations we had recently, in that some Members of Congress might have countermanded some of the orders given to policemen by saying, "Well, I think this should be corrected; that people should be able to come on the steps, people should be able to come into the buildings."

Who gives the Capitol policemen their orders? Does a Member have a right to countermand an order given a policeman by a sergeant, by the captain or by the chief?

I believe this is a very important point, and I wish the gentleman would comment on this, because this could develop into a serious problem, if 435 Members of the House thought they were chiefs of police and could change orders. We could really run into some chaos.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman from Mississippi has raised a very important point. I will be glad to answer briefly, and then I will yield to my distinguished chairman, who is much more knowledgeable than I.

This is a situation the chief anticipated before the march in May because of his long tenure here. He is a deputy chief of the Metropolitan Police Force also. He came to the Sergeant at Arms of the House, and he talked with me, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the chairman of the full committee. All of us gave him full authority to enforce the law. Whatever orders were issued at the Capitol, was the law. Any Member acting contrary notwithstanding was in violation.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. HAYS. I should like to supplement that by saying the Chief did talk to me, and he said certain Members had told him he would not dare to harass any of these demonstrators. He asked, "Mr. Chairman, what do I do?" I said, "I do not know what authority I have to tell you anything, but my suggestion is that you do not harass anybody, but if anybody violates the law you put them in the 'pokey' with whatever force seems to be indicated."

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

Mr. GRAY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The reason I mention this, before yielding, is because we have had hearings in our subcommittee concerning security not only for the Capitol but for all Federal buildings. The gentleman from New York was very helpful.

Mr. GROVER. I will say to my colleague I do support this legislation.

I was quite surprised some weeks ago when it was pointed out there was neglect of the financial status of the Capitol Hill police.

I was surprised also to find that no physical examinations are required. I hope when the new standards for physical examinations are promulgated they will be an improvement upon those of the Metropolitan Police, because I read in the newspapers today they have standards for the Metropolitan Police which would discourage people like Dick Butkus and other big football players.

With the things going on around Capitol Hill these days, I believe we need those big fellows to help protect us and to help out our colleague from Mississippi, who almost fought the battle of the Capitol steps by himself the other day.

Mr. GRAY. I appreciate the comments of my distinguished friend.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank my able friend for yielding.

I want to commend the able chairman and the distinguished committee for bringing forward this resolution and in some measure recognizing the debt of gratitude we owe to these law enforcement officials who protect us here.

I also want to associate myself with the very able words said by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) with respect to the police of this country and law enforcement officials being underpaid.

Personally, I believe it ought to be a Federal offense, as it is a State offense, to kill a law enforcement officer. I believe it is within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government to do that. Law enforcement for the people of this country is interrelated to the whole law enforcement problem, so the Federal Government could take jurisdiction over it and make that a Federal offense as well as a State offense.

I have introduced a bill to exempt the first \$5,000 of every peace officer's income from income tax. This is the only way I know of whereby we can quickly and without a lot of red tape and expense give a very appreciable and very meaningful increment to the income of those faithful soldiers on our civil line, the law enforcement officers of this country.

Mr. GRAY. As always, my friend from Florida makes a great contribution.

I now yield to my friend from West Virginia, a valued member of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the knowledgeable and distinguished gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this measure we have before us, which I hope and pray will pass unanimously, without one single dissenting vote, will prove to be in the days to come one of the most important resolutions that we have been called upon or will be called upon to consider during this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, if one bomb goes off and destroys the Capitol or the House office buildings or the Senate office buildings, we are going to be the ones who will have to shoulder the blame. This House Resolution 449 is a most effective step in preventing a future tragedy.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GRAY. I thank my friend from West Virginia.

I will be delighted now to yield to my good friend from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with every portion of House Resolution 449 that has to do with further protection and certainly with further preservation of the Capitol and most of all, Mr. Speaker, with the proper compensation, including overtime, for those officers that are on duty.

I full well appreciate the need to protect the House office buildings. I appreciate the need for traffic direction. I appreciate that we do not need a national police force, and that that responsibility is delegated to the various States and territories, and so forth. I appreciate

the work that was done in the recent scare here by our existent Capitol Police force.

I well recall, Mr. Speaker, the last time the increase in the size of the Capitol Police force came up that I asked a question about how many more men we could have between McCormack Park and the Rayburn Building extremes and still not have them at least duplicating one another's duties. That question was properly discussed at that time. Later the Chief of the Capitol Police force called upon me, and I made it clear to him, as I did to the House at that time, that I had the greatest respect for the members of the force. The fact that it has been taken out of politics and the training school which was started and the work in general that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois' committee and the Committee on House Administration has done, along with the Sergeant at Arms and the Speaker of the House, I think are very important and significant contributions.

However, all of us who are thinking people realize that there does come a time of saturation. It makes no difference whether it is with regard to the question of the number of police officers, the amount of dollars spent, or whether it is in the number of personnel involved in research or the amount of dollars dedicated to research, or whatever else we have coming before us. I just wonder if we need the additional number of people that are requested here at this time and which has been brought out in this very excellent discussion here today as a Capitol-wise extension of the police. We reach the point of saturation sometimes and there is no question but what that time is rapidly approaching. I definitely feel that this is asking for too much and will be likened by the American people to the increase in our own salaries, the increase in the protection of the national shrine, the increase in the pay of our people, which this House roundly voted down in specific instances during the last session of the last Congress.

Would the gentleman yield further for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GRAY. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, at what time an amendment will be in order in the legislative situation under which we find ourselves?

The SPEAKER. In answer to the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry, under the legislative situation the gentleman from Illinois has the time and can only yield for the purpose of debate or amendment. If the gentleman yields for the purpose of amendment, he loses the time. The gentleman is not required to yield for purposes of amendment. The only way an amendment can be forced upon the gentleman from Illinois is by defeating the previous question.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, if I may comment here, I want to accommodate all of the Members. I have a copy of the gentleman's amendment. As I read it, it strikes out the 214 men. I do not see

any reason to gag the House, and after everyone has been heard, I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri for the purpose of offering his amendment only although I am sure it will be voted down.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate that, and as the gentleman from Illinois well knows—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois also realizes that if he yields for that purpose he is yielding 1 hour of time?

Mr. HALL. I well know that but shall not take advantage of the gentleman under the parliamentary situation. This is why I want to say to the gentleman that I have purposely remained on my feet until I thought all others had completed debate. It would be my purpose simply to submit the amendment and ask that it be voted on by the yeas and nays, and as the gentleman so quickly discerns, the sole purpose would be to strike section 1 and make the necessary adjustments so that we do not have an addition, but we do keep the emoluments in the resolution, including overtime and compensatory pay that is written into this very excellently brought out resolution.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. RUTH. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would yield for an amendment? The gentleman does not have a copy of my amendment. What we are trying to do here is to do a good job with the police and eliminate the patronage jobs. My amendment would be along the line of patronage and when those who are now on patronage leave or retire, they would be replaced by professional people.

Mr. GRAY. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment is in the resolution now. It says that no person shall be hired with regard to any consideration of political affiliation, be he Democrat or Republican, but only on the merits of the applicant and his background.

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, does that mean that those whom we know who do now serve as patronage policemen, if they go off the payroll they will not be replaced in the same manner?

Mr. GRAY. That is correct.

Mr. RUTH. And the gentleman assures me of that?

Mr. GRAY. I do.

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

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Could I ask my colleague how many members of the Capitol Police force on the House side do we have who are patronage appointees and who have not been at any time professionally trained or have not had professional training?

Mr. GRAY. I, personally, do not like to use the word "patronage." I think it is abused. If a Member of Congress, be he Democrat or Republican, has a man whom he feels is qualified, I think he should be in the position to recommend

him to the Chief of Police who should give consideration of the man's qualifications. But in further response to the gentleman's question, there are 123 employees out of the force, or approximately one-third, who have been hired by referrals of Members of Congress. This does not preclude a Member, be he Republican or Democrat, from sending a qualified applicant for consideration and, in fact, I would hope that Members of the House would try to bring in qualified men from their respective districts so that we may be able to have the best possible police force.

Mr. SCHEUER. It seems to me that it might have been appropriate a decade ago or two decades ago, but with the means of sophisticated security here and the extraordinary demands placed on the security personnel by some of the recent phenomena, it seems to me that the Capitol Police force ought to be totally professionalized and that there should not be any recommendation by Members of Congress.

Mr. GRAY. Not recommendations, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from New York, only referrals. We are trying to recruit men. The starting salary is only \$8,600. I am sure the gentleman is not going to have many police aspirants from New York City coming to Washington to work for \$8,600.

Mr. SCHEUER. That is the big mistake, it seems to me, because if we are going to seek to get the best, not by reference by Members of the Congress, but by getting the kind of men that the FBI has, and the other security agencies have. That is the type of men we need on this police force. Is there any effort being made to transfer, let us say, men in the security forces who do not have the qualified professional training, who were originally recommended by Members of the Congress, to transfer them from the security functions to the perfectly respectable position of custodial functions on the Hill so that we can more rapidly effect the changeover to a totally professional force, and not a political force?

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman from New York raises a very important point. As soon as this resolution passes today we are reinstating the training program, and all members of the Capitol Police force, regardless of how they got there, will have to go through 2 months of training if they have not already had that training, plus they must have had at least 1 year of police work.

Mr. SCHEUER. Will there be any effort made to get those who have not had real professional training transferred into custodial jobs, so we can fill those vacated positions on the police force with highly professionally skilled and well trained policemen?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) how many professionally trained people the city of New York hires before they go on the New York City Police Force?

Mr. SCHEUER. That is a perfectly respectable question. We have a 1-year training program in New York, and it is

very much more rigorous than the 2 months training in the school. There also have to be rigorous requirements, they have to take police examinations, physical examinations, mental and psychological examinations.

I would be very happy if my colleague assured me that the selections for the Capitol Police Force were just as professional, and as nonpolitical as the new entrants into the New York City Police Force. That is all I am looking for.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I want to say to my friend, the gentleman from New York, that as a member of the Subcommittee on the Police Force, which is a subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration, that we are talking about minimum requirements. That is all that your committee is striving for. That is the reason that the subcommittee chairman touched on the training school. That is the reason I brought up the physical examinations. And I want to say to the Members of this Congress that as your committee continues to work its will, it is our hope that with this minimum amount of money we are paying that we are going to get the best police force that we can for the U.S. Capitol.

Mr. SCHEUER. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that if the limiting factor is the starting salary, then we ought to raise the starting salary and make the starting salary comparable to that paid in Chicago, in New York, and in San Francisco, and to other security police. In my opinion it is ludicrous for us to pay less than that, so that we know that we will get the best qualified people. We should not be paying less than the other police departments are paid in the country.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I do not believe that there is anybody in this Congress who is against higher pay. We have to have a place to start, and this is the place, and then we can go on from here.

And while I am talking Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the number of police we are talking about is the very, very minimum. We are talking about three shifts. And I direct my statement to the gentleman from Missouri in the hope that he will withdraw his amendment after I make this explanation, because I have given this problem very, very serious study.

When you have three shifts, and you have men working 40 hours, in order to prevent this overtime pay on those three 40-hour shifts, that we will never have more than 50 or 100 men patrolling the Capitol Grounds on each shift under our jurisdiction on the House side. And when we talk about training these men it means that they have to take time out from their regular schedules in order to get that training we require that is so necessary in this sophisticated society in which we live today.

So when the gentleman talks about an amendment to ask us to withdraw 200 or more men, believe me, he might as well be offering an amendment to eliminate the entire Capitol Police force.

With the number of people that you have now, I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri, we are not getting the protection that we should

be getting. It does not provide even the bare minimum of protection. Your committee is studying this problem, and we are doing everything we can in order to raise the professional standing. I hope that we can get by with this increase, because even at that, it is the very, very minimum. I know my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, is sincere and is interested and wants to do the best possible job that we can in the Capitol, not only to protect the buildings, but also to protect the millions of visitors that we get on our Capitol Grounds, each year.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, consistent with my remarks earlier, I want to say it is essential that we have the training academy open and continuing the training. I would like to suggest very strongly for the record that the recruitment process in the city of New York, as effective as it is, has less than one-quarter of 1 percent of our police officers coming into the job with any training whatsoever. There is no professional police officer coming into the job—they become professional police officers once they are inducted. But the essential thing and the main thrust is that of training them while they are on the job. Currently they are in the academy for less than 6 months. They have never gone beyond that period of time. There is in-service training which I advocate here for our Capitol Police to implement that and to continue periodically in their careers and that is an important thing in this day and time.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has made a very important contribution.

Mr. Speaker, let me take 5 seconds, if I may, to point out something. In 1969 we had 20 bomb threats in the Capital—and I am talking of the city of Washington—and in 1970 it catapulted up to 217. Think of that—from 20 in March 1969 to 217 in 1970.

I think this is the least we must do as Members of Congress to protect our great Capital.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In response to the question by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) who asked about the number of policemen on the force who have been referred by Members of Congress, the gentleman responded that 123 had been. But this does not necessarily mean that these are men with no previous experience.

Mr. GRAY. No. To the contrary, all those hired must have 1 year's police experience.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I happen to know that many of these men are veterans with extensive experience as MP's in the Armed Forces. Many of them have been policemen in their local communities. I would not want anyone to get the idea that the 123 members of the police force who were recommended by Members of

Congress are necessarily inexperienced policemen.

Mr. GRAY. I will say to my friend, that I repudiated that label. I was merely pointing out that these 123 men were referred.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHEUER. I am glad to hear that some of them, perhaps most of them, had excellent professional qualifications. I personally knew some of them who were referred by New York Members of Congress and frankly I do not think they would know which way to point that gun, and I would rather have them against me than for me.

Mr. GRAY. Your committee is trying to straighten that out?

Mr. SCHEUER. Right.

I want to emphasize that so far as the chairman is concerned, what we need on Capitol Hill is more security and that means not alone more in numbers, but better trained police professionals.

Mr. GRAY. I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) for the purpose of offering an amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: On page 1, line 1, strike out the word "That" and all that follows down through the word "Each" in line 14 on page 2 and insert in lieu thereof the words "That each";

And on page 2, line 23, strike out the colon and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon;

And on page 3, lines 3 and 4, strike out "plainclothesman; technician (dog handler); or other technician" and insert in lieu thereof "or plainclothesman";

And on page 3, line 10, strike out "Sec. 3." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 2.";

And on page 4, lines 3 and 4, strike out "plainclothesman; technician (dog handler); or other technician" and insert in lieu thereof "or plainclothesman";

And on page 4, line 10, strike out "Sec. 4." and all that follows down through the word "and" in line 14 on page 4 and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 3. (a) The rate of pay";

And on page 5, strike out lines 8 to 13, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 4. There shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, until otherwise provided by law, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as I promised, I will take only a short time on this amendment.

The amendment simply strikes section 1 of the amendment which deals with the addition of the additional officers and men, the plainclothesmen and police dogs and their handlers as technicians. It does not in any wise affect the balance of the amendment involving compensatory time or pay for overtime.

As I said in the beginning, I am proud of our Capitol Hill Police Force. But I do not want that police force to become unwieldy. I am for the best possible training. I am for the payment for overtime and for the compensation. I respect my friend, the gentleman from Illinois,

and his explanation, but I do not feel it is proper to withdraw the amendment. We shall simply vote it up or down.

All the king's horses and all the personnel added in the world will not give us protection and, like the Committee on House Administration, for a long time I have worked on the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress in which we reviewed this proposition, and the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that until we have a judiciary that will back up the action of the constabulary, quite different from yesterday's 5-to-4 regrettable decision versus loitering, by our Nation's highest tribunal, it will avail us nothing to add more and more personnel and monies.

I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today the citizens of Italy observe the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic. The Italian Republic has come of age, and its outstanding achievements over the past quarter century engender pride not only in the hearts of the people of Italy but of all free people. On this anniversary, the Italians look back with satisfaction on 25 years of unbroken progress and look forward confidently to a future filled with promise.

In 1946, the goals that the Italians set for themselves seemed far distant, for the ugly scars of war and fascism were apparent everywhere. Today the scars are gone and the goals have been reached. A stable, democratic government has been established, a modern industrial economy is flourishing, the benefits of economic and social progress are being shared with the less privileged south, foreign trade is expanding, and firm ties have been made with the nations of Western Europe and the Atlantic world.

As an alternate delegate last November to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, I was impressed by Italy's spirit of cooperation in meeting the collective responsibilities of the NATO nations including defense of the Western world, financing of world trade, aid to developing countries, and preservation of the international monetary equilibrium. As a partner in NATO, Italy has been one of the staunchest supporters of U.S. policy in Europe and over the years has made a genuine contribution toward stabilizing the economic climate in Europe and toward encouraging world peace.

The coalition cabinet headed by Italy's dynamic prime minister, Emilio Colombo, has given Italy a broadly representative

government with a diversity of forces in the leadership reflecting the highly heterogeneous country that was unified only a century ago. Premier Colombo's cabinet has provided enlightened leadership for Italy by putting top priority on developing Italy's southland, by earmarking funds to provide schools, hospitals, and other social services that the expanding industrial cities of the north require, by taking steps to stem the massive migration of labor from the peasant villages of the south to the booming industrial cities of the north through transfer of industry and capital to the southland, and by improving housing, hospitals, medical clinics, roads, sewers, railroads, inland waterways, air transportation, and other facilities.

Seven million Italians, or a fifth of the electorate will go to the polls on June 13 and 14 to elect local governments in Sicily, Rome, Genoa, and other localities, and a vote of confidence is expected for Colombo's coalition government which has instituted these major reforms and innovative programs.

Italy's economic growth rate is currently second only to Japan among the world's industrial powers, her gross national product has roughly tripled in the past two decades, and production per capita is now equal to that of Great Britain. Among those who have contributed to Italy's phenomenal economic growth are Lamberto Mazza, managing director of Industria A. Zanussi, the largest manufacturer of major home appliances in Europe; the lady magnate of Milan, Anna Bonomi-Bolchini, whose real estate and construction company, Beni Immobili Italia, merged recently with two other giant real estate companies combining assets which exceed \$160 million; Gianni Agnelli, head of the family that controls Fiat; Carlo Pesenti, the cement king; Giorgio Valerio, whose power was based in electrical companies that made up Milan Edison; Leopoldo Pirelli, operating head of the tire-making empire; Giovanni Borghi, producer of Ignis refrigerators; Dino and Giovanni Fabri, owners of one of Europe's biggest publishing empires; Piero Bassetti, the linen producer; Antonio Cerruti, whose textile company has moved into men's fashion clothing; and Marco Trolli, who sells more than 2 million pairs of shoes annually.

These captains of industry are rivaled only by the Italian luminaries who have contributed so much to the advancement of Western culture and civilization. Not only since the birth of the Italian Republic, but through the centuries spanning the Roman Empire, the Italian Renaissance, and the Risorgimento, Italy, has left to the world an awe-inspiring legacy of art, literature, music, and scientific achievement. The names of Donatello, Botteicelli, Cellini, da Vinci, Raphael, Titian, Tintoretto, Michelangelo, Corelli, Vivaldi, Scarlatti, Rossini, Verdi, Puccini, Caruso, Pinza, Toscanini, Stradivari, Cristofari, Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Machiavelli, di Cavour, Garibaldi, Galileo, Marconi, and Fermi immediately come to mind.

I know that many of my colleagues in

the Congress, who have had the opportunity to visit the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, were as pleased as I that the center's entire requirement for marble has been filled by Italy's gift of more than 3,500 tons of Carrara marble valued in excess of \$1 million. This represents the largest gift to the center from a foreign nation, and as an American of Italian descent, I am proud that such a magnificent gift has been donated to America by the Republic of Italy in order to foster creativity in the world of art and music.

In recent years the Congress of the United States has extended special recognition to Christopher Columbus, whom we honor this year for the first time in our history by a national legal holiday; Dr. Enrico Fermi, in whose honor the nuclear accelerator at Weston, Ill., has been named; and Constantino Brumidi, the Michelangelo of the U.S. Capitol, whose marble bust has now been placed in the Senate wing of the Capitol. By honoring these eminent men of Italian descent, the Congress has strengthened the bonds of affection and friendship between the people of our country and of Italy. I want to congratulate Emilio Colombo, who by his visit here in February helped to cement these bonds of friendship, and His Excellency, Egidio Ortona, the distinguished Ambassador of Italy to the United States, for his continuing efforts to perpetuate these ties of friendship between Italy and America.

It is with great personal pleasure that I extend my greetings and best wishes to the people of the Italian Republic, as well as to the Italian Americans in my own Seventh Congressional District of Illinois and throughout our country, who are joining in this 25th anniversary celebration. May the Republic of Italy continue to experience peace, prosperity and progress in the years ahead.

GUN CONTROL, REGISTRATION, AND LICENSING ACT OF 1971

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a proposed Gun Control, Registration, and Licensing Act of 1971.

I fully realize the besetting difficulties of attempting to enact new gun control laws at this time. But horrendous conditions have developed. The trend of gun violence and gun misuse involving brutal and random assaults against the police must be reversed.

Fifty-one police officers have been killed in performance of their duties so far this year, 80 percent of the killings were by guns. Measures to regulate the use of firearms, particularly the handgun, are demanded without delay.

Be it known that I have solicited the comments of the chief law enforcement officials in 25 major cities across the country.

The cities include: Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Houston, Indianapolis, Kansas City, Memphis,

Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Newark, New Orleans, New York City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D.C.

I shall advise the House further when I have received the responses of these law enforcement officials.

An analysis of the bill follows:

SUMMARY OF "GUN CONTROL, REGISTRATION AND LICENSING ACT OF 1971"

The bill contains five titles, *Title V* of which contains general provisions pertaining to separability, effect on State law, the effective date of the proposal, and authorization for appropriations.

Title I requires national registration of all firearms with the Secretary of the Treasury. It requires evidence of registration to accompany a firearm when it is carried about, and provides that such registration must be exhibited upon demand to any law enforcement officer. Ammunition could be sold by licensed dealers only to persons having and exhibiting certificates of registration for weapons using such ammunition. The bill also requires that the Secretary of the Treasury be notified of changes of firearms ownership.

The bill provides penalties of imprisonment up to two years, a fine up to \$2,000, or both, for violations of the title. Falsification or forgery of registration information would be severely punished by imprisonment of up to five years, a fine up to \$10,000, or both. *Title I* also would reinstitute recordkeeping requirements for rifle and shotgun ammunition sales which were deleted by a rider in the last Congress.

Title II of the bill requires every individual to obtain either a State gun permit or a Federal gun permit before he is entrusted with a gun. The bill specifies minimum standards for an "adequate" State gun permit law. If the State does not adopt a system that meets the minimum standards, Federal gun permits are required. After September 1, 1972, no person—whether a licensed dealer or a private individual—may sell firearms or ammunition to an individual who does not have either a State permit (meeting the minimum standards of the Act) or a Federal gun permit. Effective September 1, 1973, no person may possess a firearm or ammunition unless he has either an adequate State gun permit or a Federal gun permit.

To qualify as an adequate permit system, the bill requires that a State prohibit the issuance of gun permits to convicted felons, fugitives from justice, mental defectives, alcoholics, and juveniles. It must also assume adequate investigation of applicants prior to the issuance of a gun permit.

The sale or possession of firearms or ammunition in violation of the permit provisions of *Title II* carries a maximum sentence of imprisonment of five years and a fine of \$5,000.

Title III of the bill prohibits the importation, manufacture, transfer and transportation of any handgun, except by law enforcement officers, military personnel, or certain persons licensed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Potential licensees include importers, manufacturers and dealers qualified under the 1968 Gun Control Act who may engage in importing, manufacturing or dealing in handguns for law enforcement authorities, the military, or other licensees. The only other kinds of non-governmental groups who may qualify for handgun licenses are sporting or recreational pistol clubs approved by the Secretary. To qualify for a license, a pistol club must have no members who are themselves disqualified from handgun ownership under Federal or State law. The club also must have facilities and procedures for storing the club's handguns when they are not being used for sporting or recreational purposes.

Title III also provides a procedure for voluntary relinquishment of privately owned handguns to Federal, State or local law enforcement officials who are authorized to reimburse the owner of the handgun for the value of the weapon, or \$25, whichever is greater. The bill provides that the handgun restrictions in *Title III* shall become effective one year after the date of enactment of the Act. *Title III* also prohibits the sale or delivery of handguns which the Secretary of the Treasury determines are not suitable for nor readily adaptable to sporting purposes under standards presently applied by the Secretary to imported firearms. Thus, the bill would apply the import restrictions on cheap handguns of the 1968 Gun Control Act to handguns domestically manufactured. These latter handgun restrictions would become effective 60 days after the date of enactment of the Act.

Title IV of the bill provides an incentive to States to adopt adequate gun permit systems. It specifies that after June 30, 1973, a State must have an adequate gun permit system to be eligible to share in the distribution of Federal firearms and ammunition excise tax proceeds, which today are earmarked as the Federal Wildlife Restoration Fund. The size and distribution of the Fund depend directly on sales and use of firearms and ammunition, therefore, it is appropriate to reward those States that effectively regulate firearms.

If we are serious in our professions of concern about crime, and especially violent crime, then let us move directly against the favored weapon of the lawless—guns, particularly handguns. Licensing and registration are rudimentary steps essential to protect the public safety by keeping guns out of the hands of criminals, juveniles and the insane.

REVENUE-SHARING PROPOSAL

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the administration is currently urging the Congress to adopt their revenue-sharing proposal.

I have stated that I support the concept of revenue sharing. I have felt that this proposal has great potential in relieving the tax burden of our citizens—especially the property owner.

I will stand by my previous statement. However, under the present administration, I have serious reservations whether the enactment of revenue sharing would provide any relief whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, what if the administration impounds revenue-sharing funds in the same manner as it has impounded \$12.4 billion lawfully appropriated by Congress?

If the President can impound \$34 million that were appropriated by Congress for regional medical programs, then he can surely impound \$34 million that would go to Los Angeles under revenue sharing.

If the President refuses to spend \$200 million that Congress has appropriated for water and sewer facilities, he can surely refuse to release the \$1 million that Torrance is authorized under revenue sharing.

If, at a time when our Navy is being seriously challenged by the Soviet Navy,

the administration insists on "freezing" \$957 million appropriated for naval ship construction, it can, surely "freeze" \$398,012 that is earmarked for Compton under the revenue-sharing proposal.

If the administration has the authority to impound \$18 million appropriated for NASA research and development; \$583 million for model cities; \$672 million for airport construction, expansion and improvement; \$10 million for aid to elementary and secondary schools; and a myriad of other programs lawfully funded by Congress and approved by the President, then the administration can surely impound funds that would be authorized by revenue sharing.

Mr. Speaker, revenue sharing is designed to help our financially pressed cities and enable them to relieve the burden on the overtaxed property owner. I support this idea. However, if revenue sharing is administered similar to the method by which appropriations are impounded, I seriously question whether the taxpayer would receive any relief at all.

DROUGHT RELIEF LEGISLATION IS URGENTLY NEEDED NOW

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is becoming increasingly aware of deficiencies in our present farm disaster relief programs, and also the pressing need for improvements in the manner in which these programs are administered.

No better example for the need of improvement can be found than the current drought crisis in the Southwestern United States. The extended drought in western Oklahoma alone is predicted to cause the 1971 wheat crop to be the lowest yield since 1957—36 million bushels fewer than were harvested during last year alone. What little assistance the Federal Government has made to this area thus far has been slow in coming, and even then it has only been made available in patchwork fashion.

The people of Oklahoma have seen many disasters in their State—tornadoes, floods, blizzards—but they know a drought is unlike any other type of natural disaster. The damage it creates is not brought on overnight—the disaster conditions are building up over months and months. Likewise, the damage wrought by a drought cannot be repaired in quick order, no matter how much Federal assistance is quickly made available to a stricken area. Lost crops are gone forever—champion breeding livestock may take generations to replace—once rich topsoil will take years to reclaim. And Oklahomans know another thing—the only real way drought damage can be ended is for the rains to come again.

Nevertheless, I believe there are many ways our Federal Government can lessen the impact of drought disaster. To do this, however, we must gear our assistance programs to the very unique nature of a drought. We must have very simple and flexible conditions under which an area can be designated as a drought disaster area. We must have funds promptly

available for low-interest loans to farmers and ranchers in the areas, so that breeding stock and poultry can be saved when feed crops cannot be raised on the land. Feed grains also must be readily available at surplus commodity prices, so that farmers and ranchers can continue operations without financial ruination.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which I believe will go a long way toward providing this much-needed assistance to the farmers and ranchers of our Nation. The bill I am introducing today will simplify procedures and remove the redtape for obtaining designation as a drought disaster area, and will expedite assistance payments to the farmers and ranchers of that area.

Moreover, this legislation will make it possible for the Governor of any State to request designation as a drought disaster area directly from the Secretary of Agriculture—the same procedure which is currently used for expediting assistance to areas declared by the President to be major disaster areas.

Under the provisions of my bill, the Secretary will be authorized during drought emergencies to furnish livestock feed and hay, as well as commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, to the farmers and ranchers in the affected areas. The Secretary will be further authorized to provide assistance to unemployed farmworkers and ranch hands, and to cancel emergency assistance crop loss loans which he makes to insure continued operations during the period of the drought.

I want to urge my colleagues to expedite this proposal, and to provide this streamlined form of disaster relief to the farmers and ranchers of our Nation. The damage and destruction of drought disaster can never be totally avoided, but I believe this type of legislation can make great strides toward protecting rural America from suffering permanent and irreparable losses during drought crises.

THE LATE AUDIE MURPHY

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

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and untimely death of Audie Murphy on last Sunday in an airplane accident was too sad and regrettable to contemplate. The entire Nation bows its head in solemn mourning.

Rated as the Nation's top hero of World War II, the courage and gallantry of this man on the field of battle stands unexcelled in the annals of warfare. Always modest and never boastful, he insisted that many of his scores of decorations should be shared by others who were closely associated with him in the midst of enemy fire.

Every loyal American recognizes the debt that is owed to Audie Murphy and his memory. His record will undoubtedly identify him as one of the truly great heroes of American history.

This veteran was a native Texan, whose parents were tenant farmers of modest means, and whose ancestry reaches deep into the history of the

State. He is a product of a sturdy stock of people, fiercely devoted to God and country.

It is noteworthy that Murphy's forebearers were likewise quick to respond to their country's call. His great-great grandfather, John Berry, was a veteran of the War of 1812, during which time he served under Gen. William Henry Harrison and took part in some famous Indian fights—including the battles of Tippecanoe and Thames. Three of Berry's sons served with distinction during the Texas revolution. One was killed in action against Mexican forces. Two were in the battle of San Jacinto.

It happens, incidentally, that John Berry was also my great-great grandfather.

Following his military service, Audie Murphy wrote the book, "To Hell and Back," and acted the leading role in a movie taken from that publication. He became widely acclaimed as an actor.

The June 1 issue of the Washington Post carried a featured report on Murphy's death, along with his great military record. Pertinent portions of the article follow:

Murphy, who was born on a tenant farm in Texas, rose to fame in World War II as the boyish looking soldier who won 24 citations for his battlefield deeds, including the Medal of Honor, the nation's highest.

From there, he entered a checkered career in Hollywood, made a number of movie successes and many failures, married twice, suffered numerous financial setbacks and tangled with the law at least three times.

He wrote an autobiographical book called "To Hell and Back," then starred in a movie version of it.

In the war, he had won almost every medal available to an infantryman and won a battlefield commission.

Murphy became the nation's war idol when, on a winter afternoon in France, he climbed atop a burning tank destroyer loaded with explosives to hold off an advancing company of Germany infantry with a .50-caliber machine gun.

The Medal of Honor citation he received for the act said:

"He was alone and exposed to German fire from three sides, but his deadly fire killed dozens of Germans and caused their infantry attack to waver."

Infantryman Anthony V. Abramski, who witnessed the event, said later:

"The fight that Lt. Murphy put up was the greatest display of guts and courage I have ever seen. There is only one in a million who would be willing to stand up on a burning vehicle, loaded up with explosives, and hold around 250 raging Krauts for an hour and do all that when he was wounded."

The world has changed and so perhaps has its concept of wartime heroism since those days. Last December, Murphy was asked for his views about Lt. William L. Calley, court martialed on charges of murdering civilians in Vietnam.

"I'm not saying Calley's innocent or guilty," he said, "but there's no excuse for the kind of behavior he's accused of unless he was following orders. If orders came from above, then he's guilty of nothing. That's what a soldier is supposed to do—follow orders."

Murphy often said his combat marksmanship originated from his days on the tenant farm when he had to shoot Texas jackrabbits for the table. The family was so poor, he said, that he often could afford only one cartridge at a time.

"I just couldn't afford to miss," he said. Born in Kingston, Tex., on June 20, 1924, he was turned down by the Marines as too

small and failed to become a paratrooper. He was assigned to the Army's 3d Division as a replacement trooper, serving first in North Africa and later in France.

He was wounded three times in France. He won the Distinguished Service Cross on D-Day when, enraged by the Germans' use of a white flag to lure a friend into exposing his position, he stormed alone up a hill and killed or captured the enemy troops who were there.

He was commissioned a lieutenant on the battlefield and mustered out of the Army as a captain. He wanted to become a career soldier but was turned down after being classified as 50 per cent disabled because of his wounds.

CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING— ITS INCIDENCE

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

Mr. RYAN, Mr. Speaker, childhood lead poisoning is the scourge of America's slums. Its victims are the small children—almost none of them older than 6—who pick up lead-tainted paint and plaster chips which have fallen from the walls and ceilings of their dilapidated apartments and homes and then eat them. Over months, the lead these youngsters ingest accumulates—a child eating daily a few small leaded chips no larger than the size of an adult's thumbnail for about 3 months or longer, can develop clinical symptoms of lead poisoning. The ultimate result? Death, cerebral palsy, blindness, kidney impairment, brain damage.

The Bureau of Community Environmental Management, a division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has estimated the number of children suffering from lead poisoning at 250,000 to 400,000. Two hundred children will die this year; 800 will suffer permanent institutionalization; 3,200 will suffer moderate to severe brain damage.

In other words, childhood lead poisoning is a national calamity. As Dr. Jane S. Lin-Fu has written in "Childhood Lead Poisoning . . . An Eradicable Disease," published in Children's magazine, the January-February 1970 issue:

(T)his man-made disease exists in epidemic proportions in many cities.

Only last week, the Washington, D.C., newspapers reported the findings of a survey of some 350 children tested for lead poisoning in the District's model cities area. Some 10 percent have a higher lead concentration in their bodies than is considered safe. City health officials estimate that as high as 10 percent of the 50,000 children who live in old houses in the District of Columbia might have high lead levels.

Similar situations exist in our other major cities.

In New York City:

It is estimated that there are 120,000 endangered children . . . At any one moment, we might have 10,000 children with blood lead levels over 0.06 mg. percent . . . (McCloughlin, M. C., "Two Health Problems: One Solution," Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, Volume 46, p. 454, June, 1970).

In Chicago:

The total number of children living in these areas of the age group at risk for lead poisoning is about 150,000. (Blanksma, L. A., et al., "Incidence of High Blood Lead Levels in Chicago Children," *Pediatrics*, Volume 44, pp. 661-67, November, 1969).

In Philadelphia:

According to the 1960 census, Health Districts 1, 4, 5, and 6 (the lead belt), had 86,000 children in the age group considered (1-6 years). (Philadelphia Department of Public Health, Record of Community Meeting on Prevention of Childhood Lead Poisoning, April 22, 1970).

In Newark:

Based on the 1960 census, over two thirds of the approximately 40,000 Newark children in the age group 1-5 years reside in housing typical of lead poisoning environments. (Browder, A., "Epidemiologic Notes and Reports, Lead Poisoning—Newark, New Jersey," *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, Volume 19, page 358, September 12, 1970).

Lead poisoning is not a disease limited to the older cities of the Northeast. In the past 10 years, cases of lead poisoning have been reported in 26 different States. In 1970, new cases or pilot programs have been reported in: St. Louis, Mo.; Kansas City, Mo.; Portland, Maine; New Orleans, La.; Providence, R.I.; Norfolk, Va.; San Francisco, Calif.; Boston, Mass.; Dallas, Tex., and Charleston, S.C.

Childhood lead poisoning is indeed a silent epidemic across this land.

RECOGNITION OF A VALUABLE RESOURCE—THE MEDIC

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

Mr. GUDE, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress a reply I received last week from Philip J. Rutledge, Director of the Department of Human Resources in the District of Columbia. The subject of our communication was the establishment of a program for paramedics in the District.

I trust that many of you saw our colleague, Mr. ROSENTHAL's insertion last week about such a program in Washington State. He stressed the critical manpower shortage in medicine, urging we begin to alleviate it now, with similar programs in other States.

By merely taking advantage of the training thousands of medical corpsmen, discharged each year by the armed services, we can actually kill two birds with one stone—we can remedy the present physician shortage throughout the country, while at the same time, providing worthwhile vital employment for the increasing number of veterans returning from Southeast Asia.

This year 40,000 servicemen with paramedical and dental specialties will be separated from the armed services. These women and men have had medical training during their service tours. They have worked as skilled technicians in service hospitals and can probably perform many tasks, by virtue of experience, as well as many doctors.

The paramedic would not be competitive with the physicians, but would rath-

er work with the doctors and handle routine procedures such as setting casts, suturing, vaccinations, or basic examining and thereby freeing the physicians for the more demanding tasks requiring their special attention.

It is ironic that these men are given medical responsibility day in and day out at Fort Meade, and yet are not utilized in the same skills when they step across the street and off the base. The tragedy is that the services that they are capable of performing are in such urgent demand today, not only in the District of Columbia or small rural towns in Washington but in every corner of America.

The letter from Mr. Rutledge follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1971.

HON. GILBERT GUDE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUDE: Your letter of April 28, 1971 concerning the utilization of paramedics is indeed timely for our department.

We are in the process of requesting a grant from the National Institute of Health to broaden the training program that we have begun at D.C. General Hospital. As you know, this is a teaching hospital that has students and professors from Howard University Medical School, Georgetown University Medical School, and George Washington Medical School.

At present, we have 13 trainees in this program of which all are veterans. These employees are being trained by the regular teaching physicians and, at present, are being utilized as Physicians' Assistants in the following services: All medical services; and Emergency Room.

We are discussing with the Washington Technical Institute, the establishment of an Associate Arts Degree for the participants. As the program develops, we would envision a Baccalaureate Degree for more advanced work.

It is our desire to broaden this program and it is to this end that we are requesting the grant from the National Institutes of Health. A copy of this project is enclosed for your information.

We hope this program will be a model for the nation. Since the paramedical employees would be working side by side with medical students and interns, the experience at D.C. General Hospital could have nationwide impact as these students enter practice in other localities.

One serious problem is the need for stipends for the students who are in training to be Physicians' Assistants. The grant we are requesting will establish the program, but it will not provide for stipends.

Thank you for your interest. If at any time you would like to talk with the individuals involved in this program, we will be pleased to arrange a visit or a meeting.

Sincerely,

PHILIP J. RUTLEDGE,
Director.

BILL BATES CENTER FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS

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

Mr. MORSE, Mr. Speaker, for those of us who knew Bill Bates as a dear friend and as an outstanding and devoted Member of this Chamber, the words of Msgr. John E. Mullarkey, spoken at the opening

of the Bates Center for Public Affairs at the State College at Salem, Mass., will bring back fond memories.

For those who did not have the honor and the immense enjoyment of knowing and working with Bill, these remarks, delivered by the former pastor of Saint Pius V Rectory of Lynn, Mass., for whom Bill used to serve Mass when he was a young boy, will impart some measure of the profound respect and the love which was felt for this good man by everyone who knew him, and some measure of his dedication, his energy, his wisdom, and his ability.

Certainly it is a fitting memorial to Bill and to the goals and principles for which he worked so hard and so long, that the Center for Public Affairs at Salem will bear his name. He contributed greatly to its inception, and I know his name will serve as an inspiration to all those dedicated to the continued development of the Center as a forum for discussion and learning.

It is with a deep sense of regret that Bill Bates is no longer with us, but with the greatest pride in having known his friendship and wise counsel for so many wonderful years, that I share with my colleagues today, this moving tribute:

EULOGY ON OCCASION OF OPENING OF THE BATES CENTER FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS—MASSACHUSETTS STATE COLLEGE AT SALEM, APRIL 30, 1971

(By Rev. Msgr. John E. Mullarkey)

We are gathered today to pay reverent tribute to the memory of our beloved friend, William Henry Bates.

Death is an uncontested fact of life that knows of no exceptions. Rich and poor, great and simple, all must accept it as inevitable without dispute. To some it can be the greatest of life's humiliations, filled with embarrassment and frustration. To others it may mean merely the passing from the present life into an entirely novel and unknown existence. But to the man of faith death is not just a separation and the termination of earthly existence—no—it is the fulfillment of the things he believes in and of the things he hopes for.

There is no death for those who live in the Lord. From the day of our Baptism we begin to live in the House of the Lord and our lives are up in His. The longing to see Him and be with Him begins then and never ends. It is not for us to wait until the moment of death to see Christ. Rather, when we come to that hour, we bring a life spent in the presence of God as we have seen Him in the people with whom we have spent our lives. His voice has spoken to us in the forgiving words of others. We have been His hands as we have tried to heal and to clothe and to feed. We will find Christ if we look for Him in the strange sudden, unexpected places of His choosing.

I stood across the grave from Bill on that lonely November day almost twenty-two years ago when his beloved father was laid to rest. I could see the tears glistening in his eyes and his lips moved in prayer and I remember, as vividly as though it were yesterday, as he nodded his head and gave every indication of a man who had made a decision and I have always felt that it was at that moment that this strapping, exceptionally handsome young Naval officer made the pledge that committed him to picking up and carrying the torch that had been snatched so abruptly from his father's hands.

How superbly he was equipped for the task. Born of God-fearing and God-loving parents, the third child in a family of eight, his home was a sanctuary of love and devotion. His brother and sisters were all united

in a remarkable sense of unity that was firmly planted and cultivated by the word and example of his beloved father and mother.

His religious profession was genuine and sincere. Respect and esteem for his Church was part of his daily living and went hand in hand with his love and devotion for his family, his fellowman and his country.

He was endowed by God with great natural gifts, a fine mind—a magnificent physique—a handsome countenance—a ready smile that caused his face to beam with friendliness as he responded to the impulses of his warm and generous heart. Men could differ with him strongly but none ever questioned his integrity or his honor. For over nineteen years he served the people—his friends—his neighbors—in the Sixth Congressional District with fidelity and distinction.

For thirty-three years the Bates family, George J. and William H., distinguished father and son, gave devoted, intelligent unselfish service. Humble men of deep conviction and unshaken integrity, they were beloved and respected by all whose concern they had made their own.

They have left to their family the legacy of honored and respected names. And though the days and months of separation have increased, their loyal and never-forgetting family will look with tear stained eyes but with full confidence to our all loving Father, trusting always in the promise of our Savior, "I am the resurrection and the life—he who believes in Me although he be dead shall live and everyone who believes and trusts in Me shall never die."

May God grant His peace to the generous, compassionate souls of George J. and William Henry Bates.

ARMED FORCES DRUG ABUSE CONTROL ACT OF 1971

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, in connection with the subject about which I am going to speak.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, I introduced H.R. 8216, "The Armed Forces Drug Abuse Control Act of 1971," which is designed to remedy the rapidly escalating drug abuse problem within the Armed Forces. Since I filed the bill, a tremendous amount of interest in it has been demonstrated by other Members of Congress, by returned veterans, by the news media, and by the public generally.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HEBERT), the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has assured me that the committee will consider scheduling hearings on my bill and the general subject of drug abuse in the military after it has determined the position of the Department of Defense on the subject. The chairman stated that something must be done, and done immediately about this tragic and rapidly growing problem.

Today, I am pleased to reintroduce my

bill with the support of 45 additional sponsors. These cosponsors include: The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BARDILLO), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE), the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CLANCY), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLINS), the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. CORDOVA), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. CORTER), the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EILBERG), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FORSYTHE), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GALLAGHER), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. GRASSO), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER), the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HELSTOSKI), the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON), the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), the gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS), the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MCCLORY), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADDE), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McDONALD), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MCKINNEY), the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER), the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. NIX), the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL), the gentleman from California (Mr. REES), the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN), the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK), the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT), the gentleman from California (Mr. WILSON), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. YATRON).

During his press conference last night, President Nixon spoke of the growing problem of drug abuse. I was pleased to hear him say that a corrective program "insofar as veterans are concerned, means treating them where they are addicted to heroin or hard drugs before releasing them." The President's support for this concept is crucial for this is the main thrust of this legislation, and I am hopeful that Congress will act speedily on my bill knowing that effective drug abuse control in the military is not a partisan issue.

Our bill would set up a Drug Abuse Control Corps within each branch of the armed services to offer drug education and rehabilitative treatment for servicemen. The bill would prohibit any person from being tried for an offense involving the possession or use of any narcotic drug if, before a court martial was convened, he voluntarily agreed to undergo the treatment and rehabilitation recommended by the Drug Corps.

In addition, no serviceman with a drug abuse problem could be discharged until he was adjudged free from drug dependency by competent medical authorities. This provision would protect the addicted serviceman as well as the civilian society to which he would eventually return. Since a serviceman could not be discharged for drug abuse, he would not run the risk of receiving a dishonorable discharge for a problem which, under the circumstances, should be treated medically rather than punitively.

Likewise, if a serviceman was discharged free of addiction to narcotic drugs, he would not bring home an expensive habit which he would most probably support by regular criminal activity. By placing full responsibility for treatment of drug abuse on the military services themselves, the current madness of allowing military addicts to reenter civilian life with dishonorable discharges which prevent them from being treated in veterans' hospitals, would be promptly halted.

I have recently learned from Dr. M. J. Musser, Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery, that the veterans' hospitals will be able to treat an estimated 6,000 drug dependent veterans in the next 2 years. When one considers that according to the Hagan report, approximately 25,000 men are drug dependent in Vietnam alone, the facilities that will be available to veterans, even after July 1, 1971, are obviously totally inadequate.

In April, at the biannual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Caracas, Venezuela, my resolution, which was co-sponsored by representatives from France, Turkey, and Thailand, and called for international cooperation in the cultivation and export of dangerous narcotic drugs, received unanimous approval. It is clear that this dangerous drug problem must be confronted on many levels—the domestic as well as the international, the military as well as the civilian.

The military drug abuse problem cannot remain hidden from view in the Pentagon closet any longer. This monumental and much ignored problem must be brought home to the public in order to get public support for the expensive measures needed for control. The bill which my cosponsors and I are introducing today offers an intelligent and reasonable remedy for an epidemic which is ravaging our enlisted men. Unless something is done immediately, the drug will have the power to wipe out thousands of potentially productive young men who have served in the Armed Forces.

The Hagan Armed Services Subcommittee has done an excellent job in defining the extent of the drug abuse problem within the military. Now, however, it is time to move to action and to help our servicemen before it is too late—for them and for us.

I have taken the floor today to call to public attention the critical nature of the military's drug abuse problem. I ask all of my colleagues to support this very important bill.

Our bill has received favorable comment from the press and from a number of my constituents. I include several ar-

ticles, editorials, and letters in the RECORD at this time:

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1971]

THE HANGOVER OF WAR

(By James Reston)

The quickest way for an American soldier to avoid combat in Vietnam and get back home these days is to take the drugs. If he's hooked on heroin, he's finished—finished with fighting, finished with the Army, a casualty of the war, finished with everything but the drug habit.

This is one of those tragic consequences of war where, in Nikita Khrushchev's vivid phrase, the living may envy the dead. Retiring Army Secretary Stanley Resor recently testified that between 10 and 15 per cent of the American troops in Vietnam have a serious heroin habit, and this is at best an official guess—at least 20,000 and maybe twice the number in the American Expeditionary force are now in danger of drug addiction.

The facts and military regulations of this problem are alarmingly vague. President Nixon has conceded that the problem exists. The military authorities have established a rehabilitation program to deal with it. Extreme cases of drug addiction are compelled to join the program, but the easy way in dubious cases is merely to get the man home and out of the service.

Getting them out of the service at least blurs and disperses the problem. If the soldier wants out and does not volunteer for the drug rehabilitation program, the veterans hospitals are not full of addicts, but the soldier is thrown back on his own with an expensive habit he cannot cure or afford.

Divided as the nation is about the war, confused as it is about past and present war objectives, the country ought to be able to agree about rescuing the men who were drafted into the battle, and giving them the health and jobs essential to a decent life. This is not being done now. Rehabilitation and employment centers are being established, the problems of the veteran drug-addict and the veteran unemployed are recognized in Washington, but the sick and unemployed casualties of the war are not really being dealt with effectively.

One of the major drug problems of the American soldier in Vietnam is that heroin in Southeast Asia is strong, easy to get and taken by smoking, rather than by needle, and cheap. It eases the agony of combat, and promises home-leave if it gets beyond control. But hooked on this powerful cheap stuff in Vietnam, a discharged veteran in any normal American community has the means neither of curing the habit nor of affording the habit, without stealing.

The Nixon Administration has not been indifferent to the menace of drugs in America. It has tried to get at the problem at the source. It has used its political and economic power to cut off the supply of drugs in Turkey, Lebanon and elsewhere in the Middle East. It has worked effectively with the Pompidou Government in Paris to break up the processing of drugs in Marseilles and elsewhere in the Mediterranean. It has trebled the number of agents watching the drug trade across the Mexican border and through customs at the international airports in this country, and it has poured Federal money and manpower into breaking up the drug peddlers in this country.

But in Vietnam, where it has much more control over both the peddlers and the soldiers, the Nixon Administration has not been effective. In Saigon, at least, it has much more authority than it has used to attack the source of drugs, to intervene in the drug corruption, which reaches into the highest levels of the Saigon Government, and to insist that the American soldiers, who are the casualties of the war-drug culture, go into the drug-rehabilitation program.

More than that, the Administration has not cooperated in a serious, private examination of the Vietnam drug problem with the Congress. Nobody on Capitol Hill expects the President to approve public hearings on the question, but serious men in the Congress, both critics and defenders of the President's Vietnam policy, have urged him, without success, to get at the facts of drug addiction among the soldiers, and cooperate in legislation to deal with the drug casualties of the war.

This is so serious a problem that, unlike most political issues in Washington, it is beyond politics. Both parties, all factions for and against the Nixon policy of "winding down the war," agree on the human tragedy of drug addiction among the soldiers in Vietnam, and the dangers of sending them back home before they are cured, but this is what is happening. To save their lives by avoiding combat, many of the Americans in Vietnam are ruining their lives by drugs, and are being sent home to families and communities that have no means to cure or even understand the tragedy of their returning sons.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, May 24, 1971]

CURE THE ADDICTS FIRST

Some day when America counts up the terrible costs of our mistaken intervention in the Vietnamese War, we may come to a startling conclusion.

It is that after the high cost in death and maiming, the next most damaging effect of the war was its stimulation of the drug culture in this country.

The country has been aware for a long time of the large numbers of soldiers introduced to marijuana in Vietnam. The use in this country has spread rapidly with the progress of the war. (This week, a top senior among 15 expelled from Annapolis on drug charges said an investigation showed nearly one-fourth of the 4,300-man brigade at the U.S. Naval Academy smokes marijuana regularly.)

And now it's deadly heroin. A new study revealed that the use of heroin by U.S. troops in Vietnam has reached epidemic proportions.

The figure heard most often in Vietnam is that about 10 to 15 per cent of enlisted men use heroin. That would represent about 37,000 men. But some officers working in drug control believe the total may be 60,000, and some field surveys have reported units with 50 per cent of their men on the drug.

The army is now working to cut off the flow of cheap drugs and is establishing rehabilitation centers. But there's also a need for Congress to approve a bill introduced by Rep. John S. Monagan, D-Conn.

It would require the Army to certify that servicemen being discharged were free from drug addiction, thus keeping addicts in the service where rehabilitation and treatment can be administered.

Unless this bill is passed, tens of thousands of addicts will be discharged—time bombs walking the streets in search of ways to maintain a \$700-a-day habit. If that happens, the terror of this war really will be visited upon the streets of American cities.

[From the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times, May 17, 1971]

MONAGAN BILL ON MILITARY ADDICTS

The military services, after placing thousands of young Americans in surroundings which expose them to hard drugs, particularly in Southeast Asia, have too often followed the old routine of the easy way out when servicemen acquire a drug habit.

The easy way out is to discharge addicts as quickly as possible, often with other than honorable discharges. That puts the burden on the local communities to which the former servicemen return.

Fifth District Congressman John S. Monagan has filed a bill which would require the military services to take positive steps to control the drug abuse problems in and around military bases.

It would further require that no member of the armed forces, who becomes addicted to a narcotic drug while on active service, could be separated from service until he receives treatment and is judged free from habitual dependence on such drugs.

One would think that it would not take a law to get the military service to discharge their obvious obligation to their own members and to the community at large.

But they haven't. And that's why the Monagan bill should receive early and favorable action in Congress.

[From the Waterbury American, May 19, 1971]

MONAGAN FIGHTS DRUGS

U.S. Rep. John S. Monagan has recommended extreme measures to overcome the growing problem of drug-addicted veterans returning from Vietnam. There will be the "friends" of the Armed Services who will decry his proposal as unworkable.

The only thing wrong with Monagan's proposal is that it is necessary in the first place. His three-fold bill would force the branches of the Armed Forces to establish drug abuse control divisions; would prohibit any veteran from being released from the service while an addict, and prohibit any addict from being court-martialed if he voluntarily agrees to undergo treatment.

Drug abuse by members of the Armed Forces in Vietnam could never have reached today's proportions were it not for the closed-eyes attitude on the part of Americans in that country. There have been all too many congressional reports (ask U.S. Rep. Robert Steele of Connecticut what he saw on his recent trip) of drug abuse that has been ignored.

During World War II officers found it pos-

sible to put areas off limits if they were found detrimental to troop morale. It's strange that officers don't know how (or don't care to) crack down on the free access of drugs in Vietnam. There are reports that Americans cannot raid civilian areas where drugs are being sold without being accompanied by Vietnamese police.

Why do officials in Washington permit the corruption in the Saigon government to continue without taking drastic action?

If President Nixon believes that we must remain in Vietnam—and his reasoning appears valid—then he must order the Armed Forces to put a halt to the massive use of drugs by the troops. He must force the Saigon government to crack down on its civilian offenders.

There are only two possible alternatives. One would be the complete seclusion of American troops from every area of civilian life in Vietnam (that means no civilian bars, movies, gambling houses, girls, stores) or a complete withdrawal of our troops.

This nation cannot permit its youth to be corrupted by the failure of both its own officers and the officials of a "friendly" government to ignore the drug problem.

For every protest which Monagan receives from the military concerning the severity of his proposals, he should ask: What have you done to make it unnecessary to pass such legislation?

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1971.
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: I am pleased to respond to your inquiry of May 12 regarding the treatment the Veterans Administration is providing for drug addicts.

We agree with you that the problem of drug addiction among Vietnam veterans is a growing one. The enclosed chart reveals the alarming escalation that has occurred

since fiscal year 1969, from a total of 183 cases among the under 35 age group in the last three quarters of that year to a total of 2,194 cases during the first three quarters of this fiscal year. The unexpectedly huge increase in numbers of servicemen being released with drug problems has made our original plans inadequate, but we are stepping up our programs to the limit of our resources.

The VA has embarked on a special medical program of treatment of drug dependent veterans. Thirty special treatment units are planned nationwide by fiscal year 1973. The first five are in operation now, one in each VA medical region, and the next twelve will begin after July 1, 1971. Units will be located in existing VA hospitals and treatment will be on a voluntary basis for eligible veterans. If resources permit, we plan to be able to treat an estimated 6,000 drug dependent veterans in the next two years, with each unit reaching an average caseload of 200 patients with an average of 15 beds per unit for necessary in-hospital care.

In addition to the special drug treatment units, many veterans with drug problems will be helped in other VA hospitals, especially in the acute withdrawal stages. After initial treatment at these hospitals, they will be referred to an appropriate addiction facility.

Hospitalization for drug cases usually lasts four to six weeks, followed by a prolonged period of out-patient care. Various treatment modalities will be used including methadone maintenance, confrontation and other group approaches, and social and vocational rehabilitation techniques.

The pressure for treatment of the literally thousands of new cases of drug dependence makes it imperative that the VA increase its efforts, as the available drug facilities of the nation are inadequately prepared to serve the numbers involved. We assure you that every effort will be made to provide for the needs of returning Vietnam veterans.

Sincerely yours,
M. J. MUSSER, M.D.,
Chief Medical Director.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION: VETERANS DISCHARGED WITH PRINCIPAL OR ASSOCIATED DIAGNOSES OF DRUG DEPENDENCE COMPARISON OF 3 QUARTERS, FISCAL YEAR 1969 (OCT. 1-JUNE 30) AND FISCAL YEAR 1971 (JULY 1-MAR. 31)

Drugs involved (some cases represented in more than 1 category)	Age										Total	
	Under 25		25 to 34		35 to 44		45 to 54		Over 55		1969	1971
	1969	1971	1969	1971	1969	1971	1969	1971	1969	1971		
Amphetamines.....	3	63	4	46	9	43	4	20	1	3	21	175
Barbiturates.....	3	84	4	55	14	77	16	90	10	31	47	337
Hallucinogens.....	12	188	0	66	1	6	1	3	0	1	14	264
Marihuana.....	5	142	6	58	0	14	0	0	0	0	11	214
Opiates (and derivatives).....	32	655	53	434	64	308	37	190	16	60	202	1,647
Tranquilizers.....	0	5	1	9	5	31	13	28	3	15	22	88
Other sedatives.....	18	230	42	159	60	128	66	202	29	67	215	786
Total.....	73	1,367	110	827	153	607	137	533	59	177	532	3,511

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MONAGAN: Congratulations on your alert sensitivity to our problem of GI drug addiction. Best of luck with your rehab program.

Sincerely,
R. W. NASH.

ANSONIA, CONN.,
May 14, 1971.

Congressman JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This morning's news broadcast focussed upon your newly-introduced bill re discharge of drug-addicted servicemen.

It sounds like an excellent, thoughtful proposal and one which protects the best interests of both the community and the men who have succumbed to addiction as their own private way out of a despicable,

mindless war. Now, please work to stop the war, too.

Respectfully yours,
GILLETTE C. STANTON.

STAMFORD, CONN.
Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MONAGAN: I have just read about your interest in establishing a special corps for dealing with the problem of drug addiction of servicemen. The problems of any serviceman returning to civilian life are at best stressing and can be most difficult depending on the individual, but for a drug dependent veteran, his medical and personal problems must be tremendous.

I, therefore support your effort to develop a medical unit to attempt to return a person to society who does not have a drug

problem to contend with after having served his country.

Further, we must make a supreme effort to develop drug control and prevention procedures. It is obvious that curing is less satisfactory than prevention. I would think that the military establishment would be as ideal as any for development of preventative techniques.

Finally, just as a child does not learn family pride without participating in family responsibility, so I feel that the young people will have difficulty developing pride in their country without giving or participating for themselves. This is indeed the essence of pride and the forerunner of vision. I therefore feel that a universal obligation to participate in some phase of our country's struggle should be the rule rather than the exception.

Sincerely,
PHILIP J. BAUER, D.M.D.

MAY 15, 1971.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: Congratulations on your fight to make the Armed Forces responsible for rehabilitation of drug users.

Sincerely,

Mrs. RUTH L. BRIGHT.

MAY 26, 1971.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We strongly endorse the bill requiring servicemen being discharged to be free from drug addiction.

Your truly,

PAUL MITCHELL,
LILLIAN MITCHELL.WATERBURY, CONN.,
May 19, 1971.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I strongly support your three-fold bill to:

1. force the branches of the Armed Forces to establish drug abuse control divisions,
2. prohibit any veteran from being discharged from the service while an addict, and
3. prohibit any addict from being court-martialed if he voluntarily agrees to undergo treatment.

If this bill was reported correctly in our local newspaper, then I am behind it and you 100%. My brother returned from Vietnam all messed up because of drugs, and narrowly escaped being dishonorably discharged because of an arrest connected with this. Men away from home, lonely and fighting a war which no one seems to want any more, are very susceptible to drug use. It's about time we decided to help them.

As my brother says, "Right on, sir!"

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. ROBERT CATHERINE J. GAGNON.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1971.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: Your letter dated May 19, 1971 addressed to our National Commander has been referred to us for reply.

First, may I take this opportunity to express our organization's gratification in the deep interest that you have manifested in the drug abuse problem in our Armed Services. I can assure you that any veteran who has this problem and comes to our attention, that we will certainly advise him as you requested in your letter.

Thanking you again for your efforts in behalf of these unfortunate servicemen, I am

Respectfully yours,

JOHN J. KELLER,
National Service Director.ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
May 24, 1971.

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The St. Petersburg Times of May 24, 1971, ran an article on the editorial page captioned "Cure the Addicts First."

Your name was mentioned in the article as sponsoring a bill which would require the Army (why not all branches of the service) to certify that servicemen being discharged were free from drug addiction, thus keeping addicts in the service where rehabilitation and treatment can be administered.

May I congratulate you for sponsoring such a most necessary bill. If you would inform me of the number of the bill, I will be most happy to contact the congressmen from Florida and request that they give your bill full support.

Very truly yours,

S. E. LENDER.

WEST HARTFORD, CONN.,

May 16, 1971.

HON. JOHN MONAGAN,
House of Representatives, U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: Today I read the "Hartford Courant's" lead article about your proposed legislation regarding drug addicted servicemen. The bill seems simple and to the point. To simply dishonorably discharge the boy is not only a waste of humanity but another "washing of hands," the traditional disclaimer of responsibility.

Certainly the serviceman cannot be relieved of his responsibility for the problem he directly created. Requiring he be retained in the service until he is cured, should strengthen his resolution to be cured.

Civilian society has yet to find its own solutions to the drug problem. The military should not be allowed to compound this problem.

Your bill is the first new constructive solution that I'm aware of. I applaud your efforts.

Very truly yours,

SIEGFRIED T. RUNGE.

DOCTORS DIAGNOSTIC LABORATORY, INC.,
May 18, 1971.

Congressman JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: The Legislation which you have just introduced requiring the Armed Forces to treat and rehabilitate young men addicted to drugs before their release from the service is both excellent and timely.

In my own office we have begun to see an increasing number of young people ill due to drug use, and the seriousness of the situation is all too apparent.

You are to be commended for this thoughtful measure; its passage into law will be a significant step toward averting a potentially dangerous problem.

With warmest personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

BERYL B. WEINSTEIN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

HON. JOHN MONAGAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: We are in favor of your legislation requiring certification that servicemen are free of drug addiction before discharge. Please let us know of your progress.

Mr. and Mrs. M. B. MILLER.

DANBURY, CONN.,
May 24, 1971.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: Thank you for your admirable and much needed bill requiring our Military Services to take positive steps to control drug abuse problems of servicemen—and to insure treatment of drug addicts before discharge from service—including a complete cure. This bill should get a 100 per cent vote in passing. With best wishes for its—and for your combined success.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. E. SAVERY.

[From the Hartford Courant, May 16, 1971]

MONAGAN DRUG BILL MAY JAR MILITARY

(By Barbara Carlson)

WASHINGTON.—A drug abuse bill that was quietly introduced in the House by U.S. Rep. John S. Monagan, D-5th Dist., is a radically innovative bill that could turn out to be a bombshell for the military.

The bill, Monagan said in an interview, came largely as a gut reaction—a reaction,

the Congressman said as he clenched his fist, that "something has to be done."

Monagan said he was prompted to write the bill largely because of his recent discussions with Vietnam veterans about the drug situation and also because of his correspondence with the parents of a Connecticut veteran who returned home suffering the agonies of drug withdrawal.

The bill has two major provisions—both controversial. One is the establishment of a Drug Abuse Control Corps in each section of the military—the Army, the Navy, the Air Force. Each corps would attempt to prevent drug addiction through education and training, would rehabilitate addicts and would enforce elimination of the drug supply.

Another provision, and the one most likely to set off lightning bolts from all sides, says that no member of an armed force who is a narcotics addict may be separated from service until "such time as he is adjudged by competent medical authority to be free of any habitual dependence on narcotic drugs."

And yet another section of the bill states that no person in the services shall be tried for an offense involving possession or use of a narcotic if he voluntarily agrees to undergo treatment before a court-martial is convened.

That last provision should not shake up the Army too much but the Marine Corps, it is said is adamant about drug users and discharges them dishonorably if they are discovered. The Army has an amnesty program through which drug users may turn themselves in for treatment and suffer no punishment.

ANOTHER MATTER

Keeping addicted persons in the service until he is drug-free is another matter.

There is, first of all, the legality of the matter.

A public information officer with the Department of the Army stated flatly that "you can't legally keep somebody two days" after his term of service is up.

Monagan's bill would have to overturn this law.

And it would also have to change the entire concept of the Army, according to other sources.

A psychiatrist in the Army's Office of the Surgeon General said the provision to rehabilitate drug addicts before they can be separated would demand "a change in the mission of the Army."

The Army, he said, has been structured as a "single-mission operation"—and that mission has not been rehabilitation.

The psychiatrist was dubious about the efficiency of attempting to get someone off drugs who doesn't want to give up drugs—but, he said, involuntary rehabilitation "might work if you lock up a man for a couple of years. But this would make it a pseudo crime and the Army is not funded to do this . . . The Army is funded not to rehabilitate but to fight wars."

MANY QUESTIONS

There are, then, questions about the mission of the Army—should the Army be in the business of social rehabilitation? and questions about the legality of keeping men after their term of service is up. And there are medical questions about the possibility of achieving success where a man is required to go off drugs when he doesn't want to.

The last question has as many answers as there are psychiatrists. One psychiatrist in the Veterans Administration said the theory that involuntary treatment wouldn't work is an "old bugaboo."

Rep. Monagan takes the view that his bill "involves recasting our thinking." With the drug problem of "epidemic proportions," he said, "we've got to revise our attitudes."

Before April 24, the day of peaceful demonstrations in Washington against the Vietnam war, veterans camped in the nation's

capital and talked to congressmen—among them Monagan. The veterans, Monagan said, were distressed at the handling of drug users in Vietnam, at the "inadequacy, the absence, of any real constructive arrangements to take care of them (addicts)."

PERSONAL ELEMENT

And the "personal element" in a case brought to the congressman's attention also had a big part in moving him to present his bill—which would be officially the "Armed Forces Drug Abuse Control Act of 1971."

A letter from the parents of a 19-year-old veteran said that the young man returned home, separated from the Army, at 10:30 one night last January. By 3 a.m., the letter says, the parents were "half dragging and half carrying the withering and pain-racked body of our son, who by this time had admitted to us that he was addicted to heroin and had been using it for the past nine months."

The young soldier had been discharged administratively before his tour of duty was finished.

WROTE TO MONAGAN

The parents wrote Monagan, "Does the government owe men no explanation?" They asked Monagan to look into the matter "to save another child from someday being thrown into this situation."

One response the congressman received from his questions to the Army about this addicted youth included this statement, "To be completely candid, the Army is still struggling with effective ways to deal with the drug abuse problem."

Monagan seemed pleased with the response to the bill. It has been mentioned favorably on national television and radio.

And Congress seems in the mood to support some sort of funding for increased care for servicemen who become addicted to narcotics.

(Monagan hasn't made an estimate of what implementation of his bill would cost; it would involve, he said, "personnel costs and possibly some construction." An Army officer estimated that, for the Army alone, the cost of increased personnel to care for addicts would run to \$7 million a year.)

CHANGE OF VIEWS

There are enormous problems involved in changing the entire traditional view of drug addicts, who, strictly speaking, are breaking the law.

There are all kinds of estimates about the number of drug experimenters, drug users and drug addicts in the armed forces and one estimate is about as good as another.

"You can't do epidemiological studies on an illegal disease," an Army psychiatrist noted.

But all signs—and the statistics there are—point to a sizeable increase in the number of drug users in Vietnam in the past year.

Monagan feels there is a "sense of urgency developing."

Whatever the legal, medical and philosophical snags to Monagan's bill, it is nonetheless, the first bill of its type to be presented. The effect, even of its introduction, could be revolutionary.

[From the Connecticut Sunday Herald,
May 30, 1971]

NEWS FROM WASHINGTON
(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—A Vietnam war veteran from Connecticut arrived home recently to enjoy what his family thought would be a joyful homecoming celebration. But a few hours later he was suffering the agonies of drug withdrawal and had to be committed to an insane asylum.

The young man's parents communicated

with Rep. John S. Monagan of Waterbury and urged the Congressman to take action to prevent similar experiences by narcotics addicts in the Service.

The parents wrote Monagan:

"Does the government owe me no explanation?" They asked the congressman to look into the matter "to save another child from someday being thrown into this situation."

In an interview with the Connecticut Sunday Herald, Monagan said:

"I checked into this with the Army and learned that the Veterans Administration did not have a record of this soldier's taking hard drugs, although all the time he was in Vietnam he did so and his parents knew it."

Where does a young man—and there are thousands like him—turn for help?

"There was nothing in this soldier's military record and there should have been," Monagan contends. "Apparently, the Army is looking the other way."

In order to correct this type of situation and deal with the drug hazard confronting military men, Monagan has introduced legislation this week to establish a Drug Abuse Control Corps which would set up and oversee a drug abuse control program for the Armed Forces.

The most important provision of Monagan's bill states that no member of an Armed Force who is adjudged addicted to a narcotic drug by competent medical authorities during his active duty, may be separated from the service until he no longer has any habitual dependence on narcotic drugs.

Monagan said his bill (H.R. 8216) is attracting growing interest and from the House and Senate, and he refilled the bill Wednesday in order to show the measure's cosponsor.

As proof of the seriousness of the drug problem in the military, Monagan cited a recent drug report by a House Armed Services Subcommittee headed by Rep. Elliott G. Hagan (D-Ga.). The report showed at least 60 per cent and undoubtedly many more of the men in Vietnam habitually use marijuana and up to 10 per cent of our personnel there use hard drugs.

The Congressional Subcommittee found that the heroin problem in Vietnam is increasing in seriousness because abundant supplies of the drug are reaching the area from new processing laboratories in Laos and that there are processing laboratories in Thailand and Hong Kong.

The testimony of interested officers of the various services indicated that investigations of drug cases have doubled each year for the last 3 years.

A total of 69 soldiers died in Vietnam probably from overdoses of drugs, during the first 10 months of 1970. The Army's 25-division study shows that roughly 10 per cent of the men tested presently use hard drugs, Monagan declared:

"Although all of the Armed Services admit that the drug problem exists, the Army has so far been the only service to confront the problem through setting up a program and providing rehabilitation opportunities for the drug user in that branch.

"The Navy, Air Force and Marines take the position that they do not have adequate facilities or personnel to handle this problem," Monagan continued.

"Their solution is to discharge drug users as quickly as possible, and usually with other than honorable discharges."

Monagan was critical of these services' position.

"The attitude of these Services toward drug users allow young men, damaged physically and emotionally by a habit they developed while in the Service, to bring their problems back to civilian life. The inevitable result for the homefront is an increase in drug-related crime."

Although the number of Vietnam veterans involved in drug-related crimes has not been made available by the Pentagon, the Connecticut legislator contended "it is certainly high."

In addition to the provision regarding separation, the Monagan bill provides the military structure in all services with a specialized division, trained to care for the problems of drug addiction within each of the Armed Services.

According to the bill, each Service would establish a Drug Abuse Control Corps that will oversee the drug abuse control program for each branch.

Each corps will include three divisions: an education section designed to prevent those not already addicted to dangerous drugs from developing the inclination to begin; a rehabilitation division designed to rehabilitate those already addicted; and an enforcement section, to eliminate the source of the supply of narcotics now available to members of the American military.

Another provision of the bill states that no person in the Services shall be tried for an offense involving possession or use of a narcotic if he voluntarily agrees to undergo treatment before a court martial is convened.

This last provision is in conflict with Marine Corps policy which is that drug users must be dishonorably discharged if they are discovered. The Army has an amnesty program through which drug users may turn themselves in for treatment and suffer no punishment.

Another matter that would presumably have to be ironed out is that provision of the bill keeping addicted persons in the service until they are drug free.

A Pentagon spokesman said Monagan's bill, if passed, would have to overturn the law which makes it impossible to legally keep anybody in the service after his term is up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. CORDOVA).

Mr. CORDOVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to underline the importance and urgency of legislation to control drug abuse in the Armed Forces. Because my constituency is several times as large as that of any Member of this House, I represent more young men in the Armed Forces than any Member, and as a result, my correspondence reflects the problem of the abuse of drugs in the services.

We all know that it has become increasingly difficult for parents of teenagers to discharge their responsibilities to their children and to the community. But it is shocking to discover that the armed services, after tearing a boy away from his family, may well return him 2 years later, discharged after he has acquired the drug habit while serving overseas.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that so long as the Congress chooses to draft our young men, it has the responsibility of protecting them, not only against enemy bullets and explosives, but also against this equally destructive vice. H.R. 8216 offers an avenue for the Congress to discharge this responsibility, by setting up drug abuse control organizations in each of the services, by providing for treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts instead of court martial, and by providing that no one who becomes addicted in the service may be separated until he is free of any habitual dependence on narcotic drugs.

I strongly support H.R. 8216, and commend it to the consideration of the Members. We cannot continue to wash our hands of responsibility for drug addiction acquired in an environment into which we have thrust our young men without their consent. We must acknowledge this responsibility, and the services should be required by law to acknowledge their own responsibility. The present solution—perhaps a court martial, and a discharge is no solution at all, it is simply a refusal to face the problem, or to accept responsibility. We cannot, we must not, continue to turn our back on those of our young men whom we have helped to place in jeopardy and who have been stricken.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman for his observations and for his support of this legislation and compliment him on the very cogent and pertinent remarks he has just made.

Mr. Speaker, I now am happy to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut, my colleague, Mr. WILLIAM COTTER.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleague and friend, JOHN MONAGAN, in cosponsoring his bill to help our servicemen who become addicted to drugs.

This bill was drafted after the most intensive and serious effort on the part of the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut. JOHN is well known for his concern and effort in the field of drug addiction. His quiet and effective leadership in this area is acknowledged by all those conversant with drug problems.

I do want to take this time explaining the bill which my colleague has so ably done, but I want to stress one part very carefully. There are those who argue that any bill should allow the addicted soldier to voluntarily go to a VA hospital after his service is finished. I do not pretend to be a psychiatrist specializing in drug addiction behavior but, I submit that it is naive to expect most service addicts to voluntarily turn themselves over to a VA hospital. I believe that there should be facilities at VA hospitals to treat veterans, but we must confront this problem as it occurs by keeping the addict under treatment cured with or without his approval.

We must remember that this Nation has two very important obligations in the area of service addicts. First, society must protect itself and, second, and perhaps more humanely, it must help the addicted serviceman. It serves neither society nor the addict to turn him loose to what will probably be a life of crime and his own untimely and tragic death.

It was our distinguished colleague, JOHN MONAGAN, who developed this novel, and necessary concept and put it into legislative form. This brilliant innovation should be enacted quickly and I will work with my colleague for final passage.

The establishment of a Drug Abuse Corps in each of the armed services is the proper approach to combat drug addiction in the armed services. These Drug Abuse Corps will have several missions. First, they will educate servicemen to the perils of drug addiction. Second, they will provide personnel to help the service addict. Finally, they will be re-

quired to police the flow of drugs to our troops.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman for his statement of support and also for his kind remarks about the gentleman in the well with reference to his efforts to enact this legislation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri whose pertinent questions I was very proud and happy to see in the course of the hearings of the Hagan subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services to which I have already referred. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it was the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut's reference to the Hagan subcommittee's hearings over a year's study and recommendations that brings me to my feet.

I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services and, indeed, was the ranking minority member on that subcommittee.

In addition, as the gentleman knows, I am a physician and as has been developed on the floor of the Congress before, have at times in my past experience had the unpleasant duty and responsibility of treating drug addicts.

Be all that as it may, I am delighted to hear the gentleman's comments, and I want to assure the gentleman that I know and respect and revere the blow for liberty that he struck in the Inter-parliamentary Union by having those who had perhaps inadvertently participated in the drug supply and traffic involving the association join him in his most worthwhile resolution. And I hope that it will have untold and very highly effectual results.

Is the gentleman aware, I would ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, if it was the finding of the Subcommittee on Alleged Drug Abuse of the Committee on Armed Services, that overall the proportion in service, regardless of the corps, or regardless of the armed services, was just about proportionate to the problem in the interim phase between high school and college students? And that in the findings of the Committee on Alleged Drug Abuse that is was remarked that the military and our Republic still must derive from the civilian, and with the percentage of draftees and the known percentage of experimenters or participants among the regular files or the regular corps, that the percentage remained roughly the same as in civilian life?

Mr. MONAGAN. I recall a discussion which the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) had with one of the witnesses, I believe from one of the armed services, in which the questioning was directed along this line. I do not, myself, specifically remember whether there was a finding to this effect or not.

Mr. HALL. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there was, and it was roughly to that effect. It is for that reason that I rise to engage in this colloquy which I think is very excellent. I do not want to decry one whit from anything that the gentleman is do-

ing except to say that, not only were these findings and conclusions reached, but there were specific recommendations in this final report which is now being acted on. And, believing that things equal to the same things are equal to each other—and goodness knows, we will accept all the boost we can get—

Mr. MONAGAN. Yes.

Mr. HALL. But technically, Mr. Speaker, it does involve to some extent the Uniform Code of Military Justice. It involves implementation of the legislative intent of the Congress, and the committee, and certainly of this body. But just for example, if anyone were allowed to withdraw and find amnesty up until the time that the court martial was convened—I believe is the wording the gentleman used a while ago—and also to then be guaranteed maximum benefit of inservice care and treatment, by inservice psychiatrists, by inservice drug treatment specialists, and so forth and so on, it could very easily come to pass that without the rights of retirement, that without the rights of discharge for the benefit of the service, leaving out the question of discharge with honor or without honor, and so forth and so on—and I am keenly interested in this problem also, I will say to the gentleman from Connecticut—that I believe that a man ought to have maximum inservice benefit of medical and hospital care. By the same token, you cannot fill the service with these people being regulated under the right, long after the specifications have been issued, Article of War No. 32 review being carried out, and the charges and, indeed, the decision as to whether or not to convene a court-martial or not, or a convening authority has been set, you cannot give them amnesty and fill the forces up with these people.

I, for one, would not want to have one of them who was liable to have a retroactive LSD hallucination protecting my flank if I was in the frontline at any one point. And we find ourselves getting down to these practical considerations. I wanted to bring these considerations out in addition to the very excellent points the gentleman has in his bill, and has made here on the floor of the Congress.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It certainly demonstrates the degree to which he, both as a Member of Congress and also as a professional medical man, has thought about this very difficult problem.

I do point out in connection with the question of the gentleman with relation to the percentage of addicts in civilian society and those in Vietnam that one disturbing thing that I find in these statistics is the rate of the increase in the number of cases that were under consideration and under investigation, and also the belief that there has been a marked increase in recent times as to the situation in which we find ourselves with relation to the prosecution of the war and the reducing of the members of the armed services who are assigned to Vietnam and also the lack of military activity.

So I certainly agree with the gentleman from Missouri that there are complications in any proposal and that this is not an easy problem to solve and that it must be done with reference to the constitutional rights of the individuals and also with reference to the needs of the armed services to have healthy and vigorous and active members prosecuting their normal jobs, which is that of military service.

And I can sympathize with the position expressed by the Marine Corps for example in saying that they do not have the facilities, and they do not have the personnel to take care of this problem, and that their job is fighting. Well, all I can say is that the country is going to have to make the resources and the personnel available in one way or another, and in my judgment it is better to do it in the manner that the President has indicated he favors, and that is before the time when they are thrown out on the streets, probably with a dishonorable discharge, and they are not able to receive the treatment they need, and they are taking to the sort of street crime that has increased 100 percent in recent years due to narcotics and drugs.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I commend your distinguished colleague from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) and I am pleased to have the opportunity to join as a cosponsor in a far-reaching humanitarian bill.

Individual tragedies for discharged veterans follow in the wake of the tragic events of our military involvements. As our young men return home free of the obligation to serve their country in the Armed Forces, we are finding an alarming and increasing number of them not free of the tragic habits of drug abuse acquired in the Armed Forces and plaguing themselves and their families with the greatest of individual tragedies.

Over on the Virginia side of the Potomac in the huge complex of Pentagon files and records they are a day late and a dollar short on comprehensive statistics on how many of our armed personnel are involved in drug abuses. This is the most serious problem we have to the morale and the shredding discipline of the military, yet the Pentagon has few of the details. Retiring Army Secretary Stanley Resor recently testified that between 10 and 15 percent of our troops in Vietnam have a serious heroin habit. That is 30,000 men. Thirty-five heroin overdose deaths in the first 3 months of this year have been reported in our armed services in Vietnam. Our men in Southeast Asia find heroin, cocaine, and opium in generous supply at bargain prices; the Hagan subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee showed that drug abuses have penetrated all branches of our Armed Forces, both for those stationed in this country and abroad. These and other indications of the widening drug peril dictate that Congress must take immediate action.

As an important step I join in sponsorship of the Armed Forces Drug Control Act of 1971 as a tool to provide treatment, rehabilitation, and prevention programs in each of the armed services. As a cornerstone of the act, each member

of the Armed Forces who seeks treatment to break himself of the drug habit would be granted amnesty for his part in the illegal possession and use of the drug. Contrary to the present policy of discharging servicemen because they are drug addicts, the act would require treatment and cure before they are discharged.

Despite the Defense Department's 1970 directive to the Armed Forces branches to undertake their own efforts to eliminate drug abuse, it is plain that the response has been piecemeal and inadequate. In the Army, rehabilitation is up to local commanders and amnesty enables an addict to turn himself in for treatment in exchange for immunity from prosecution so long as he is not under investigation. The Air Force has a limited rehabilitation program that provides limited amnesty. The Navy has developed a treatment program—at the same time doubting the consistency of long-term rehabilitation with austere funding—and finally has announced an immunity program. And, at least until now, the Marine Corps has engaged in no official rehabilitation efforts and has depended upon separation of drug abusers as its basic response to the problem.

It is tragic that many a military man picks up a dangerous drug habit in the service only to be shoved from the military with a dishonorable discharge into a shattered life at home. They are barred from receiving help at a Veterans' Administration medical facility because of the dishonorable discharge. They are faced with the prospect of continuing to support a suddenly expensive compulsion, maybe turning to crime as a means. They are broken wrecks to themselves and to those around them.

Let us act now to provide a comprehensive, uniform program to curb this national calamity.

Let the Pentagon divert some of the millions and billions it is investing in spying on the civilian population, in selling the Pentagon, in research and development on nonmilitary subjects, and in planning for the administration of civilian governments to research and development of methods and institutions to reclaim the lives of young men who are swept up in the net of the draft, sent into war without incentives, and allowed to slip into the worst of all habits.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with my distinguished and esteemed colleague from the State of Connecticut the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN who is a leader in the fight against drug addiction.

Mr. Speaker, in agreeing to cosponsor H.R. 8216, the Armed Forces Drug Control Act of 1971, which the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut is reintroducing today with additional cosponsors, I feel that I should say a few words by way of explanation. For in agreeing to cosponsor this bill, I am not doing a routine thing. I am not just adding my signature to another worthy campaign and leaving it at that. I am joining other Members with a sense of complete commitment to get action before any more time goes by. The fact is that there are few more compelling bills before this

House for consideration this session. It is not enough to express one's concern about a serious problem. The time to act is now. I congratulate the Member from Connecticut for bringing this matter to our attention, providing us with the opportunity to seek support from all of the Members of the House, to present the facts for consideration, and for providing us with a well-thought-out bill which addresses itself to the treatment and cure of what I feel to be the most serious problem facing this Nation today.

There are countless arguments why this country should not be in Vietnam today. There is every reason why we should bend every effort to withdraw every last troop by December 31, of this year. Sooner if possible. But I can honestly say that today we are discussing what may well turn out to be the most convincing argument to the broad spectrum of the American electorate who, to date, may not have taken a position on ending the war this year: Because the GI drug problem is becoming apparent for all to see, it is striking every home in this country—at least the possibility of involvement with drugs is a constant threat to the parents and loved ones of every soldier fighting in Southeast Asia.

And this is not a problem which is confined to a section of the Globe miles away. These young men are returning home infected with the problem and in all likelihood, since no one lives in a vacuum, tainting countless other people of their generation with their habit. It is no coincidence that the war in Southeast Asia coincides almost to the day with the growing drug problem, the spread of the drug scene, the rise of a drug culture in our society. The habit is easy to pick up in Southeast Asia and is only kicked at great cost in this country, with far too little understanding, virtually no government assistance, and, not surprisingly, very few results. Even the White House the other day gave the opponents of the war's continuance one of their best arguments when Presidential Adviser, Robert H. Finch, expressed alarm at the fact that the war was dumping on American society somewhere in the neighborhood of 20,000 drug addicts a year, returning GIs who picked up the habit overseas. When the costs of this terrible war are added up, I think few statistics will be found to give a hint of the true cost more than this last statistic.

Congressmen STEELE and MURPHY have performed yeoman's service to this country in their penetrating report on the drug problem, following their recent overseas tour. Congressmen have been photographed purchasing drugs in Saigon alleys to demonstrate for all to see just how easy and cheap it is to buy drugs in Southeast Asia.

It is time to reexamine old-fashioned attitudes and revise Military and Veteran Department regulations which appear more intent on putting a stigma on drug addicts than attempting to provide treatment or rehabilitation to those so afflicted. This bill will do this, representing as it does a practical approach to treating drug addiction among the members of our Armed Forces. It begins

by including a uniform amnesty-treatment provision. Further, no member of an armed forces who, during his active duty, is determined to be addicted to a narcotic drug, may be separated from the services until such time as he has judged to be free from habitual dependence on drugs. The armed services have an obligation to those who become addicted to narcotics while serving their country in the military and to treat the ailment before the men are discharged. It has been stated all too often by returning veterans that the \$7 habit costs thousands to cure, even thousands to continue once they get back to this country. This dilemma is providing our veterans to whom we owe so much an open invitation to a life of crime to finance an expensive habit, inexpensively acquired in the Nation's service.

News reports indicate that 10 to 15 percent of the U.S. troops in Vietnam have developed a heroin habit. In other words, as Congressman STEELE points out:

The soldier going to South Vietnam today runs a far greater risk of becoming a heroin addict than a combat casualty.

How is that for a hidden casualty figure? If nothing else, Congressmen MURPHY and STEELE deserve a vote of thanks simply for the publicity they have focused on these heretofore obscure statistics. Alas, what Representative MORGAN MURPHY of Illinois says is all too true, that:

A soldier suffering from a wound or even venereal disease can be retained in the service until restored to health, but one suffering from the sickness of heroin addiction is discharged and returned to society and denied the facilities of the Veterans Administration because of the nature of his illness.

I agree with him wholeheartedly that it is a national disgrace that the Veterans Administration is not equipped to rehabilitate drug addicts. This bill in fact should be but the first of a whole range of legislation to begin to tackle the problems which this unwanted war has brought forth upon our society. Malaise is not too strong a term to describe the situation this war has produced among our young people, not only overseas but at home. The malaise has taken many forms. The sickness of spirit may be something that we can never cure, but a beginning must be made. Today, let us dedicate ourselves to curing those sicknesses of mind and body that will yield to treatment. I can think of no better problem to tackle first than the problem of drug addiction.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that the recently released Hagah Report on Drug Addiction in the Military be required reading for all Members of Congress.

The situation is far worse than I think any of us at first imagined. Sixty percent of our men in Vietnam habitually use marihuana and up to 10 percent of our soldiers use hard drugs. Just a quick calculation reveals that drug addiction afflicts up to 25,000 of our men.

The natural question is what has been done to combat this health crisis. A telephone call to any of the three branches of the armed services reveals that they

are woefully unable to handle the problem. They have neither the facilities nor the personnel to even begin coping with it.

Now this situation is not limited to the military alone. It reflects an overall problem in our society. The rapid escalation in drug use has caught all segments of society unprepared.

However, the problem is most acute in the military and it is in the localized, disciplined atmosphere of the military that a great opportunity exists to rehabilitate drug addicts.

If 60 percent of our men had yellow fever, would the Navy only have two treatment centers? If 60 percent of our men came down with smallpox, would the Marine Corps give them dishonorable discharges? Of course not, and yet what is so tragic and incomprehensible is that in the case of drug addiction, we not only do not have the necessary treatment facilities but by issuing a dishonorable discharge, we preclude any chance of the addicted soldier from receiving treatment in a VA hospital. Present policy simply returns them home with the good possibility of their engaging in criminal activity to support their addiction.

Where is the logic in it all? Can any Member of this Congress find even a hint of rationality in such a process?

The time has long since come to develop an overall program to combat drug addiction in the military. Drug addiction disables thousands upon thousands of our military personnel and the time has long since passed that we develop a positive program to rehabilitate those soldiers so disabled.

My colleague from Connecticut, JOHN MONAGAN, has introduced legislation which affords the military the great opportunity of providing this Nation with aid in combating this deadly social ill.

The key to H.R. 8216 is the final section of the bill which provides that no member of the armed services who is adjudged addicted to a narcotic drug by competent medical authorities during his active duty, may be separated from the service until he is free from habitual dependence on narcotic drugs.

The precedent for such legislation is found within our policies of not severing the military status of injured men until they are well again. While in the case of drug addiction, we enter the gray area of whether or not drug addiction is service connected, nevertheless, to provide our young men with the opportunity of returning home as whole men does not, I think, violate or endanger military policy but rather realistically expands it.

In closing, I would urge you to give this bill your utmost attention.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH), for their fine work in bringing the problem of drug addiction in the Armed Forces to the attention of the President.

This is indeed a problem of great mag-

nitude and gravity and I was pleased to note that the President recognized it as such in his news conference last night. The President belatedly accepted the essence of a proposal that has been made by Members of this body for some time by announcing that addicted servicemen would be treated before being discharged.

I was also pleased to note that the President recognized that addiction in the Armed Forces is a part of a national problem and that he called for a national program to combat drug addiction.

I am in complete agreement with the President's call for a national strategy. I believe that we must move immediately to charge a high level official of great intelligence, leadership qualities and administrative and organizational abilities with the specific responsibility of developing a multi-faceted, multi-disciplinary program involving research, education, domestic and foreign law enforcement, foreign crop diversification programs and rehabilitation. Then we must give him enough authority and resources to effectively implement this comprehensive program of coordinating or controlling new and existing research efforts and action programs.

To implement this proposal, I have joined with over 60 of my colleagues in the House and Senators MUSKIE and HARRIS in the Senate in introducing legislation which would establish, within the Executive Office of the President, an Office of Drug Abuse Control, specifically directed to develop and implement a program such as I have outlined.

Mr. Speaker, I realize there is a presumption against creating another office within the Executive Office of the President. However, in this case I believe that presumption is rebuttable. So many agencies are involved—Justice, Treasury, Defense, Agriculture, Labor, Commerce, Health, Education and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, State, and others—that there is no persuasive rationale for developing and operating this plan in any one agency of the executive branch. Indeed, this very fragmentation of responsibility demands coordination and direction at the highest level, by establishing an Office of Drug Abuse Control in the Executive Office of the President.

The Office would possess its own budget and its own appropriation. The Director would report directly to the President and through him to the Congress. He would possess the authority to employ the experts he required either from the private sector or by loan from Federal departments or agencies. Finally, the Director would be granted complete authority to coordinate the entire Federal effort in this area, and where, in his judgment it is necessary, to recommend to the President that the Office be vested with direct operational authority over new and existing programs.

One of the most important features of the proposed legislation empowers the Director to make recommendations to the President with respect to the expenditure of funds by Federal departments or agencies for programs related to drug abuse control. This budgetary

power will guarantee the ability of the Director to influence the programs conducted by these departments and will thus insure his ability to develop a coordinated, comprehensive, and truly effective program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the creation of an Office such as I have described will enable us to make great progress in the field of drug abuse control. A man with great administrative ability and leadership potential would be able to utilize all of the resources at the command of the Federal Government including programs involving agricultural economics, law enforcement technology, medical and educational research, crop diversification techniques, industrial development assistance, and technical information which are now located in such Federal departments and agencies as Agriculture, Defense, Justice, Treasury, Health, Education, and Welfare, State, Labor, Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, NASA, and OEO.

In addition, such a man would be able to overcome the comparable fragmentation on Capitol Hill which results in consideration of the drug abuse problem by at least nine different committees, including Foreign Affairs, Agriculture, Judiciary, Education and Labor, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, Government Operations, Science and Astronautics, and Appropriations. In short, such a man would serve as the focus for a sophisticated, coordinated, and comprehensive attack on the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Director of this Office should possess the flexibility required to exercise initiative and imagination as well as the ability to adapt to changing needs and increasing progress in developing a solution. However, a number of essential elements of our initial comprehensive plan can be specified. Accordingly, my legislation contains a number of specific items which may be included in the basic beginning program if, in fact, upon detailed examination they appear to be as effective as I believe them to be.

These specific program items would include many of the following elements:

RESEARCH EFFORTS

The Director's comprehensive plan may include the stimulation of expanded research to develop:

First, a synthetic analgesic substitute which is nonaddictive, to replace opium and its derivatives, morphine and codeine, in medical usage.

Synthetic analgesics are already in limited use as painkillers. None of these, however, induce the euphoria for which opium products are noted and which many physicians seem to value in their practices. In addition, existing substitutes possess undesirable addictive properties.

Government-sponsored research must be conducted to improve these substitutes and to eliminate their addictive nature. The American Medical Association and its counterparts abroad must encourage the members of the medical profession to use these replacements.

Successful implementation of this program would permit a complete interna-

tional ban on opium production—ultimately, the most feasible method of ending heroin addiction.

Second, a long-lasting blocking or antagonistic drug to treat heroin addiction.

Methadone is one drug which is being widely used to halt heroin addiction. Although an addict becomes as dependent upon methadone as a diabetic is dependent upon insulin, regular daily doses of methadone can block an addict's craving for heroin for up to 8 hours and thereby permit him to pursue a normal life instead of a life of crime.

We must develop a drug or device which, with dosage units administered at long intervals or by subcutaneous implantation, would cancel heroin's euphoric effect and end the craving for narcotics for 3 days, 8 weeks, or 8 months, rather than 8 hours.

Third, a detoxification agent which when administered breaks the physical addiction of a heroin user without the unpleasant physical side effects of "cold-turkey" withdrawal.

Fourth, effective utilization of chemical or radioactive tracers to aid in law enforcement efforts.

Heroin can be easily smuggled into this country because small amounts, worth a great deal, can be hidden so easily. If poppies in the field could be sprayed with chemical or low-grade radioactive tracer elements, the detection of smugglers would be greatly facilitated and, by utilizing slightly different tracers for different areas, it would become a relatively simple task to locate fields from which opium was being illegally produced or diverted.

Fifth, effective utilization of Department of Defense and NASA high-altitude and/or satellite surveillance techniques to detect illegal poppy culture or to monitor licit poppy crops to prevent diversion into illicit channels.

Sixth, effective drug abuse prevention programs. Some time ago, many of us became very enamored with the use of driver education as a means of reducing automobile accidents. Several recent studies have cast doubts upon the contribution of driver education to a reduction in the accident rate. I suggest the same may well prove to be true about drug abuse prevention education.

We must develop a truly effective education program or programs which will utilize techniques that will reach all potential drug abusers, from affluent suburbanite to ghetto youth.

DOMESTIC ACTION PROGRAM

The Director's plan for a comprehensive domestic action program may include the development of:

First, A large-scale, national program of methadone or advanced substitute treatment, with proper supportive services, in a variety of community-based models appropriate to the needs of various user-groups.

A massive nationwide program of methadone treatment, with appropriate supportive services, can make a definite contribution to a great reduction in violent personal street crime. We must move immediately to establish a program sufficient to treat every willing addict.

Second, A plan for the control of the production and distribution of psychotropic substances—amphetamines, barbiturates, and tranquilizers. This plan will no doubt include the utilization of computers to monitor the manufacture, distribution, and, perhaps, the dispensing of all mind-altering drugs.

According to the House Select Committee on Crime, the United States produces nearly 8 billion amphetamines annually—enough to supply nearly 40 doses to every American citizen—when the medical need is estimated at 0.05 pills per person per year. This must be stopped.

The Comprehensive Drug Abuse Control Act of 1970 must be expanded to regulate medical journal advertising of these products and to require manufacturers, wholesalers, jobbers, and druggists to make computer-compatible reports on all transactions involving these drugs. The computer would then cross-check all reports and immediately notify law enforcement investigators of any suspected illegal production or distribution.

Prescriptions for mind-altering drugs have been increasing at an alarming rate. In 1970, pharmacists filled more than 225 million prescriptions for these drugs compared with 166 million in 1965. This 37-percent increase compares with a 32-percent increase for all prescription drugs during the same period.

The medical profession must be urged to subject prescription practices to scrutiny and review, and to conduct postgraduate seminars on the dangers of overprescription. If they fail to do so, government intervention must be considered as a serious possibility.

Third, Legislative proposals for bringing the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 into conformity with the requirements of the new Convention on Psychotropic Substances when it is ratified and enters into force.

On February 21, 1971, 20 nations signed a new Convention on Psychotropic Substances designed to control the international traffic in all manmade synthetic mind-altering drugs. Hopefully, the President will submit this new treaty to the Senate for its advice and consent in the very near future, and the Senate will complete the formal procedures as rapidly as possible.

After ratification, we should examine our own law to insure complete conformity with the treaty.

INTERNATIONAL ACTION PROGRAM

First, The Director must propose amendments to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, the principal international instrument designed to control dangerous narcotic drugs.

The 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs is the successor to 10 previous treaties aimed at controlling leakages into illegal channels of lawfully produced narcotic drugs adopted by the nations of the world since 1912. That control has been developed. The 1,100 tons of opium required to meet the legitimate medical and scientific needs of the world community are well regulated.

However, at the same time, illicit pro-

duction and illegal trafficking has increased to the point where an additional 1,200 to 1,400 tons are produced annually outside the law. This development was not surprising since only a small handful of professionals were charged with overseeing the entire world problem and their enforcement powers were limited.

Increasing the number of international civil servants to enforce the 1961 Single Convention would not be sufficient, however. New methods and new sanctions are required. The United States should take the lead in proposing amendments to the Single Convention, or, perhaps, in calling a conference to develop an entirely new treaty.

When this is accomplished and when the new Convention on Psychotropic Substances, designed to control the synthetic mind-altering drugs, takes its place beside the 1961 Single Convention, a sound international juridical framework for the control of drug abuse will have been constructed. It will then be necessary to build upon this framework to create a truly complete system of controls.

Second. The Director should develop effective means of cooperation with international institutions such as United Nations Division on Narcotic Drugs, the United Nations Special Fund for Drug Abuse Control, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, Interpol, and the international lending agencies such as the World Bank, the United Nations Development Plan, and the International Development Association.

a. An effort to build upon the existing international framework for the control of the international traffic in drugs was begun in November 1970, when, at the urging of our State Department, the United Nations established a Special Fund for Drug Abuse Control. Designed to provide new resources for integrated international action against drug abuse, the fund will be used to establish pilot programs which would: first, provide training and equipment for law enforcement and government officials involved in drug control programs; second, stimulate and develop crop diversification programs, including the development and distribution of the necessary seed, fertilizer, and farm equipment; the organization, if necessary, of farm cooperatives, and the development of roads and the provision, if necessary, of such equipment as refrigerated trucks for a farm-to-market distribution system; third, develop new techniques of addict rehabilitation.

Turkey provides an example of the potential utility of the Special Fund. Although Turkey has been a party to the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs since 1965, the international community has been justifiably increasingly dissatisfied with Turkey for not fulfilling its obligation to enact a poppy culture licensing system.

Turkey has reduced the area of poppy cultivation by 50 percent from what it was in 1964 and has reduced the number of opium farmers from 200,000 to 80,000. However, yields per hectare have been

increased so greatly that total production in 1968 was 50 percent higher than it was in 1964. Obviously, even if outright prohibition is not possible at present, some form of control is essential as a start to bringing the production under control.

Although the fall of the Demirel government may change the situation somewhat, in the past Turkey has bristled at American diplomatic and political pressure designed to stimulate it to tighten its controls. Left-wing critics of the government have consistently demagogued what they characterized as American interference in Turkey's internal affairs. Thus, a licensing law which has been before the Turkish parliament for some time has yet to be enacted and Turkey continues to supply an estimated 80 percent of the illegal heroin which reaches the United States.

The Special Fund can obviously serve as a multilateral channel for aid and pressure, thus disarming critics of U.S. foreign policy. It is essential, therefore, that the Special Fund operate effectively and efficiently. An indecisive undirected organization with insufficient resources, will be almost as bad as no international agency at all.

Despite the fine initiative displayed by the United States in encouraging the establishment of the Special Fund, American financial support has been fainthearted and parsimonious. The United States has pledged an initial first year contribution of only \$2 million. Given the importance of narcotics control to the United States, other nations took this small pledge as a depressingly clear signal of American lack of interest and confidence in the Fund.

Moreover, the United States only 1 month ago—while the Vienna Conference on Psychotropic Substances was still in progress—indicated that it was willing to release only a mere \$100,000 of its \$2 million pledge. This, again, was taken as a signal of lack of urgency, purpose, and priority and has greatly impaired American credibility concerning its desire to solve the problem. While the State Department has, since the Conference, agreed to release \$1 million—the harm was done.

Finally, the \$2 million American contribution has impaired the effectiveness of the Fund. As a general rule, the United States contributes approximately 35 percent of the budget of international agencies. Using this rule, the American pledge of \$2 million means that the Fund will initially possess resources of only approximately \$5 million when the Fund should have resources of \$25 to \$50 million per year.

The cost of not spending millions abroad is measured in a cost of billions in our cities. It is no exaggeration to use a multiple of 1,000 in relating failure to spend abroad with cost at home.

Therefore, the actions of the United States must be corrected. The American contribution should have been, and, in the future, must be much greater. We must evidence a clear and credible intent to solve the drug problem now.

b. The World Health Organization conducts medical research and disseminates

public health information. Clearly our efforts must be coordinated with this organization.

c. The Food and Agricultural Organization has 2,300 agents spread throughout the world who possess the expertise required to develop crop diversification programs. Again, if poppy culture is to be eliminated, this valuable expertise must be utilized. No initiative has yet been made to harness FAO expertise, available manpower in the field, and its widespread credibility and popularity with the underdeveloped nations.

d. The international lending agencies, such as the World Bank, the International Development Association, and the United Nations Development Program must be involved in a well designed program to make their resources available for hard and soft loans to fund economic diversification programs to shift poppy farmers to the production of other cash crops or into other employment.

In anticipation of the potential control over poppy culture in Turkey and processing in Marseilles, the organized criminal syndicates are already shifting opium, morphine base, and heroin production from Turkey to such other countries as Afghanistan, Burma, Laos, and Thailand. If we are to halt this shift we must obviously move quickly before it becomes well established.

This will not be easy. Many of the countries I have mentioned lack effective administrative control over their remote poppy growing areas. Roads must be built, administrative and control infrastructures developed, seed for such crops as sunflowers, fertilizer, and farm equipment provided and technical expertise made available. The international lending agencies can be invaluable in providing the variety of financial aid that is required in order to close all the holes in the dikes and create a seamless web of controls over opium production.

Third. The Director should offer technological assistance to international organizations and foreign countries, including:

a. Advanced computer technology. The need for such assistance is clearly illustrated by the current plight of Interpol. This international organization deals primarily in information and criminal intelligence which it provides for member governments around the world. Yet, it currently has a budget of only \$800,000, less than the police budget of Fargo, N. Dak. Clearly, the organization should have a larger budget which would enable it to utilize advanced computer technology for its information gathering, storing, and disseminating functions.

b. Sophisticated administrative and law enforcement techniques must be made available to opium-producing countries for use in licensing or halting opium production.

c. Agricultural expertise for use in crop diversification. The most effective method of ending heroin addiction in this country involves a total prohibition of poppy culture. This must be our goal.

Poppy farming is a very labor intensive occupation which, to the farmer, is not very remunerative. For example, the average Turkish poppy farmer earns less

than \$100 per year from his opium crop. Thus, countries such as Yugoslavia have found it relatively easy to move farmers from poppy cultivation to the production of other more financially rewarding crops. Expertise in crop diversification must be made available for this purpose.

COORDINATION AND OPERATIONAL CONTROL

First. Obviously, to accomplish his task, the Director will be required to effectively coordinate programs which are presently located in other Federal departments and agencies. These programs include:

Domestic law enforcement programs which are located within the Department of Justice and border control activities which are located in the Treasury Department;

Medical research and treatment programs located within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity;

Technological research conducted by the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

Agricultural research and technical assistance programs located within the Department of Agriculture and operated by AID;

Local treatment programs to reach large numbers of potential drug abusers such as those located within the Department of Housing and Urban Development (Model Cities), the Office of Economic Opportunity (community action programs), the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Office of Education, Office of Child Development), the Public Health Service (community based health clinics);

International programs developed or implemented by the Department of State, including the relevant programs under the jurisdiction of the Agency for International Development;

Relevant technical assistance programs available through the Department of Labor—for example, manpower training for new skills for farmers—and Commerce—for example, light industrial development.

Second. In some instances, coordination of existing programs will not be sufficient. Therefore, when, in his judgment, it will best serve the aim of drug abuse control, the Director is empowered to recommend to the President that existing programs be transferred to the direct control of the Office for continued operation or consolidation. In addition, under the same conditions, the Director may recommend to the President that the Office be empowered to develop directly an entirely new program.

Mr. Speaker, drug abuse is not a partisan problem. It is a serious national problem which involves all regions of the country: urban and rural, North and South, East and West. It is attacking affluent youth in our suburbs, poor youth in our slums, students on our college campuses, pupils in our elementary and secondary schools, men in our workshops, and executives in our corporate headquarters.

Similarly, our failure to solve the problem has not been the failure of one party or one administration. It has been a national failure over many years to

develop programs and apply resources even marginally commensurate with the appalling scope of the problem.

We can stop the illicit traffic in dangerous drugs if we are willing to call a moratorium in rhetoric and join across party lines to devote the thought, the resources, and the energy that are required to mount a total and coordinated effort to end the scourge of addiction.

This proposal to establish an Office of Drug Abuse Control represents an effective and feasible means of conquering this dreaded epidemic. In the past, when we have wished to accomplish a task, we have utilized high quality personnel to develop a sophisticated grand design for action. We have created an Office of Consumer Affairs when we wished to develop a program of consumer protection. We have established a National Aeronautics and Space Administration when we wished to send men to the moon, and a Manhattan project when we wished to split the atom. Surely, drug abuse control is as important a national challenge as consumer affairs, space flight, and atomic energy.

Admittedly, these organizations were not perfect. But they provided the organizational framework to do the job. They used highly sophisticated, multidisciplinary methods to develop programs which applied imagination, initiative, centralization, coordination, operational control, and major resources to accomplish their tasks. We can do the same for drug abuse control if we have the will and the energy.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this proposal is a short term measure only. It deals with a symptom—drug abuse—rather than the disease. While we must move, and move quickly, to correct the symptom because of the disastrous effect it is having upon our society, we should not permit these efforts to diminish our search for a cure of the disease. History will judge us harshly if we fail to end drug abuse. But the judgment will be even more severe if we fail to end the despair which are the root causes of the abuse of drugs. Therein lies the true solution. That should be our ultimate goal.

As the President gathers ideas on mounting a "national offensive" on the problem of drug abuse, I would hope he will find this proposal useful.

Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN MONAGAN, has persistently worked to bring about control of drug abuse, and I share the special emphasis that he places upon expeditious action on H.R. 8216, which I was pleased to cosponsor.

This legislation, I believe, will be a very practical vehicle by which the Armed Forces could most effectively cope with the misuse of dangerous drugs.

I further believe that Congress must act on the basic subject of drug abuse in the Armed Forces and the bill introduced by Representative MONAGAN, which so many of us cosponsored, will be a practical vehicle for legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to commend the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) for the splendid initiative and

determination he demonstrated at the spring meeting of the Interparliamentary Union, at which time the council of that organization unanimously adopted a resolution presented by our colleague. The resolution appealed to parliaments of all countries to join in control and elimination of illegal international drug traffic. We recognize that international cooperation is necessary to control the problem of drug abuse since this problem is international in scope, a fact which has been recognized by the United Nations. Thus, we are demonstrating with the passage of H.R. 8216 the leading role that the U.S. Congress is playing in working toward correction of international drug problems, especially as they relate to our servicemen.

Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. Speaker, drug abuse among military personnel has reached such staggering proportions that the Armed Forces are presently discharging about 20,000 servicemen a year for drug offenses.

We hear a great deal about the devastating effects of drug abuse and addiction on military morale and efficiency, but to date we have shown little sympathy for the man who is stripped of his honor, deprived of veterans benefits he has earned, and thrown back into civilian life with a deadly and expensive drug habit.

It is my feeling, and that of all my colleagues who have joined Mr. MONAGAN in sponsoring legislation to establish Drug Abuse Control Crops within the services, that something must be done immediately to stop the destruction of an entire generation of young men and to avert the havoc that will result from placing thousands of new drug addicts in the streets to fend for themselves.

It is the responsibility of the Armed Forces to provide addicted servicemen with an alternative to disgrace, namely the chance to undergo rehabilitation and treatment within the service, and to guarantee these unfortunate men that they will not be released from the military until they have been cured.

By punishing servicemen with dishonorable or undesirable discharges, we abrogate our responsibilities to men who have otherwise served their country loyally and we condemn them to tortured lives of drug addiction and crime. The military must not contribute to a problem that has extracted from society a phenomenal price in human and material resources.

The type of treatment and rehabilitation we advocate might solve the problem; court martials and discharges simply indicate that the Department of Defense is unwilling or unable to face the problem and prefers to dump it on already overburdened civilian programs. I am of the opinion that servicemen with drug problems are suffering from severe service-connected disabilities and should be treated as such, and not simply committed to the swelling ranks of drug addicts.

Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. Speaker, there is no less pleasant duty for me than to speak today on the subject of drug abuse in the military, but the terrible facts of

the situation warrant the immediate attention of this body.

Conservative estimates place heroin use in Vietnam at 10 percent of all American enlisted men—about 37,000 addicts among our 277,000 soldiers. Other reliable sources indicate, however, that those totals may be far too low—that the percentage of addicts could be as high as 25 percent or 60,000 members of the Armed Forces in Southeast Asia. When we hear at the same time that more than half of some individual combat units are composed of addicts, we must certainly recognize the explosive nature of this problem.

An addicted veteran returns with his habit to a society in which heroin is far less available and far more expensive than it was in Vietnam. His natural impulse is to turn to crime for the money he needs to satisfy his craving. While the Defense Department has no figures on drug-related crimes committed by veterans, simple logic tells us that these are likely to increase as habituated veterans are released from the service.

Meanwhile, there are no effective military programs to detect, deter, and treat drug abuse in Vietnam. Only the Army has introduced an amnesty provision of limited value for those who turn themselves in for treatment. The other services, complaining justly that they lack the facilities to provide rehabilitation, simply discharge their addicts on less than honorable grounds, to be dealt with by an unprepared and unsuspecting civilian society. It seems to me that some type of treatment should be afforded these men before they are sent out into an unsympathetic and unfamiliar new grounds.

Most of the addicts picked up their habits, after all, while they were in the service; the pressures of the war combined with the availability of heroin has created a completely unique set of circumstances in Vietnam, under which drug abuse is all too alluring an alternative. We should, perhaps, be grateful it has not been an even more serious problem than it is.

At any rate, it seems elementary to me that the services should themselves be responsible for the cure of soldiers who became addicted under their auspices. But to take up this new responsibility, they will need increased authority from the Government, and that is why I have joined Congressman MONAGAN in sponsoring his important drug abuse legislation.

The most important element of our bill is a provision requiring that no member of the Armed Forces with an addiction to narcotics be separated from service until he is adjudged by competent medical authority to be free of his dependence. The point is obvious; we must deal with the habit while the drug user is still under the military's control.

Now, it should be clear that this requirement cannot be complied with unless the various military services are given sufficient authority to conduct rehabilitation efforts. Our bill gives them that authority by creating a Drug Abuse Control Corps in each branch of the Armed Forces. Each of these Corps, in turn, would have an educative, a rehabil-

itative and an enforcement division for the purpose of: first, preventing those not already addicted to dangerous drugs from becoming habituated; second, rehabilitating those already addicted, and third, through enforcement, eliminating the source of the drug supply available to members of the military services. No one who voluntarily entered a rehabilitative program while he was a member of the armed services would be prosecuted for drug abuse.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is as sound as it is necessary. I trust the House of Representatives will act promptly to put it into effect.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join in this special order taken by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN), to discuss the dangerous and growing problem of drug abuse in the armed services of the United States.

Over the past several months, I personally have become increasingly disturbed not only by the extent of narcotics use in the armed services, but also by the callous attitude which the military itself has taken toward this matter. At worst, the Marine Corps until recently dishonorably discharged, upon discovery, narcotics addicts within its ranks, leaving them to fend for themselves with "tracks" on their arms and a permanent black mark upon their records. At best, which is little better, the Army has had a fitful rehabilitation program, with room for less than 1 percent of the heroin addicts within its ranks, and no provision for posttreatment counseling. If a GI comes back for treatment a second time, he is court martialed or discharged.

Back in the United States, the outlook until recently was little better. For a long time, the VA refused to accept ex-servicemen for treatment in its hospitals for narcotics addiction. As a member of the Hospitals Subcommittee of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I was gratified to learn recently that the Veterans' Administration has begun a trial program in five hospitals, the number soon to be expanded, to treat ex-servicemen who are heroin addicts.

Such a program, welcome as it may be, does little to aid the soldier still in the service who is an addict. Finding the bureaucratic thinking of the armed services on this matter to be intolerable, I am proud to be a sponsor of H.R. 8388, to provide for the treatment of members of the armed services who are narcotics addicts. H.R. 8388 provides for the examination of each serviceman before discharge; his retention on active duty if found addicted, with placement in appropriate hospital facilities until such time as he is found no longer to be a narcotics addict; and his subsequent release.

The Army has said that such retention is illegal; and that such a law, moreover, would change the entire mission of the Army, which is funded "not to rehabilitate," but to fight wars. I find such contentions to be unacceptable—for \$75 billion a year, the armed services of this Nation should take at least some account of the consequences of their wars, especially as such consequences are faced by their own employees.

It is estimated that more than 200

young American GI's will die of overdoses of heroin in 1971. It is time to act if we are to fulfill our responsibilities to the men who serve this country.

Mr. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) in introducing legislation to combat the growing menace of drug addiction that has spread through the military almost unchecked.

While I am grateful that this subject is gaining more public attention as typified by the President's statement at his news conference; however, mere attention to the problem is not going to solve it. Action is required and it must be immediate if we are to end this scourge.

The unique feature of the bill we are introducing today is that it provides the means to begin treatment of those who become addicted to hard drugs while in the Armed Forces. In addition, it requires a significant change in our policy toward addicts by permitting them to be treated medically rather than punitively.

The armed services have traditionally followed the practice of discharging known addicts under less than honorable conditions. This tragic practice has had the twofold effect of punishing those who would make their addiction known to those who could assist them, and forcing the addict into society where his only means of supporting his habit is through criminal activities.

Through the provisions in the bill we are introducing, the military will be prohibited from discharging those who are known to be addicts until they are rehabilitated. This can encourage addicts to seek treatment and also serve to save society from suffering yet another rapacious criminal appetite caused by the need to buy heroin.

Another unique provision in this bill will permit a serviceman being tried for an offense involving the possession or use of drugs to avoid court martial by agreeing to undergo treatment and rehabilitation procedures.

Finally, the bill establishes a Drug Abuse Control Corps in each branch of the military services to provide the necessary educational services and rehabilitation treatment for servicemen addicted to hard drugs.

I hope the Committee on Armed Services will act swiftly to hold hearings on this legislation and give its approval so that we can pass this bill and begin to bind up these new and hidden wounds of war.

NARCOTICS ADDICTION IN THE MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard a very learned discussion on one of the most serious problems confronting our military—the growing problem of narcotics addiction among our military.

I was very much interested in the discussion that just preceded my own special order. Surely I would have to agree

that the legislation being proposed by our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN), is long overdue, and is urgently needed. I would be most pleased to support it and join in cosponsoring it, particularly since I am a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a serious problem and, while we can talk all we want to about the need for medical facilities and treatment facilities, perhaps we ought to address ourselves to the root causes of the problem.

I was deeply concerned when our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MORGAN MURPHY, came back from an extensive tour of a number of countries, including Vietnam, and brought back with him a startling report about the narcotics problem among our military in Vietnam—that some 10 to 15 percent of our soldiers in Vietnam had become addicted to narcotics, according to official figures, and that privately those very same people—soldiers in the field along with doctors and other medical authorities—tell us the unofficial figure actually might be as high as 40 percent.

It seems to me we have a national crisis on our hands if, indeed, anywhere from 15 percent to 40 percent of American troops in Vietnam have now turned to some form of narcotics addiction.

It occurs to me then that we ought to take a hard look at that situation and perhaps, indeed, the time has come when the President can make his greatest single contribution to deal with this problem by imposing the moratorium on sending any further troops to Vietnam, that I have suggested.

There are now some 20 signatures on my discharge petition on the Clerk's desk calling for such a moratorium. It would be my hope, in the face of the statistics coming out of Vietnam, and in the wake of the discussion just held here before my own special order on the extent of the narcotics problem among our soldiers and our military, that the President seriously consider the prospect of a moratorium on sending any more American troops to Vietnam.

I have proposed that as our boys are rotated back home they not be replaced in Vietnam. In that way, in 1 year there would be no troops left in Vietnam.

More importantly, we would at least have a chance to save those youngsters who will be sent as replacements to Vietnam between now and the final day of withdrawal, whenever that is determined. It occurs to me that there is considerable logic to the suggestion.

I was pleased to hear the President say last night at his press conference, when he was asked when he thought we could stop sending draftees to Vietnam, that the day might come sooner than we think. I recall only too well during the debate on the draft extension in this chamber, when I questioned the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee as to whether or not we really needed extension of the draft, I submitted at that time statistics to show that if the President's present withdrawal rate of 14,300 troops a month is continued, we will have all of our troops

out of Vietnam by December 1972. And if, indeed, the President accelerates the withdrawal rate, as we have every reason to believe he will on November 15—he said yesterday that he would have a new withdrawal schedule to be announced on November 15—if indeed the President accelerates that withdrawal schedule, our troops will be out of Vietnam very much sooner.

So it seems perfectly logical to suggest at this time that we have a moratorium on the sending of any further troops to Vietnam.

How many more of our American soldiers are to be exposed to the menace of dope addiction in Vietnam? How many of our soldiers are to be killed in Vietnam? How many to be wounded?

Under the present withdrawal schedule, between now and December 1, we will send some 32,000 to 38,000 replacement troops to Vietnam. So it seems to me that the President would do well in declaring a moratorium now. I think the anxieties that lead so many of our young people in this country to dope addiction, seeking some forum of opiate to overcome the concerns and insecurities that have swept the Nation in the wake of this long and costly war, would certainly be alleviated, and it is reasonable to expect that a moratorium on troop shipments to Vietnam at this time would have a profound effect on our homefront, not only on the war front.

I would not be making this suggestion if I was not thoroughly convinced that South Vietnam now is fully capable of defending the country. We have been asked on a number of occasions, "What is the American mission in Vietnam?" America's mission in Vietnam was to give the Vietnamese sufficient time to develop their own defense capability. I submit the record is now replete with evidence that that commitment has been discharged with great honor. The President has said he has his own withdrawal time schedule. He said he wants to get the troops out of Vietnam, but to get them out in such a way as not to lose the gains we have made in this long and costly war.

I submit that we could have a moratorium at this time, and we could start moving those troops out of Vietnam and not suffer any great losses, because I am convinced that the South Vietnamese forces are more than capable of defending their country.

For that reason it would be my hope that the President would seriously consider a moratorium at this time, not only because of the impact it would have on the homefront, but the impact it would have on the soldiers overseas.

Those of us who have served in World War II or Korea know what happens to men when they are waiting. We are now in a so-called final phase of America's involvement in Vietnam. Yet for those boys remaining in Vietnam this is not the final phase. These are the most anxious months, anxious weeks, and anxious days of their entire military career. The waiting around, waiting for something to happen, is an open invitation to seek opiates and other forms of relief. For that reason it seems to me it is logical to suggest at this time that

America's mission in Vietnam has been completed and has been completed with honor. I would hope that in view of the mounting evidence of what has happened to young Americans in Vietnam, not only on the battlefield but the rising tide of dope addiction while young men are waiting for something to happen—all of this evidence should certainly convince the President that the time has come to impose a moratorium on the sending of any more troops to Vietnam, and then getting our troops out of there as quickly as possible.

I am sure that the South Vietnamese can more than adequately carry on the defense of their country. I disagree with the Vice President, when he suggests a withdrawal at this time would be tantamount to some sort of surrender. On the contrary, it would be a public acknowledgement that America's mission in Vietnam has been concluded with honor and we are now ready to assume leadership in the world, because while we have been bogged down in the swamps of Vietnam for the last 6 or 7 years the Soviet Union has roamed all over the world, creating all sorts of new intrigues and new trouble spots.

It seems to me the United States must assume its role of leadership again if we are to have peace in this world. By getting our troops out of Vietnam, we shall hasten that day.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation.

In 1870 the average yield per acre of corn in America was 29 bushels. By 1950 it had increased to 38 bushels, and it is now about 75 bushels per acre.

ELECTRICITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in this decade of ecology, we are made increasingly aware of the need for preserving our natural heritage and improving our environment. At the same time Americans continue to expect the goods and conveniences which our highly industrialized society makes available. Resolving these two competing demands is one of the most challenging problems now facing our country. While many Americans are content just to talk about the problems of industrial growth and environmental protection, another group is hard at work finding the solutions to these problems. In particular, I am referring to the electric utility industry whose work on behalf of the environment goes on quietly but with increasing progress.

Many Members are aware of the hear-

ings on powerplant sitings recently conducted by the Communications and Power Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. My membership on that subcommittee has served to reinforce my belief that power companies are dedicated to finding workable solutions to environmental problems. And yet, few industries have received the attention of the aroused public more than has the electric utility industry. While faced with an insatiable demand for more electric power, electric companies are often told when siting powerplants or transmission lines, "Don't put it here." I believe this resistance is encountered because the public is not fully aware of the vast expenditures and effort this industry has invested in environmental control.

The May 15, 1971, issue of *Business Week* magazine reported from a McGraw-Hill survey that electric utilities will spend \$679 million in pollution control in 1971, an increase of 68 percent over the \$405 million spent in 1970. This is more money than will be spent in pollution control by any other industry. In addition to this figure, millions of dollars are spent annually on environmental research.

Dollar figures do not tell the whole story, however. A behind-the-scenes look at the electric utility industry reveals an impressive picture of professionally trained environmentalists seeking solutions to complex ecological problems. Companies are increasingly being staffed with biologists, meteorologists and others with diverse environmental backgrounds. In their research and development activities they work to provide a vitally needed service with the least possible impact on the natural environment.

An investigation of the electric industry's approach to water quality protection, for example, showed that some 445 water studies have been completed, are underway, or are proposed by 121 investor-owned electric companies in the United States. These studies include the beneficial uses and biological effects of thermal discharges, ecological surveys, water cooling tower design, temperature modeling, desalinization and monitoring techniques.

The Office of Science and Technology was the first to advocate the beneficial uses of thermal pollution—another name for waste heat. They cited the following areas as worthy of further research and development: space heating—especially for new cities; improvements in biological efficiency of sewage treatment plants, air conditioning and refrigeration applications; and the use of waste heat for agricultural purposes such as heating and cooling of greenhouses to permit the year-round raising of crops.

Perhaps the most spectacular capability of waste heat is the way it encourages prodigious growth in many forms of marine life. In my own State of Texas, the electric companies joined together in financial support of a 5-year research program on the effects of heated water discharge on fishes and commercial invertebrates. This project is being conducted by the Wildlife Science Department at Texas A. & M. University.

Scientists studying artificial reservoirs constructed by electric companies for cooling purposes are confirming what fishermen in Texas have known for years: that heated water has a beneficial rather than detrimental effect on water quality. John E. Tilton, a biologist at Texas Electric Service Co., has pioneered in research utilizing heated water discharged from one of their plants for commercial catfish culturing. Another utility, Texas Power & Light Co., with the wildlife scientists at Texas A. & M., is presently entering into an 8-year research program, funded entirely by that company, to study intensive catfish farming in its cooling reservoirs. In addition to producing over a million pounds of catfish annually, the wildlife scientists anticipate a 400 to 500 percent increase in the sport fish available in the reservoir.

Shellfish production is prodigiously increased by the use of waste heat. Japanese spat—oysters—on the Pacific shore near Eugene, Oreg., grow 10 times larger in only 4 weeks, and become ready for market in two-thirds of normal time, simply because the water is 10 to 15 degrees above normal. Another oyster seed hatchery on Long Island Sound receives water from a steam-electric station, and is able to increase the oyster survival rate a million-fold and cut the maturing time in half. In Florida, shrimp and lobster are being profitably raised in warm water discharges.

Agriculture is another area where waste heat can be used effectively. In experiments at the Oregon State University Hyslop Farm, the use of warmed water in underground pipes to warm the soil has increased crop yield up to 64 percent. Similar agriculture experiments have resulted in faster and more bountiful production of corn, tomatoes, soybeans, lima beans, and strawberries. Waste heat has also been used in warm water sprinkling systems to prevent frost on orange groves.

Mr. Sam Beall, Oak Ridge National Laboratory Reactor Division Director, said that:

7,000 acres of greenhouses near Cleveland, Ohio, shared by 60 growers who pay \$6,000 to \$8,000 per acre for gas heat, could get steam from a powerplant for only \$2,000 an acre. . . Glass-covered greenhouses near a powerplant . . . would produce three crops of tomatoes a year totaling 750,000 pounds, compared with a California tomato field of similar size producing 60,000 pounds per season.

At the University of Arizona's Environmental Research Laboratory, scientists are growing vegetables in the barren desert by using small quantities of desalinated water in controlled environment greenhouses. Eggplant, squash, lettuce, and more than 30 other crops have been harvested from the closed-environment greenhouses in areas where nothing grows outdoors except cactus and other desert plants. On a much larger scale, the Atomic Energy Commission is working on integrated systems of power, water and food production at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Waste heat has also been used beneficially in experiments to keep harbors and city streets free of ice and to clear fog from airfields.

We can see from the foregoing research into the beneficial uses of thermal discharge that electrical facilities are striving to do more than just stop thermal pollution—they are learning to use the waste heat for our betterment. In addition, many electric companies are investigating the environmental impact of their facilities well enough in advance of their construction and operation to insure compliance with environmental standards. At one proposed plant site near Granbury, Tex., the biology department of Southern Methodist University is conducting a comprehensive investigation into the aquatic ecology of the reservoir where waste heat will be discharged. The company supporting this research has made a public commitment to install alternate cooling facilities if it is determined that heated water will upset the ecology of the reservoir. Such studies are not unique. Most utility companies in Texas and across the country are conducting similar investigations.

The electric power industry has made significant gains in other fields of environmental protection. Air quality control has received the same degree of environmental attention as thermal discharge. Across the United States electric utility companies are investing millions of dollars in equipment to abate air pollution. Companies using coal or oil as a source of fuel are aggressively working to insure air quality standards although little credit is given publicly for this aspect of it. During the past 40 years, the pounds of coal or coal equivalent, required to produce a kilowatt-hour of electricity has been reduced from 1.7 to 0.9. In fact, fuel burned for generating electric power in 1969 was less than half of what it would have been if 1929 efficiencies had prevailed.

To abate particulate emissions or fly-ash modern powerplants are being equipped with electrostatic precipitators with efficiencies approaching 99 percent. Older plants are being retrofitted with this equipment. Where sulfur dioxide emissions have imposed environmental problems, stepped-up research and development of abatement equipment is being initiated.

Land use has been another area of increased public concern, and I find that the electric industry has amply demonstrated its willingness to live in harmony with the natural environment. The list of land use accomplishments must be impressive even to the utilities' severest critic. A brief sampling of innovations includes Georgia Power Company's donation of parks, as well as wildlife and conservation programs; Dallas Power & Light and Seattle City Light have won awards for substation architecture and landscaping; Consumers Power Co. and others have comprehensive plant siting programs; Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has developed over 400 campsites, cloud-seeding for irrigation purposes, maintenance of forests and streams, new roadside rests, and recreation on 150 lakes; Florida Power & Light Co. has installed marinas, manmade lagoons, and linear parks beneath rights-of-way; Idaho Power has conducted extensive fish conservation and grassland development

programs; and Kansas Gas & Electric is involved in tree farming and a \$3 million steam station face lifting and landscaping. For the entire industry, land use has meant millions of dollars spent on undergrounding of facilities, transmission-line beautification and rights-of-way for playgrounds, nurseries and farms.

Mr. Speaker, we hear much talk from environmentalists these days that all power pollutes and that there is no hope for the future. This attitude totally disregards not only the developments and accomplishments I have just outlined, but also a realistic evaluation of what the future actually holds for electric power production and the environment. While providing our country with vital electrical power, the electric utility industry is making a substantial contribution to America's environmental improvement.

HIGH SEAS INCIDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, there was an extraordinary and very well-publicized meeting on the high seas between representatives of the United States and the commander of the Russian fishing fleet off the east coast of this country.

The purpose of the meeting aboard the very elaborate and plushy appointed Soviet mother ship was to work out some *modus vivendi* for the Russian and American fishing boats plying the same waters. The Americans, mostly lobstermen with fixed gear, had been complaining vigorously that the larger, faster Soviet vessels had been running through their lines, deliberately or otherwise, causing extensive and expensive damage and loss of revenue.

The Russian commander purportedly apologized to the American delegation at the shipboard meeting and gave assurances that the incidents would halt.

U.S. Ambassador Donald L. McKernan, special assistant for fisheries, wildlife, and ocean affairs in the State Department, who headed the American delegation at the meeting with the Russians, testified May 20 before a subcommittee of this body on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation to the effect that the meeting appeared to be successful and hopefully would put an end to the incidents.

Even as McKernan was testifying, not 24 hours after the meeting, reports were received of additional harassments by Russian ships. Once again, this blatant treachery involved the American lobster ship, *Wily Fox*, owned by the Prelude Corp. of Westport, Mass., in my congressional district. Joseph Gaziano, the president, and John Jensen, the treasurer, of Prelude, attended the meeting with the Russians and also testified before the subcommittee. Their initial outrage over the incidents and skepticism about the effectiveness of the conference on the

high seas was both heightened and confirmed.

And now, Mr. Speaker, we have additional evidence of Soviet duplicity and the foolishness of reposing any hope or faith in Russian assurances—as if this country ever needed any.

On June 1, there was a reported incident involving an American lobster boat out of Marblehead, Mass.

On May 27 and May 28, there was still another round of incidents involving the Russian fishing fleet and American lobster ships. This time, under even more infuriating circumstances, the victim American ship was the *United States*, owned by D.O.K. Fishing Enterprises, Inc., of Westport, Mass.

According to a carefully kept log, which is supported by photographs, the *United States* arrived at a point 65 miles southeast of Montauk Point, Long Island, before dawn on May 27 to find a considerable amount of gear had been damaged.

For the next 12 hours, a total of 12 Soviet vessels were sighted and identified as they towed through the gear of the *United States*. Some pulled away when approached, others ignored the *United States'* signaling.

After it notified the Coast Guard, the *United States* was then contacted by the very same Russian mother ship on which the May 19 conference was held and invited to come alongside. When the *United States* reached the *Robert Eikhe*, there was long and difficult radio conversation and charts with all the *United States* lines clearly marked were sent over to the Russian vessel.

The Soviet response was that they would radio their ships to stay clear of the *United States* gear. A few hours later, three large Russian stern trawlers cut through the American lines, disdainful of any order or agreement, real or imagined.

Only with the appearance of the Coast Guard cutter *Vigilant* later in the day did the Russian fleet leave the area.

The *United States* suffered an estimated \$5,000 damage to its gear and equipment from the incidents, which does not sound like a great deal, but which is a very significant loss to a small company owned by three individuals whose every penny is sunk in the enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, to steal a line from Cicero, how long will the Russians' unbridled effrontery try our patience? How many slaps in the face does it take for us to do something to protect not only our own citizens, but also our own interests in the harvesting and dissemination of the sea's resources?

I say we have had enough. In testimony before the subcommittee 2 weeks ago, I proposed a four-point response to the situation:

First. The strongest possible protest by the United States to the Soviet Government, demanding compensation for the damages wrought by its fishing fleet.

Second. Permanent assignment of Coast Guard or naval vessels in the fishing waters of the United States for deterrence and protection.

Third. Congressional enactment of the joint resolution introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY), that would make harassment of any American fishing vessel or gear unlawful, provide for Coast Guard surveillance and extend the territorial waters of the United States for 100 miles. To that could be added enactment of Mr. PELLY's concurrent resolution creating a conservation zone covering the extent of the Continental Shelf in which no foreign fishing would be allowed.

Fourth. If the Russians fail to make compensation for the damages, then the Federal Government should make whole the owners of these harassed vessels it cannot or will not protect.

The time for talking and hoping is past, Mr. Speaker. The time for action is at hand. If we ever needed absolute justification for stern measures, we have it now. Let us proceed to end this unconscionable piracy of a struggling American industry once and for all.

SUMMER OF EXPANDED OPPORTUNITY FOR THE DISADVANTAGED YOUTH OF OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, with school vacation starting for our young people, I know my colleagues will be happy to hear that summer job opportunities will be at the highest level in 7 years and that Federal summer recreational programs for youth are also being expanded by the Nixon administration.

The President's announcement made at the White House this morning will be of interest to millions of American families and I am placing it in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The summer of 1971 will be a summer of expanded opportunity for the disadvantaged youth of our country—due in no small measure to a large number of summer jobs which are being made available to them.

I am pleased to report that more than 824,000 job opportunities will be available this summer: 674,000 through Federal Government programs and 150,000 through the efforts of the National Alliance of Businessmen which works with the Government but does not receive public monies. Altogether, job opportunities this summer are 30 percent greater than a year ago and are at the highest level in the 7-year history of this program.

The Federal Government will invest over \$303 million in its summer job programs in 1971. Of the 674,000 Federally-provided jobs, the Neighborhood Youth Corps will provide more than 609,000. An additional 63,000 of the jobs are in the Federal Summer Employment Program for Youth and 2,000 are in the newly established Youth Conservation Corps.

I am also pleased to report the expansion of Federal summer recreation programs for even younger Americans. We expect that some 2 million young people will participate in programs designed to build physical fitness, improve health, and provide educational and cultural opportunities.

I believe this expanded program represents a positive and promising approach to the problems of disadvantaged youth in every part of our country. It provides them with a chance to do useful work and learn useful skills. Surely this is one of the wisest investments a nation can make—an investment in the lives of its young.

MAJ. GEN. PAUL R. STONEY'S ADDRESS ON ARMED FORCES DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McKEVITT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, on this past Armed Forces Day, it was my pleasure to visit Lowry Air Force Base in my congressional district of Denver. I was most impressed with an Armed Forces Day address at Lowry delivered by Maj. Gen. Paul R. Stoney, USAF, Commander, Air Force Communications Service.

I believe General Stoney's address carries a message about our military establishment—a message that is too often overlooked. I would like to share General Stoney's address with the House:

ARMED FORCES DAY

(Presented by Maj. Gen. Paul R. Stoney)

A new generation has grown into maturity since the first Armed Forces Day in 1950. The members of this new generation differ in many ways from their elders; they are less tolerant of hypocrisy, prejudice and indifference to our nation's ills. During their 21 years of life, much has happened and much has changed. Wars, assassinations, sit-ins, revolutions, moonwalks and campus demonstrations have been part of their daily bread. Their environment has been far different from that we grew up in.

But despite all the events and upheavals, two constants have remained unchanged: (1) the very real and growing military threat to this country by aggressive Soviet actions; and (2) the strong and successful U.S. strategic deterrent, of which the Air Force is a key element.

On this Armed Forces Day, the United States finds its military strength challenged around the globe, even close to home. In the past year, the Soviet Air Force forayed into the Western Hemisphere by way of Cuba and Peru.

On this Armed Forces Day, the daily newspaper headlines pretty well sum up the threat:

Soviets Expand Missile Forces; More ICBMs than U.S.

Soviet Technology Produces Multiple Rocket Vehicles;

New Stable of Soviet Fighters Shown;

Expanded Soviet R&D Outlays Outstrips U.S.

Mach 3 FOXBAT in Production; Red Navy Everywhere.

Growing ChiCom Nuclear Threat, and so the stories go every day.

Combine these facts with developments on the home front—such as public criticism on the military, defense budget cuts, an expanding public mood of retrenchment, and even disenchantment in the ranks—and that spells Trouble, with a capital T.

Introspection, self-chastisement, penny-pinching and even retrenchment can be healthy and desirable—at the proper time. But is this the proper time? I think not. Good intentions, wishful thinking and relaxation of vigilance and resolution have never defended freedom. History deals only in cold and hard realities. And its lesson is clear: a weak defense posture, and an irresolute pop-

ulation, are invitation to attack and exploitation by a belligerent regime.

There can be no prudent alternative for this great nation than to remain strong in both weaponry, and national will.

Fortunately, the ingredients of real and credible national strength come from the people. And most of the American people have learned from the painful lessons of history. President Nixon restated those lessons recently when he said:

"We have accepted the necessity of war. But our purpose is peace. Peace with freedom... so that peace may be worth having. Peace with justice... so that peace may be worth keeping. And peace with strength... so that peace may be preserved.

"We must have strength. If all the world were free, we might have no need of arms. If all the world were just, we would have no need for valor. But as we see that the values we cherish are not cherished universally, and that there are those who feel threatened by the prospects of freedom and justice, then we must keep the strength we need to keep the values we cherish."

The men and women of our Armed Forces have learned that lesson from first hand experience. Their dedication and skill have made our military strength respected and reckoned with in today's world.

But respect and appreciation goes beyond those for the brave and the strong. It goes to the uniformed men and women—old and young—who are thinkers, educators, healers and humanitarians. They are communicators, electrical engineers, technicians, clerks, nurses, lawyers, journalists; specialists of all vocations... a true section of America.

However, too often our people are regarded as mere cogs in the machine of war, or as one politician said last week, as fodder for the hungry beast. His point was to cut off the supply by stopping the draft. Blaming war on the military is like blaming fires on the fire department. Too often military people are thought of only in terms of combat. Too often time in service is seen as "a bad trip," a waste of time, money and manpower. Too often time in service is seen as "a bad trip," as the kids say.

But I believe it would be more realistic to look upon our servicemen as a special kind of national resource—members of a vast training, education and testing ground for American youth at the threshold of their career.

Although the new generation may regard the old military maxim of "send me your boy and I'll return you a man" as corny, and as a "bummer," I think it is more valid today than it was yesterday.

Every day the military establishment returns to our cities and towns, servicemen and women and broader experiences and with more marketable skills and education than they possessed when they left home, or probably than they would have had if they had stayed at home. Almost all the young recruits and enlistees have to be trained, for they possessed no real skills. Most of them had only recently finished or left high school with hardly more skills than those required to run a lawnmower. Without the military there to accept these young people, many of them would have remained unemployable, or become unemployed or menial laborers drifting from job to job. The social and economic costs of supporting them would have gone to their parents and the public.

Unfortunately, this probability is not being recognized and is perhaps obscured by the public's current attitude toward the draft and the war in Southeast Asia.

Secretary of the Air Force Robert Seamans realized their phenomenon when he remarked recently: Quote "Sometimes I think there are not enough young people who realize how much the Air Force has to offer as a

means to develop their skills for a more productive role in America, whether within or without the military." Unquote.

Since I am most familiar with Air Force activities, I will have to discuss them, but I don't mean to slight the efforts of the Army, Navy and Marine Corps.

The magnitude of our education and training effort is impressive indeed. Last year almost 500,000 Air Force members participated in some form of formal technical training, and over 180,000 were enrolled in civilian schools—on or off-duty. And I have not included the practical training every man receives at his work as he gains improved proficiency on the job. In this fiscal year, the Air Force will spend 1.3 billion dollars on training, resulting in over one million completions of Air Force formal courses. And counting the extension courses we offer, the number of completions will amount to about 1½ million. Only in this manner are we able to maintain a highly qualified and competent force.

Right here at Lowry, about 32,000 Air Force personnel were trained last year in such civilian utility fields as logistics, avionics and photo training. Through the Army's Fitzsimmons Hospital, valuable training in many aspects of medicine was provided Army personnel. Many of those trained left the Army to serve the nation as civilian medical practitioners. So, the immediate benefits go to the armed service, but in the long run the civilian sectors will benefit, and we get defense of our nation in the process. Each year about 140,000 skilled Air Force people return to civilian communities and assume productive and meaningful civilian careers. We wish we could keep more of them, but with their training, a civilian career often sounds very alluring.

Without the military's ability to create a trained manpower pool, civilian industry would today be hard pressed to replenish its work force. According to Labor Department statistics, one of every six civilian craftsmen or technicians earned his initial skill and training in the military. Because civilian educators, for a variety of reasons, have neglected vocational education in America, the military services have had to assume the responsibility for technical training. It is highly unlikely that Congress or the civilian sector would have financed a training program on the scale required in the military. The cost would have been prohibitive, and we wouldn't have gotten defense of our country at the same time.

Just think of all the types of military experience which can be transferred directly to civilian industry! As a matter of fact, over 90% of Air Force skills have direct civilian utility. How about all the former pilots, navigators and ground crews who make up the bulk of the commercial airline work force, as well as many fine former Air Force Communications Service communicators and air controllers. And then there are doctors, fire chiefs, clerks, mechanics, computer programmers, and the unjustly infamous cooks. The list is endless. When we look at this kind of indirect benefit to the country, we realize that the return to the American people on their defense investment has been and will continue to be high. I would say we get a good return for our tax dollar.

Then there is that unknown number of men who were destined to failure on the outside. For them, the services have been successful in allowing them to live a dignified life. It seems obvious that no matter what your views may be, the services have a valuable training proficiency that the nation cannot afford to overlook or abolish.

But besides being one of the largest educational institutions in the world, the defense establishment has also been in the vanguard of technological advancement. The nation derives spin-offs from military technology

through application by non-military segments of our economy. Civilian technology is advanced by both our aeronautical and our space programs in the fields of communications and electronics, medicine, metallurgy, meteorology, geodesy and many others.

Almost from its birth, the American military has had an expanding role in American life. The U.S. Army sent two young infantry captains, Lewis and Clark, to explore the western edge of this continent, a trip that transformed the American concept of nationhood. The Navy sent Commodore Perry in 1853 to open the doors to Japan, thus admitting Western Commerce.

The Army Corps of Engineers has long been involved in public projects related to flood control and navigation. Dr. Walter Reed helped to stamp out yellow fever, and just recently Army doctors discovered an antidote for encephalitis. New methods of communication are usually first developed by and for the military prior to a time the commercial sector appreciated the benefits, or could afford their development.

The present effectiveness of air transportation, be it superiority in airframes, communications equipment or air traffic control, can be traced to military aviation. Space exploration has been boosted through contribution of knowledge and manpower by the Navy and Air Force.

Advancements in Air Force weapon system have directly increased the overall scientific capability of our nation. Much of our work has spurred the development of automation technology and helped to revolutionize the entire electronics field. The contribution of Air Force R&D programs in the field of aeronautics has been very significant. Expenditures have averaged about one billion dollars a year for the past 20 years. The rewards to the nation have been gratifying.

The development of American aviation is synonymous with military aviation. In more recent years, and somewhat less widely known, are the Air Force's corollary contributions to the aerospace age. For example, the Air Force pioneered a high by-pass turbofan engine in the early 60's, on which technology for the C-5 engine was built and subsequently for the Boeing 747 and McDonnell-Douglas DC-10.

Air Force research on materials has produced success in the application of titanium and filament composites which commercial aviation will surely use in the 1970's.

Countless other examples could be cited, but let it suffice to say that it is questionable whether the American aerospace industry would be the world leader in aerospace manufacturing and commercial aviation today without the ground work done by the Air Force and the other services.

The Air Force is also very active in programs outside pure aeronautical research and development, which promise to benefit communities and society at large. What we have learned doing our primary military mission often has value in other areas if imaginatively, cooperatively and boldly applied. A few examples illustrate the range of possibilities.

First, in the field of housing. We are involved in a promising project at George AFB, California, which may be applicable to both the military and domestic housing needs. Last year Congress stated that 26 million homes need to be constructed in this decade—a requirement that seems impossible unless present construction methods are improved.

One possible method of reaching that goal would be through the development of modular construction, a method the Air Force adopted years ago. The Air Force builds schools and hospitals this way, erecting them on site in record time. The George experiment involves construction of a complete residential community using a minimum number of sub-assemblies, manufactured in

an off-site plant, and erected by a minimum of 200 unskilled labor. Completion of the 200 units of townhouses, apartments and single units is scheduled for late summer—which incidentally will be six weeks ahead of schedule. A 20% reduction in overall costs is expected to be realized when compared to the more conventional method of on-site construction. Thus a 3-bedroom unit should cost only about \$12,000.

Using this kind of innovation in housing construction may enable the Air Force to overcome its own deficit of 40,000 family housing units. At the same time, it may be a means for private industry to solve our nation's housing needs. Civilian agencies and the Department of Housing and Urban Development have asked the Air Force for information for future prototype housing programs.

We hear a great deal about the deterioration of our environment. Most Americans are finally beginning to realize that continued unabated pollution of our land, water and air will eventually endanger our quality of life and even our very existence. Here again, the Air Force has taken a lead in combating the elements of pollution.

For example, Air Force scientists have produced fuel additives to reduce the smoke level of engines. New generation engines are reducing air pollution near air terminals. A C-47 has been instrumented for signature measurements. The equipment provides scientific information for such projects as wildlife surveys, data collection on waterway oil slicks and shoreline studies. The techniques employed may ultimately be used in the analysis of water pollution problems and forest management, as well as in the detection of military targets.

The Air Force high speed controlled weather communications net makes available weather data which in addition to many other benefits, forms the basis for forecasts of pollution in certain areas, including New York.

In a research effort as extensive as that pursued by the Air Force, there are many kinds of knowledge gained and techniques developed which can also serve a non-military end. The Air Force, and its sister services, will continue to direct useful information to those who can apply it for social improvements.

Although no press mills or TV cameras are grinding out stories covering our efforts, and we don't want them to, the men and women in uniform as well as their families lend continuous support to improvements in the health and welfare of their communities. They are active in church groups, PTA, the Boy Scouts, Little League, Chamber of Commerce, various associations plus a variety of projects aimed at improving the quality of our life, especially the less fortunate in our society. Go to any community outside an Air Force base and see who leads in these activities. In my own command, we support about 50 orphanages around the world. Some get their sole support from our airmen.

Beyond individual efforts to contribute to social action, most bases are involved in particular "domestic action" projects. Men from Robins AFB, Georgia, for instance, worked hand-in-hand with other concerned citizens in a massive campaign to spruce up neglected Macon on the other side of the tracks. Offutt AFB has a program for children of the ghetto in Omaha. About 2,000 youngsters spent a week of athletics, good food and counseling on the base. Veterinarians in Alaska helped curb rabies through inspection of animal populations and inoculations. Right here at Lowry, underprivileged kids use the recreational facilities during the summer, and other facilities are provided for Handicap Olympics.

Military members are consistently among the first on the scene during natural disaster to assist humanitarian efforts. At times we

are the first and only group with the resources, readiness and discipline to establish a workable command and recovery arrangement. During Hurricane Camille in 1969, the Air Force saved countless lives by preparing and providing shelters at Keesler AFB. After the calm, nearly 10,000 Air Force personnel assisted in the disaster operation, providing food, water, lodging, communications, restoring utility and power services, cleaning up debris, rescuing casualties, lending medical and health assistance and evacuating victims to hospitals. I could go on all day. The point is—

Our men in uniform stand ready to pitch in where needed, be it an earthquake in Peru, a flood in Mississippi, a tornado in Texas, a hurricane in Florida, a typhoon in the Philippines, a forest fire in California or an epidemic in a big city. They have been called in to deliver the mail, to protect passengers from skyjackers and to maintain law and order during riots when all else threatened to fail.

But the total contribution to the nation cannot be justly expressed by citing these few examples. Our military is an inseparable fiber, woven in the web that makes America strong. The pull and stress on that web is violent as never before. If the military fiber in the weaving is weakened by thoughtless and imprudent statements and acts, the entire web may rip. I pray that the American people will not stand by idle and let that happen. There is little sense in programs that enhance the quality of life for our citizens unless we also provide a defense posture that can safeguard our freedom. We in the military will not and cannot relax and we must continue to increase our efforts to better serve all of America's needs, whether people like us or not.

But let us not pass this special day of honor without remembering our men lingering in the dungeons of North Vietnam. Some 1,550 of our bravest and strongest are either Prisoners of War or are listed as Missing in Action. Some have been suffering in squalor and isolation for seven long, long years.

North Vietnam has refused again and again to honor her Geneva Convention agreements about Prisoners of War. North Vietnam has refused to release the sick and wounded; refused to allow free flow of mail; refused to release official lists of those they hold prisoners and those they know to be dead; and refused to allow impartial inspections of POW camps. This is the type of enemy we face in Vietnam and yet we see Americans carrying their flag in our streets.

The word to describe the North Vietnamese treatment of our men is "inhumane." The sands of time cannot run on any longer for them. On this Armed Forces Day, to quote Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, "We shall not rest until every American who is a prisoner of war comes home again to live out his life in peace."

INVISIBLE POWER BEHIND THE U.N.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, American patriot Lt. Col. Arch E. Roberts, Army of the United States, retired, contends that the U.N. Charter has superseded the U.S. Constitution and he is hard at work attempting to rectify this situation.

As head of the Committee To Restore the Constitution, suite 990, Savings Building, Oak at Howes, Fort Collins, Colo., Colonel Roberts is waging a campaign to inspire investigation of the United Nations Treaty agreements by the respective State legislatures, basing his

endeavor on the charge that the United Nations organization is an apparatus for covertly dismantling the U.S. Constitution.

In testimony given on May 5, 1971, to the subcommittee, house general legislation committee of the State of Florida, Roberts explained the origins of the United Nations and stated that the Vietnam war has never served interests of the American people but has been pursued for purely economic reasons. He charged that the lives of American soldiers are being expended in Vietnam to purchase resources of Southeast Asia for those who conceived the United Nations.

Believing as does Colonel Roberts that the executive and judicial branches are in some matters following the U.N. Charter rather than the U.S. Constitution, I have reintroduced the bill, H.R. 360, to repeal the United Nations Participation Act of 1965.

I insert Lieutenant Colonel Roberts' statement entitled "Invisible Power Behind the U.N.," related news clippings to support his testimony, and the text of H.R. 360:

INVISIBLE POWER BEHIND THE U.N.

(Statement by Archibald E. Roberts, Lt. Col., AUS (ret.), Director, Committee to Restore the Constitution, Inc.)

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, House General Legislation Committee, on May 5th, 1971, I addressed your parent committee in support of House Concurrent Resolution No. 769, introduced by Representative Donald H. Reed, Jr., calling for the formation of a special joint committee of the Florida State Legislature to study the relationship of agencies of the federal government with the United Nations Organization.

In consonance with the thrust of my testimony, and in accord with the purposes of this subcommittee appointed to recommend action on HCR 769, I respectfully request that the following remarks and accompanying documents be inserted into the record of your proceedings.

Mr. Chairman, there is a popular and widely promoted myth that the United Nations sprang from the minds and hearts of delegates representing fifty peace-loving nations meeting at San Francisco in 1945.

Like most UN-serving propaganda this belief, too, is false.

In the next few pages I intend to prove that the United Nations had its birth in 1941 and that it is entirely the product of private interests.

I will show that the UN is a creature of an invisible power group who operate through agencies of the federal government to covertly dismantle the United States Constitution.

I will demonstrate that the United Nations Treaty is exploited by these private interests as an instrument to coerce the States and their people into a totalitarian world government.

The United Nations Organization, lineal descendent of the star-crossed League of Nations, was spawned two weeks after Pearl Harbor in the office of Secretary of State Cordell Hull.¹

In a letter to President Franklin D. Roosevelt dated December 22, 1941, Secretary Hull, at the direction of his faceless sponsors, recommended the founding of a Presidential Advisory Committee on Post-War Foreign Policy.

The Post-War Foreign Policy Committee was, as we shall see, the Planning Commission for the United Nations Charter.

The purpose of this Committee, said Mr. Hull, would be to prepare for effective participation in the solution of "vast and complicated problems of international relations which will confront 'the United States and the world after 'final defeat of the forces of aggression.'"

"It," (the Committee) Hull said, "will work in the inseparably interrelated fields of general security, limitation of armaments, sound international economic relationships, and other phases of international cooperation, the implementation of which is essential to enduring world peace and to economic progress."

These world government goals, paralleling the objectives of the Foreign Policy Association (an interlocking agency of the Council on Foreign Relations) were subsequently embedded in the Charter of the United Nations Organization—a world government constitution.

All research, interdepartmental government agency coordination, and international cooperation concerning this United Nations Planning Commission was set up in the Department of State "or under its leadership."

In addition to himself as chairman, Cordell Hull listed the following members for his United Nations "brain trust":

Mr. Sumner Wells, Under Secretary of State, Vice Chairman, Member, Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Norman H. Davis, President, Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Myron C. Taylor, Member, Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, Member, Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong, Editor, "Foreign Affairs", official publication, Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, Member, Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Asaiah Bowman, President, John Hopkins University, Member, Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Benjamin Cohen, General Counsel, National Power Policy Committee, Member, Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Herbert Feis, Department of State Advisor on International Economic Relations, Member, Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Green N. Hackworth, Department of State Legal Advisor.

Mr. Harry C. Hopkins, Chief, Department of State Division of Commercial Policy.

Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick, Editorial Staff, The New York Times.

Dr. Leo Pasvolsky, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, Chief of the Department's Division of Special Research, Member, Council on Foreign Relations.

On or about December 28, the President wrote on Mr. Hull's letter: "I heartily approve. F.D.R."

Mr. Chairman, of the many designers of the United Nations Charter—both Russian and American—the two principal contributors on the American side proved to be Dr. Leo Pasvolsky, Chief, Division of Special Research, Department of State,² and his assistant, Mr. Alger Hiss, Chief of Political Affairs, Department of State.³

It is of critical significance to note that Dr. Pasvolsky, although born in Russia of communist revolutionary parents, achieved phenomenal success in the United States Department of State. He was inserted into our Government in 1934 and rose by rapid progression to a key position which ultimately led to decisions affecting the transfer of United States sovereignty to the United Nations Organization.⁴

Time magazine, in an obituary dated 18 May, 1953, credits Pasvolsky with being the "architect" of the United Nations Charter.

Alger Hiss, co-author of the first draft of the United Nations Charter and later U.N.

General Secretary at the San Francisco conference⁵, was at the same time a member of the Harold Ware communist cell in Washington, D.C., a Soviet espionage agent⁶, and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.⁷

The final draft of the United Nations Charter, completing the work of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Post-War Foreign Policy, was approved by President Harry S. Truman on 26 June, 1945, at the closing session of the San Francisco Conference.

On July 28, the Senate of the United States, following a reading of the Charter by Dr. Pasvolsky in the Senate Chamber, adopted this extraordinary treaty by a vote of 89 to 2.

In the words of the U.S. Senate, the Charter of the United Nations thus "became the supreme law of the Land"⁸ and the Constitution of the United States of America passed into history.

"I feel from the bottom of my heart", said the Honorable William Langer, a dissenting Senator, "that the adoption of the Charter . . . will mean perpetuating war. I feel that it will mean the enslavement of millions of people from Poland to India, from Korea to Java, as well as people in many other places on this earth."⁹

Senator Langer's prophesy was to be confirmed in blood and agony in the succeeding years—with the most terrible consequences for the American people still to unfold.

Mr. Chairman, the preceding historical vignette has established the following relevant evidence:

1. Every officer of the fourteen-member Presidential Advisory Committee on Post-War Foreign Policy was a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, or under the control of the Council on Foreign Relations.¹⁰

2. All national and international research and coordination for the Committee on Post-War Foreign Policy was set up in the U.S. Department of State "or under its leadership".

3. The end product of the work of the Committee on Post-War Foreign Policy, the United Nations Charter, resulted in the transfer by deceit and subterfuge, of powers of government from the Congress to the United Nations Organization.

Mr. Chairman, this evidence on the origins of the U.N. points to the real objective of the "no-win" war in Viet Nam.

Massive brainwashing by national news media has attempted to convince Americans that the unconscionable policy of "Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace" somehow defends the United States against "communist aggression". It is clear, however, that this interminable conflict has reduced neither the military nor political power of "communism". In fact, while sending millions of young men to fight on the mainland of Asia, "with neither the promise nor hope of Victory", the federal government has contracted extensive trade and cultural agreements with the very nations which kill our sons.

I submit that the commitment of American blood and treasure to the Indochina theatre has never served the interests of the American people. I charge that this strange United Nations war is being pursued for purely economic objectives. I declare that lives of America's soldier sons are being expended in Viet Nam to purchase the resources of Southeast Asia for those who conceived the United Nations Organization.

The facts can no longer be ignored.

I offer for examination a full page feature from Chicago Today, dated March 29, 1971, headed, "Oil fuels up Indochina politics".

"Clues are beginning to pile up that there may be huge quantities of crude oil in the waters of the Far East and Southeast Asia", declared this Chicago Tribune publication. "Discoveries by Natomas, Atlantic Richfield,

Footnotes at end of article.

and Union Oil have triggered a frantic exploration race off Indonesia. An optimistic report by a United Nations team about possible oil deposits between Japan and Taiwan is fueling speculation that the entire Far East could contain oil deposits rivaling those of the Middle East."

In another article from The Oregonian, dated May 1, 1971, a Portland manufacturing executive stated that, "The United States will form a 'strange, new partnership' with Red China because of a new economic factor—major oil discoveries off the shores of South Vietnam."

Mr. Chairman, under the guise of supporting our military forces in Viet Nam many manufacturing plants have been erected in the Mekong Delta to exploit copper, tin, and other resources of the Far East. Southeast Asia has, in fact, been transformed into a vast industrial complex and merged into the world industrial society envisaged by the monetary powers which establish the United Nations Organization. The private profits accruing to these banking and industrial interests are enormous.

Upon the documented record presented here can be constructed these deductions:

A. The Council on Foreign Relations, its membership comprising about fourteen-hundred leading financiers, industrialists, politicians, media directors, educators, and militarists in America, has as its long-range goal the establishment of a United Nations world government which they command.

B. The U.S. Department of State and other federal agencies are controlled by an international body, the Council on Foreign Relations.

C. The Council of Foreign Relations, on July 28, 1945, through its State Department apparatus, foisted upon the American people the United Nations Charter, a world government constitution, in violation of the prohibitions of the Constitution of the United States of America.

D. The Council on Foreign Relations is the invisible government of the United States and its members covertly, maliciously, and to their personal profit, direct foreign and domestic matters concerning the United States and its citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I have shown the United Nations Organization to be a subversive instrument for global conquest devised by the Council on Foreign Relations. The proper party to now challenge the validity of the ultra vires United Nations Treaty is a party to the constitutional compact a sovereign State. Through its legislative apparatus the State of Florida can legally clarify the question of attempted usurpation of governmental powers and restore the Constitution as the "supreme law of the land."

The Florida State Legislature, being the reservoir of true political power, is morally and legally obligated to defend the Constitution and protect the freedoms of person and property guaranteed to the people by the Constitution.

In support of my testimony, and in addition to the evidence noted therein, I present to your subcommittee four hundred seventy-seven pages of documents in loose-leaf folio. The raw information contained in Books One and Two of this World Government File provides substantive proof for the following conclusions:

(a) The United Nations Organization is a product of mutual cooperation between the governments of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and the United States of America.
(b) Interlocking world government organization reveals collusion between U.S. Government agencies and other public and private agents in a conspiracy to overthrow the Constitution of the United States and to erect, by guile and deceit, a totalitarian, socialist state upon the ruins of the American republic.

(c) The global proliferation of international agencies originating in New York City

indicate central funding of vast operations from reservoirs of unlimited financial power.

(d) The United Nations Treaty has nothing to do with world peace. Its purpose and objective is to transfer the U.S. Military establishment, and U.S. sovereignty, to the United Nations Organization so as to force all nations into line and to deliver them up to a one world covenant.

(e) The world government covenant, of which the United Nations is a part, is controlled and manipulated by an international money aristocracy for private profit.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge favorable consideration of House Concurrent Resolution #769 and the formation of a special legislative committee to examine the relationship of the agencies of federal government with the United Nations Organization.

Respectfully,
Lt. Col., AUS, ARCHIBALD E. ROBERTS, ret.,
Director, Committee to Restore the Constitution.

FOOTNOTES
1 Post-War Foreign Policy Preparation 1939-45, Department of State Publication #3580, General Foreign Policy Series 15, Released February, 1950, pages 63-64.

2 Time magazine, May 18, 1953, page 99.

3 Seeds of Treason, Ralph de Toledano, page 110.

4 Current Biography, 1945, pages 448-449.

5 Seeds of Treason, Ralph de Toledano, page 112.

6 Witness, Whittaker Chambers, pages 535, 542-543.

7 The Invisible Government, Dan Smoot, page 5.

8 Review of the United Nations Charter, Senate Document No. 87, January 7, 1954, page 289.

9 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 28, 1945, pages 8188-8189.

10 The Council on Foreign Relations, Harold Pratt House, 58 East 68th Street, New York, N.Y. 10021.

11 "Oil fuels up Indochina politics", Chicago Today, March 29, 1971.

12 "U.S.-Chinese thaw linked to oil find", The Oregonian, May 1, 1971.

REED'S STUDY OF THE U.N.
(By David Cook)

The House General Legislation Committee listened to testimony on Rep. Reed's bill to study the relationship between the United Nations charter and the U.S. Constitution Wednesday.

In the end the bill was put in a special subcommittee for further study and probable oblivion. It seems most unlikely at this point that the State Legislature will name a joint committee to see if U.S. affiliation with the U.N. is constitutional.

While the significance of a state probe of alleged violations of the Constitution may not be readily apparent to the public, the proponents of Reed's bill see it as an important step in getting the states to reassert their constitutional powers.

The proponents say Congress isn't about to reverse itself on the United Nations, so it is necessary for the states to demonstrate that Congress, particularly the Senate, has no constitutional right to enter into treaties which subvert the Constitution.

And it is the contention that ratification of the U.N. charter, plus other treaties, puts the U.S., its government and military forces, under the control of the United Nations.

They make a good case, because the language of the charter and various treaties is clear. Where the case breaks down, however, is in recognition that the U.S. must be willing to submit to the power of the U.N. and it will not do that.

Except for some idiotic developments during the Korean war and apparently during the Vietnam war, the U.S. has not fallen into the U.N. trap painted so vividly by those people who want us out of it.

Proponents of the Reed bill include members of the Committee to Restore the Constitution, Women for Constitutional Government, Daughters of the American Revolution, and Sons of the American Revolution. About 75 were on hand for the hearing.

Spokesman for the group was Archibald E. Roberts, a retired Army Colonel, who talked for a half hour or so about how the U.N. has subverted the Constitution.

He claimed the Vietnam War is a United Nations war and read appropriate documents to prove it. He declared the U.N. a subversive organization.

In addition, he said "vital powers of government held in trust for the American people have been illegally transferred to the United Nations in violation of the prohibitions of the Constitution."

His claim is that the U.N. Charter was "foisted upon the American people to serve those who seek to overthrow the Constitution and coerce American citizens into a socialist world government."

Col. Roberts' evidence is impressive, and he left a great deal of it with the General Legislation Committee. Whether he convinced anyone who wasn't already opinionated on the subject is questionable.

It is doubtful that he convinced committee members that the Florida Legislature could do anything about the situation even if his charges proved 100 per cent correct.

Reed argued the charges should be examined by the Legislature because "we are American citizens." He emphasized that all he asked for was a four-man committee to look into the situation and report back its findings.

Introducing Col. Roberts to the committee was former U.S. Congressman Bruce Alger of Texas, now of Boca Raton, which also is Reed's home town.

Alger also contended the Constitution is subverted by U.S. membership in the U.N. He reported that Florida Congressman Bob Sikes has introduced a resolution calling for a full review of the U.N. charter.

He added, however, that it still is necessary for the states to assert themselves on the issue. He indicated an effort is being made to get other state legislatures to look into it. "I don't consider myself a nut on this subject," Reed said. "But a lot of people have questions about the real relationship between our government and the U.N."

He said he didn't grasp the full impact of the situation and therefore felt an inquiry should be made so the Legislature could draw some conclusions about it.

The motion to shunt the bill into a subcommittee came from Rep. George Firestone of Miami. He exhibited a notable lack of sympathy with the proceedings.

Reed will be lucky if he ever hears from his bill again.

OIL FUELS UP INDOCHINA POLITICS

HUGE DEPOSITS ADD NEW ANGLE TO U.S. WAR POLICY

It has passed the rumor stage. Clues are beginning to pile up that there may be huge quantities of crude oil in the waters of the Far East and Southeast Asia. Discoveries by Natomas, Atlantic Richfield, and Union Oil have triggered a frantic exploration race off Indonesia. An optimistic report by a United Nations team about possible oil deposits between Japan and Taiwan is fueling speculation that the entire Far East could contain oil deposits rivaling those of the Middle East.

Some of these deposits would almost certainly lie off South Viet Nam. Nobody yet knows for sure because no drilling has taken place. But preliminary United Nations surveys have given the area good marks. And there are plenty of rumors. One is that a British company has found signs of oil on the prison island of Con Son, east of the southern tip of Viet Nam.

The political implications, of course, are enormous. But if the oil is there, or even probably there, the question of who rules in Saigon takes on more than political significance. Already, United States antiwar groups are beginning to suggest that a desire to ensure friendly governments in the Indochina area could slow down President Nixon's withdrawal from the war. An organization called "Another Mother for Peace" has flooded the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with over 10,000 letters calling for public hearings.

Not surprising, the oil companies are less than anxious to discuss the topic. Walter Levy, a New York-based oil expert and consultant to many of the companies, says flatly: "I don't want to comment. It's become a political issue."

"We haven't made up our minds yet," says a spokesman for Mobil Oil, asked whether his company would bid for concessions. Another dodges the question: "Texaco is not participating in exploration in Viet Nam."

Queried about his government's plans, Ngo Thanh Tung, an economist at the South Vietnamese embassy in Washington, says: "Several companies have been sending their proposals, but none of them have yet been considered." But oilmen expect Saigon to ask for bids quite soon.

In a conference last year, Chase Manhattan Chairman David Rockefeller made a little-noticed speech that created a quiet stir among Asia-watchers. By 1980, Rockefeller said, the oil industry could pour \$36 billion of capital investment into the Asian Pacific. This kind of money could give the area the boost it needs to enter the industrial age. It could help make up for the loss of U. S. military expenditures by substituting oil wells for military bases.

To give a sense of proportion, the total, free world investment Chase predicts for 1969-1980 is \$250 billion. But the Asian Pacific share will almost equal the total slated for Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. "The Asian Pacific," commented Petroleum Engineer, a trade journal, "looks like the next big international boom area."

If the oil is there, the boom will undoubtedly follow. The Asian area is the fastest-growing oil market in the world. Japan, which burns 3.4 million barrels a day, is forecast to consume over 10 million a day by 1980. While Southeast Asia consumes relatively little oil, consumption could rise at a brisk pace if industrialization plans catch hold. "Just think of all those people who are now burning charcoal and using oxcarts," sighs one oilman.

Where is all the oil coming from? Southeast Asia may contain enough offshore crude to fuel that growth. Right now its production doesn't come close. Indonesia, the largest producer, turns out only 900,000 barrels a day. Japan must therefore rely on the Middle East for 85% of its oil, but Japan is uneasy at its dependence on this volatile area.

Compared with Middle East oil, moreover, South Asian oil will be close to its markets, reducing transportation costs. Drilling and the production costs are reasonable, because the offshore areas of Indonesia and Viet Nam are relatively calm and very shallow.

Perhaps most important, the oil found so far off Indonesia is exceptionally low in sulphur content, less than 1 per cent compared with the 3 per cent-plus content of Middle East crude. This would give it a major cost advantage in Japan, which is imposing strict pollution controls.

Much of the oil could find its way into the rest of the world market, where more oil will be needed within the next 15 years than has been produced in the history of the oil industry. The low sulphur content could make the oil very attractive to the west coast American market, where pollution is a big issue. The uncertainties of Middle East poli-

tics, the higher prices being imposed by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries and the delay in finding a way to transport crude from the North Slope of Alaska to the 48 states add to the prospects.

A veteran oilman puts it this way: "We don't have the oil in the U.S. to meet our future requirements. Either we are going to have our future committed to those crazy Arabs or we are going to develop Southeast Asia, the West Coast of Africa and the West Coast of Latin America as alternate sources—and, hopefully, build the Alaskan pipeline."

In any case, mounting U.S. activity in the area raises huge political questions that must be balanced against the economic benefits for Southeast Asia and the U.S.:

Might a discovery lead to pressure for slowing down the pace of U.S. troop withdrawals?

Might oil industry agreements with the present Thieu-Ky regime commit the U.S. even closer to this controversial government?

If the war in Indochina bogs down permanently, won't the oil industry run the risk of being made the scapegoat for whatever goes wrong?

Is a "friendly" regime in Saigon really vital to U.S. access to such oil? After all many Arab countries are rabidly unfriendly to the West but sell their oil there.

What will the effect be on the political and military policies of Japan and China?

Oil seems forever fated to be a political mineral.

U.S.—CHINESE THAW LINKED TO OIL FIND

(By Blaine Schultz)

The United States will form a "strange, new partnership" with Red China because of a new economic factor—major oil discoveries off the shores of South Vietnam, a Portland manufacturing executive said Friday.

Monford A. Orloff, president of Evans Products Co., told a shippers' group at the Portland Hilton Hotel the importance of the oil will speed up "the game of musical chairs" between nations.

But he intimated it would be naive to assume that the honeymoon between the United States and mainland China simply grew out of favorable reception in Peking of an American ping pong team.

At first, most of the oil from the new deposits will be delivered to Japan, he said.

"Then China will take more and more of this extremely valuable asset," Orloff said at the closing luncheon of the three-day National Association of Shippers Advisory Boards.

Purposely side-stepping a talk that would deal with transportation alone, Orloff indicated that the "increasing turmoil and unrest which plagues our country" called for openness and that the protests by the younger generation are understandable.

In his talk to businessmen, the Portland manufacturer talked about inflation, the controversial topic of Vietnam, and the new American relationship with Red China.

At the end of the talk, almost the entire dining hall of transportation people and shippers stood to applaud. The gathering, for the most part, was "over forty."

Orloff said he could understand how the nation's leaders would be frustrated by the "rising tide of protest" led by the younger generation against the war.

"Frustrating, yes, but surprising, no," Orloff declared, as he noted that the difficulties arose "because of the insistence of our leaders in applying the panaceas of the Fifties and Sixties to the problems of the Seventies."

By 1966, he said, "we found ourselves engaged in a terrible, costly war, the likes of which were never thoughtfully contemplated and the results of which gave rise to most of the serious problems with which we are confronted today."

He said American involvement in the war "has spawned inflation, civil unrest, unem-

ployment, high interest rates, lower profits, and, possibly, a major shift in the political control of our country."

VOTERS AGE CHANGING

By 1972, he said, there will be some 42 million voters between the ages of 18 and 30.

The cure of our inflation, he said, has been a "trade-off" of higher unemployment and lessened profits in return for a somewhat lessened rate of inflation.

But the greatest inequity, he said, "the result of which will be felt for the next decade at least, was the decision to fight the war using almost entirely our young people, and particularly, the less advantaged sector of the younger generation."

He said it was the first war fought by the United States in which participation by the citizenry was "limited to those of us who have not reached the age of 26."

In addition, he said, the citizen army was disproportionately drawn from the nonwhite sector and the non-college ranks.

Because of the latent threat of intervention by Red China and the changing attitude of the American people against the war, the conflict cannot be ended by invasion or destruction of the landscape, Orloff said.

"In the not too distant future," he predicted, "our government will announce a time for final withdrawal."

"MACABRE ASPECTS" CITED

And he said there are "macabre aspects" to suggestions that the withdrawal be slowed until the prisoners of war are returned home. He said there are some 1,600 "men missing," but in the meantime, there is a casualty rate of 250 men a week "of whom 50 are killed."

Orloff said he believed that America's limitation of renewed relations with Red China "stems from the fact that the new major oil discoveries off the shores of South Vietnam have introduced a new economic factor which transcends political and social theory and calls for hardheaded realism" in how the oil is to be used.

In the not too distant future, Orloff said, "you will see our relations with Red China improve markedly," and because of the political power of the young voters, he predicted that "the war in Vietnam will quickly and speedily be ended."

EVANS SEEKS PERMISSION FOR CHINA TRADE MISSION

OLYMPIA (AP).—Gov. Dan Evans's letter to the mainland Chinese travel agency at Hong Kong asking permission to send a Washington trade mission to the Communist nation probably will be followed by direct correspondence with Peking, a state official said Friday.

Daniel B. Ward, director of the State Commerce and Economic Development Department, said the letter, dated April 22, was mailed to Hong Kong on the advice of persons experienced in trade with the Red Chinese.

"We had to decide whether to go through Hong Kong or through Ottawa, where the Chinese have some people," Ward said. "It was decided it was best to make the original overture through Hong Kong."

The letter asks permission for Evans and a 10-man group to visit the Asian nation, a possibility created by President Nixon's announcement earlier this month of relaxed market restrictions in the area.

"This mission would be limited to about 10 people who desire to promote two-way trade between the peoples of mainland China and the United States," Evans wrote.

"I seriously doubt if we'll get a quick answer to the letter," Ward said, "but when we do, it will probably be followed up with direct correspondence with Peking."

In a telephone interview from Vancouver, B.C., Ward said Evans' letter was part of a research effort to try to identify where the potential is in Chinese trade.

He said there would be no final answers for at least three or four weeks when the State Department is expected to issue a list of items that may be traded legally with China.

"We're hoping our state's products, like agriculture and Boeing aircraft, are part of the list, and if they're not, you can be sure we'll do everything we can to arbitrate their inclusion," Ward said.

He said State Department officials have told him it's still too early to say what will be on the list.

H.R. 360

A bill to repeal the United Nations Participation Act of 1945

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 is hereby repealed.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF ITALIAN NATIONAL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MINISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a notable anniversary celebrated today in the Republic of Italy. It was 25 years ago on this day that the Italian people voted in plebiscite to end their constitutional monarchy and establish a republic. By replacing the Italian monarchy with a republican form of government, Italy began her return back to the cultural and political prominence she had long enjoyed. Italy's contribution to Western civilization in such diverse fields as art, letters, religion, science and philosophy has been enormous, and many of the greatest names in the history of Western man have been Italian.

From Giotto and Cimabue in the 13th century, through Da Vinci and Raphael and Titian and Michelangelo, Italian artists ranked second to none. The musical staff was established by an Italian, Guido d'Arezzo, while Palestrina, Monteverdi, Corelli, and Vivaldi left a renowned musical legacy. Verdi and Paganini and Donizetti helped to make the 19th century the great age of opera. Puccini and Leoncavallo were more recent operatic composers, who helped to assure that the language of music was Italian. Italian operatic singer Enrico Caruso was a legend in his time and Arturo Toscanini was generally regarded as the greatest operatic and orchestral conductor among all his contemporaries. Antonio Stradivari and Giuseppe Guarneri have bequeathed to us the beauty of their musical instruments, and Italian Bartolomeo was the inventor of the piano forte.

Italian writers have ranked among the world's greats, and include Dante and Petrarch. Nobel prizewinner Luigi Pirandello wrote plays that still serve as models to budding playwrights. Novelists Ignazio Silone and Alberto Moravia are widely read and have inspired successful motion pictures. Michelangelo Antonioni, an Italian filmmaker, has directly influenced the films Americans see today, and Fed-

erico Fellino and Vittorio de Sica have produced movies no one else can hope to emulate.

Italy has produced many renowned figures in the fields of philosophy and statesmanship as well, such as Lorenzo de'Medici and Niccolo Machiavelli, Giuseppe Mazzini, statesman Camillo di Cavour and Garibaldi. Ranking Italian scientists include Galileo, Guglielmo Marconi and Enrico Fermi, while our nation can never repay its debt to Christopher Columbus and Amerigo Vespucci.

Obviously, without the contributions of the above-named Italians, our world would be a poorer place today. Some of its outstanding music, arts and letters and scientific achievements would be lost. Moreover, the great Renaissance, leading to the emergence of modern Western man, would not have had the impact nor the influence were it not for the Italian contribution.

In light of all that the great nation of Italy has offered to the world, it is most appropriate that we pay homage today to the important anniversary of its birth as a republic. Let us not forget, moreover, that Italy has not only provided us with a cultural and scientific legacy, but it has provided us with many of our citizenry as well.

It is my sincere hope that the Italian heritage, next to Greece the oldest in Europe, will continue to flourish with its present form of government. We in America wholeheartedly wish Italy every success.

EGYPTIAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP TREATY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the significance of the Egyptian-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation signed in Cairo May 27, 1971, should not be exaggerated.

The treaty produced more pessimism in the West about the course of events in the Middle East than it did in either Israel or Egypt. According to a New York Times of June 1, 1971, Prime Minister Golda Meir said the treaty "contains little that is really new," and the Egyptians regard the treaty as only formalizing their tremendous gratitude for Soviet aid over the last decade.

The only provisions of the treaty that go beyond a general plea for increased cultural, military, and political cooperation between Egypt and Russia are articles 7 and 8.

Article 7 suggests that if the political situation deteriorates in the Middle East and peace is endangered, Russia and Egypt will "contact each other without delay in order to concert their positions with a view to removing the threat that has risen or reestablishing peace."

Article 8 calls for military cooperation and aid "with a view to strengthening—the U.A.R.'s—capacity to eliminate the consequences of aggression as well as in-

creasing its ability to stand up to aggression in general."

The treaty, by itself, will not necessarily lead to any new arms deliveries or further Soviet presence in Egypt. This is not to say, however, that material deliveries will not increase.

It is useful to put this treaty into the context of Egyptian President Anwar Sadat's diplomatic strategy in recent weeks. Sadat's international role playing has sought, on the one hand, cooperation with the United States in order to pressure Israel to make concessions on withdrawals, and, on the other hand, outward signs of increased Soviet commitment to Egypt in order to increase Egypt's security and strengthen its negotiating position. In President Sadat's political position, results are extremely important. With the former tactic of cooperation with the United States producing few results, the treaty becomes an obvious way to improve his image.

From the Soviet Union's viewpoint, the treaty has the effect of bringing that country back into the forefront of events in the Middle East at a time when the U.S. interim peace proposal for opening the Suez Canal was maintaining some momentum, largely bypassing the Soviet Union.

The circumstances surrounding the signing of the treaty emphasize, first, that all nations must support the Jarring mission and any interim agreement that mission can promote, second, the importance of the United Nations' dominant role in promoting a peace so that the big powers are not offended by each other's maneuverings specifically, that the United States is not upset by this treaty and the U.S.S.R. by the recent Rogers' mission and the political upheavals in Cairo, and, third, that both Egypt and Israel have their own peace strategies that must be examined separately from the tactics of Russia and the United States.

RUTH ALEKSANDROVICH, A COURAGEOUS DAUGHTER OF ISRAEL

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, since my trip to the Soviet Union in April of this year 13 Jews have been tried and convicted in the Soviet Union. The first trial was of the nine in Leningrad; the second trial in Riga convicted four Jews. One of those convicted was Ruth Aleksandrovich. She was tried for having participated in alleged anti-Soviet agitation and anti-Soviet propaganda and was given a 1-year sentence. She has denied the charges of subversive activities and last week in the Riga court courageously asserted, "I am a Zionist"—in the U.S.S.R., that is her crime. Ruth Aleksandrovich has been in jail since October 1970, so receiving credit for time served, she will be eligible to leave prison in October.

This morning I spoke with the mother of Ruth, Mrs. Rivka Aleksandrovich who is now speaking out in the United States

on behalf of the imprisoned Soviet Jews. Mrs. Aleksandrovich told me that Ruth, who is 23 years of age, suffers from asthma and nephritis. And furthermore on May 28 Ruth's father, who is still in the U.S.S.R., was told by the Soviet authorities that Ruth was being punished. Why, he was not told—only that she has been placed in a special punishment cell for 7 days. These are cells without heat and with a stone floor. The prisoner is required to sleep on a board on the floor, and to add to the punishment, the floor is made wet; the diet consists of bread and water. Ruth Aleksandrovich, whose alleged "anti-Soviet activities" consisted of her efforts to emigrate to Israel, has been physically ill for quite some time. During the trial there were interruptions because of her illness—she came to the trial from a prison hospital—and I am told that even prior to the current punishment her physical condition was deteriorating and that she was losing her teeth. The father of Ruth spoke with his wife, Rivka Aleksandrovich, early this week and he told her that he had been scheduled to see Ruth on May 27 immediately after the trial when relatives of the other prisoners sentenced with her were permitted to see them for 10 minutes. These prisoners had not been permitted visits from their families since their imprisonment almost a year ago. Mr. Aleksandrovich was not permitted to see Ruth, however, and was told that he would no longer be allowed to send her monthly food parcels. It was then that he was told of the special punishment and treatment Ruth is now receiving.

Mr. Speaker, when I was in the Soviet Union and after having visited families of the prisoners, Lassal Kaminsky and Lev Yagman, I went to see the ancient city of Leningrad. I was taken on a tour of the Peter and Paul Fortress, now a historic museum, and shown the cells that had been used to hold young men and women who had engaged in revolutionary activities against the czar prior to the successful revolution in 1917. In front of each cell was an honorary picture of the famous prisoner with a description of his or her revolutionary activity.

There were about 12 cells, each of which was heatless. In most there were iron beds and the in-tourist guide spoke in tones of horror about the barbarism of the czarist government that left the prisoners to sleep on iron beds to which their flesh stuck, because it was so cold. In one instance the in-tourist guide pointed with horror to a cell where there was not even a bed but the prisoner was required to lie on a wet floor on a board and cope with the wind and rain that came into the cell through a large aperture. My recollection is that she was particularly proud of one young woman revolutionary, Maria Vetrova, who committed suicide in that torture cell.

Mr. Speaker, is it not strange that history should repeat itself and that the Soviets should now engage in the very barbarism which they condemned when practiced by the czar against their people. Is it not time for the nations of the

civilized world to denounce the Soviet Union for its barbarism.

Mr. Speaker, is Ruth Aleksandrovich being singled out for special punishment, because her mother speaks out here in the United States imploring the world's citizens to give aid not only for her child, but all of those held in the Soviet Union—whether in jail or living in fear in Soviet cities—whose sole desire is to emigrate to Israel?

NIXON SUPPORTS INSERVICE MILITARY DRUG TREATMENT

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, during his press conference last night, President Nixon spoke of the growing problem of drug abuse. I was pleased to hear him say that "a corrective program insofar as veterans are concerned means treating them where they are addicted to heroin or hard drugs before releasing them."

This is the main thrust of my bill, H.R. 8216, the Armed Forces Drug Abuse Control Act of 1971 which I first introduced on May 10 and which will be reintroduced today with 45 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. H.R. 8216 provides that no serviceman with a drug abuse problem may be discharged until he is adjudged free from drug dependency by competent medical authorities. The President's support for this concept is significant and welcome, and I am hopeful that Congress will act speedily on my bill knowing that effective military drug abuse control is supported by Members of both parties.

I have taken a special order today and anticipate that several of my colleagues will join me in urging immediate action on this bill.

I have today written to President Nixon to commend him for his comments on a corrective drug treatment program and to offer him my full support in his endeavors in this field. I include here the text of my letter to the President:

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I watched your press conference on television last night and I was pleased to hear you emphasize the need for a greatly improved program for handling the military drug addiction problem. I noted with gratification your statement that a corrective program "insofar as veterans are concerned, means treating them where they are addicted to heroin or hard drugs before releasing them." This is the principal thrust of my bill, H. R. 8216, "The Armed Forces Drug Abuse Control Act of 1971," which I initially filed on May 10 and which I have refiled today with the support of 45 House Members from both sides of the aisle.

I enclose for your consideration a copy of H. R. 8216 together with background statements and material which I think you may find pertinent.

I welcome your support of this concept and I hope that you will find it possible to

support H. R. 8216. I want to assure you of my support for your endeavors in this unprecedented crisis which confronts the military, and I should be happy to discuss our proposals and possible methods of making them effective.

With all good wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

THE SPACE SHUTTLE

(Mr. FREY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, on May 26 the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota inserted into the RECORD a report entitled "The Space Shuttle as an Element in the National Space Program," an interim report prepared by R. D. Shaver, D. J. Dreyfuss, W. D. Gasch, and G. S. Levenson of Rand under a contract with the Air Force.

Both the report itself and the interpretation given the report by the distinguished Senator are misleading and do not reflect current thinking about the space shuttle.

For example, the following statement was made:

An authoritative study has concluded that NASA's proposed multi-billion space shuttle program cannot be justified on economic grounds. This study thus destroys NASA's principal justification for developing this enormously expensive project.

That statement is simply not true. The Rand report is not authoritative: Its cover page clearly states that the report represents the views of its four authors, not the policy or opinion of the company or the Air Force. The report is dated 6 months ago, was largely written 12 months ago, and is based on data 2 years old and does not take account of the results of recent technical and economic studies of the shuttle and shuttle payloads.

The Air Force when it forwarded the report to the Senator noted, in fact, that "it does not represent current economic considerations." Its method of economic analysis is far less comprehensive than the studies being relied on by NASA and the Air Force in assessing the cost and usefulness of the space shuttle system. At the present time, the entire question of the space shuttle is being analyzed in depth for NASA and the Air Force by Mathematica, Inc. An interim report made by Mathematica to NASA on March 15 stated there should be a 10-percent per year economic rate of return on the investment, which "is among the highest discount rates ever applied in the evaluation of public investments in this country."

I should also like to point out that in recent testimony before the Science and Astronautics Committee that both Dr. Seamans, Secretary of the Air Force, and the Department of Defense "fully and completely support the shuttle."

The Senator also stated that "the shut-

tle, along with the space station, represents NASA's next commitment to a huge manned space program" and that to proceed with the shuttle means a NASA program of \$5 to \$9 billion per year between 1975 and 1990 and that shuttle development requires a peak budget of \$7 billion for 1 year.

The Senator, misled perhaps by his report, assumes a future space program focused on "manned space extravaganzas"; the programs for the future laid out before the Congress and carefully examined by the Committee on Science and Astronautics are not extravagant, are not focused on manned flight for its own sake, and do not cost \$9 billion per year or peak at \$7 billion.

Finally, the principal justification for the space shuttle is not purely economic, but the new capability it can bring to both our civilian and military space program for versatile and efficient operations in space.

MEMORIAL DAY SERVICE

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. DU PONT), and I shared the high personal privilege and special honor of attending the Memorial Day services at the Punch Bowl National Cemetery and also aboard the Arizona Memorial, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.

Each of us shared the moving experience of pausing for a few moments to pay a grateful homage to those who fought and sacrificed their lives that we and others might live in freedom in a place which is at once a revered national shrine, a historical monument and a constant reminder of the necessity for eternal vigilance and effective national security.

The address by Adm. Bernard A. Clarey, U.S. Navy Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, expresses a keen understanding of history, the gratitude of every patriotic American, and the spirit of mankind everywhere.

I include Admiral Clarey's address in full at this point in the RECORD, together with the memorial prayer by Capt. John W. Cohill, CHC, U.S. Navy chaplain, Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, and invocation by Comdr. Charles A. Shaw, CHC, U.S. Navy chaplain, Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, and benediction by Lt. Comdr. John A. Bruggeman, CHC, U.S. Navy chaplain, Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor:

ADDRESS BY ADM. BERNARD A. CLAREY

As grateful but sorrowing Americans have done for 103 years, we are gathered here this morning to honor our fallen heroes of all wars.

We are proud of those who have helped make our nation what it is today—the greatest, freest and most prosperous country in the history of mankind.

We are grateful for the sacrifices they have made for all of us.

We honor, too, the thousands of Americans who carry grievous scars from these wars—the men who languish in our hospitals or are incapacitated elsewhere.

And, we pay special tribute today—expressing a sense of deepest anger—for the many Americans being held prisoners by the North Vietnamese.

On this Memorial Day then, our prisoners of war, known and unknown, have a share of our hearts and our thoughts.

The events that occurred nearly 30 years ago at this site have their place in history now and will have for as long as man is able to read of the past.

Overnight the name "Pearl Harbor" became a synonym for unprovoked and shocking, surprise attack without declaration of war. It also became a symbol of unity for the people of the United States.

If we review the few years immediately preceding 1941, certain highlights on the world scene are worth recalling.

A mighty German war machine had become clearly visible, but old world statesmen chose to rely on the intentions of Adolph Hitler rather than look at his capabilities.

Munich's meaningless pact and Neville Chamberlain's "Peace in our time" stand out as tragic examples of the consequences of negotiating from a position of weakness and wishful thinking.

Of this, Winston Churchill wrote, "We (shall) see how the counsels of prudence and restraint may become the prime agents of mortal danger . . . how the middle course adopted from desires for safety and a quiet life may be found to lead direct to the bulle-eye of disaster."

About this same time, a potential aggressor in Asia had also been clearly identified.

The voices in America calling for isolation and "peace at any price" drowned out those who recognized that the oceans separating us from danger were also super highways upon which conflict could be brought to our very shores.

We know capabilities were counted and seemingly ignored as our statesmen wrestled with Japanese intentions. They negotiated, as did England some months before, from a second-best position—which is no position at all as we have learned.

To all of this we added the clinching ingredient—disunity.

Protests resulting from President Roosevelt's lend-lease of 40 overage destroyers to the British rocked the nation.

It is curious to note that these protests stopped completely and mysteriously on the day Hitler attacked the Soviet Union and that "more aid for Britain" became the new rallying cry.

One might wonder what the protesters had in mind. Exactly whose side they were on.

The final show of internal disinterest in the powder kegs on the far sides of two oceans came on the floor of the House of Representatives a few months before "Pearl Harbor" when a bill to extend conscription was passed by a majority of one vote.

Later, we learned it was this particular evidence of a divided nation—and what was taken as weak will and purpose—that largely convinced the Japanese high command to proceed with their plan for a sneak attack on this site where we stand today.

It has been said the one thing we Americans lack is a "long sense of history."

Sometimes, I am compelled to accept this.

As the events of our time unfold around us, we can well wonder how future historians will describe our passage through the mid-sixties and seventies.

Will they record that in the course of 30 years, we made the same mistakes?

Will they record that an ever-increasing threat to world peace and good order was clearly identified but underestimated?

Will they record that we allowed our armed strength to deteriorate and thus invited the invariable recklessness of those who seek world domination?

Finally, will they record that we put a higher price on personal comfort and the quiet life which Winston Churchill described than we did on freedom and security?

Let us hope and be determined that this kind of history will not be repeated.

The dead of all of our wars—in their supreme sacrifice—demand such determination and it is our responsibility to make it so.

And, to do this:

We must be done with disunity.

We must be done with policy-making by protests in the streets.

We must be done with demeaning the real peacemakers and peacekeepers—those in our community who do have a long sense of history.

In this respect, the words of George Santayana hold special meaning of this Memorial Day—"Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

In closing, let me call your attention to our flag which is flying at half-mast. Tomorrow it will be run up fully or two-blocked.

There are those who say the American spirit is at half-mast.

For these few hours on Memorial Day this is understandable.

However, let us hope the spirit of every thinking American is two-blocked tomorrow morning along with the proud colors of this greatest nation on earth.

MEMORIAL PRAYER

(By Capt. John W. Cohill)

Father of mankind; As we meet within this hallowed shrine to observe Memorial Day 1971, we gather into the embrace of our prayer and your love all of our nation's honored dead from Concord and Valley Forge to the Republic of Vietnam. Wherever brave men have stood their ground in defense of the holy cause of human freedom—from the ancient plains of Marathon—to the waters of Pearl Harbor—and the rugged hills around Khe Sanh—we today say to these stalwart men—thank you.

We thank you for the blood, sweat, and tears that have made of America not a finished achievement but an eternal inspiration, a challenge to men of character and of spirit. In these days of confusing counsel, wishful thinking, and compromise of principle for expedient gain, help us to choose the harder right instead of the easier wrong, and never to be content with a half truth when the whole can be won.

Ruler of history, you have shown us time and again that we invite catastrophe by our failure to respond to events before they build into perilous crises. If our world is to have peace, O Lord, we know that we must accept reality and respond promptly to all the facts—not only to those we want to hear. May free men everywhere unite in fighting for the whole truth, for we know that half a truth will produce only half a peace. Grant wisdom and boldness to our President, the Congress, and our Supreme Court in pursuit of peace and justice at home and abroad.

May our nation experience a new birth of freedom and hope, and may America continue to pursue a just and lasting peace on this lovely planet earth—that someday her children shall rise up and call her blessed and her honored dead shall not have died in vain. Through Christ, who is the prince of peace, Amen.

INVOCATION

(By Comdr. Charles A. Shaw)
We invoke your presence with us, O God, as we in this Memorial make a feeble effort

to pay tribute to these courageous dead. Perhaps it was just in the happiest sunniest hours of all their voyage they were dashed against the unseen rock by an unsuspected foe. In their brief but tragic encounter with disaster a courage mushroomed and in that courage a new demand for self determination was born. May the spirit of Freedom within each of us blend with theirs as we express our appreciation for their sacrifice, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

BENEDICTION

(By Lt. Comdr. John A. Bruggeman)

Grant, O Lord, we beseech Thee, thy mercy unto thy servants departed. And as we gather here to remember and pray for those who have given their lives for their country, we also remember the living and ask your special blessing for those still serving in the combat zone, for the prisoners of war, for all of us here today, our families and friends. Give us the light of wisdom to see your good and gracious will working in our daily lives. And for those whose life is ended may thy divine assistance remain always with them and may the souls of all the faithful departed rest in peace. Amen.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in times of domestic turmoil it is difficult to determine just how far the constitutional rights of American citizens extend. There are limitations, the Supreme Court has decided. Whatever the limitations, it is easy for those who have the responsibility to maintain order to overreact to the acts of an assemblage of citizens, and there is a natural inclination on the part of civil libertarians to charge repression. There is one point we should all remember about article I of the Bill of Rights and that is that it speaks of "the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

The New York Times contends that the May Day assemblage on the steps of the Capitol Building was peaceful and that the arrests which took place were unjustified. Congressman PETER PEYSER takes a contrary view. With the consent of the House, I include at this point in the RECORD a letter Mr. PEYSER has written to the Times.

MAY 20, 1971.

To the Editor:

Your May 8 editorial "Repression on Capitol Hill" conveniently overlooks some of the pertinent facts of last week's so-called peace demonstration on the Capitol steps. Having chosen to ignore what you didn't want to see, you then found it easy to condemn the police for carrying out their duty by arresting the protesters before spoken violence turned to physical violence.

You say: "The protesters were sometimes shouting, singing, and gesturing, but their assembly was entirely peaceful." You fail to mention what they were shouting, singing and gesturing, and it is precisely that which makes the difference between a peaceful assembly—which this one was not—and an unlawful assault upon everything that decent Americans believe about their country,

which is what this so-called "peaceful assembly" was.

I spent three hours observing that demonstration. What you so modestly describe as "shouting and singing" was, in fact, a torrent of filth and obscenity hurled at the United States and the Congress.

You fail to mention that one of the demonstrators assaulted the sensibilities of all but his companions by dancing nude on the Capitol steps. This may be acceptable at rock festivals, but to the great majority of Americans it is still a crime called indecent exposure. When it is done on the steps of the Capitol before tourists and television cameras, it is an outrageous act of violence against the nation's sense of decency.

Among the many individual acts which I observed was that of a fifteen-year-old girl who stood face to face with a policeman and called him every four-letter word she could think of. Policemen, like protesters, have rights too, and his were most plainly trampled upon, but to his everlasting credit, he never laid a hand on her.

I share with millions and millions of Americans a deep sorrow over the Vietnam conflict and want desperately to see this war brought to an end. They, like I, were moved again by some of the truly peaceful demonstrations on April 24 and the veterans' demonstration earlier.

But the rabble on the Capitol steps were something else. They didn't come to protest peacefully. They came, waving the enemy's flag, to insult their nation and their Government in the vilest, most offensive terms.

They came to deliver a verbal slap in the face to all of us who believe that the United States, despite its current troubles, still has a greater respect for freedom and the rights of man than any other nation in the world today. They came to take the grossest sort of advantage of the right of free speech, and they overstepped themselves.

Your editorial asserts that by arresting the protesters the police violated their constitutional rights to peaceful assembly, and it asks: "Is this nation to have one Bill of Rights for the 'crazies' and another for the respectable people?"

I say certainly not. But the fact is that the "crazies" at the Capitol went beyond their rights. Were "respectable people" to do the same thing, I would expect them to be arrested too.

PETER A. PEYSER,
Member of Congress.

NEGOTIATED CONTRACT AGREEMENT FOR DETROIT NEWSPAPERS

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in this time when the economy is suffering the aftereffects of the rail strike it is refreshing to read of an important contract agreement reached in advance of the scheduled expiration of the old agreements.

I refer to a settlement which preserves labor peace for the two Detroit newspapers, the Detroit News and the Detroit Free Press. The agreement came about after 4 days of negotiations in which a mediation team from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service figured prominently. I congratulate the Mediation and Conciliation Service for its stellar performance.

All of the participating unions—the teamsters, typographers, stereotypers, photoengravers, pressmen, and paper handlers—have now ratified the agreements.

The Mediation and Conciliation Service believes this is a milestone not only for the Detroit newspapers but for the newspaper industry.

With the unanimous consent of the House, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a news release from the Mediation and Conciliation Service and a Detroit News story detailing the agreements. The inserts follow:

NEWS RELEASE, FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

WASHINGTON.—J. Curtis Counts, Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, said today an "earlybird" contract agreement just negotiated for Detroit newspapers can point the way to a new era of labor peace in the newspaper industry. Counts led a mediation team which in four days of marathon negotiations helped the two Detroit newspapers, the Free Press and the News, reach agreements on new contracts Sunday night with most of their unions more than a month ahead of the scheduled June 17 expiration of their old agreements.

Settlement terms were withheld pending ratification meetings this weekend. Counts said the agreements were especially significant in view of the history of considerable strike activity in the newspaper industry, particularly in Detroit, which had experienced a nine-month strike in 1968, and a five-month stoppage in 1964.

"I hope what has happened in Detroit can serve as an example to the newspaper industry of what can be done to avoid unnecessary stoppages," Counts said. "The preventive mediation services of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service are available for publishers and newspaper unions to seek early agreements avoiding deadline crises. Labor and management in this industry have a special responsibility to avoid interruptions in the flow of news to the public."

Counts praised the representatives of the Detroit publishers and unions for their cooperation in the early settlement effort.

"The Detroit publishers and their unions have made a fine beginning toward a new type of peaceful relationship which can be continued and improved upon in the future," Counts said.

The new three-year Detroit agreements provide that employees of the two newspapers will, upon ratification, receive substantial wage increases several weeks in advance of the scheduled June 17 expiration of their present contracts.

Other Federal mediators who participated in the negotiations with Mr. Counts were Kenneth E. Moffett, his Special Assistant, and Commissioners William W. Rodgers and George R. Wonnacott, of Detroit.

PAPERS, UNIONS LAUDED FOR NEW 3-YEAR PACT

(By Jack Crellin)

A tentative contract agreement between The Detroit News, the Detroit Free Press and most craft unions in their shops could point to a new era of labor peace in the newspaper industry, J. Curtis Counts, head of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, said today.

The agreement on three-year contracts was reached late Sunday largely through the efforts of Counts at the end of four days of almost steady bargaining.

While there was no official disclosure of details, the Teamsters Union said the increases would amount to \$72 a week over the next three years.

Elton Schade, secretary-treasurer of Local 372, Newspaper Drivers and Handlers, said the agreement provides for an increase, including fringe benefits, this year of \$31 a week.

The increase, if ratified by the various craft union members, would become effective next Monday, a month in advance of the scheduled expiration of the present contract.

The agreement, which Schade said also includes four other unions, provides for \$22 increases effective June 18, 1972, and \$19 a week effective June 17, 1973.

Members of other unions affected, Schade said, are the International Typographical Union, the Stereotypers, Photoengravers and Paper and Plate Handlers.

Counts, who returned to Washington yesterday, said the agreements were especially significant in view of the strike activity in the newspaper industry, particularly in Detroit, which experienced a 268-day stoppage in 1967-68 and a five-month stoppage in 1964.

"I hope what has happened in Detroit can serve as an example to the newspaper industry of what can be done to avoid unnecessary stoppages," Counts said.

"The preventive mediation services of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service are available for publishers and newspaper unions to seek agreements avoiding a deadline crisis.

"Labor and management in this industry have a special responsibility to avoid interruptions in the flow of news to the public."

Counts praised the representatives of the Detroit publishers and unions for their cooperation in the early settlement effort.

"The Detroit publishers and their unions have made a fine beginning toward a new type of peaceful relationship which can be continued and improved upon in the future," Counts said.

"The new three-year Detroit agreements provide that employees of the two newspapers will, upon ratification, receive substantial wage increases several weeks in advance of the scheduled expiration of their present contracts."

Other federal mediators who participated in the negotiations with Counts were Kenneth E. Moffett, his special assistant, and Commissioners William W. Rodgers and George R. Wonnacott, both of Detroit.

THE CASE FOR MONITORSHIP OVER UMWA

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there follows a press statement and exchanges of correspondence between attorneys for Miners for Democracy and the Secretary of Labor on the need for an impartial monitorship over the affairs of the United Mine Workers of America:

MINERS FOR DEMOCRACY

On the second anniversary of the announcement of Jock Yablonski's candidacy for the presidency of the UMWA, Miners for Democracy, the reform party in the United Mine Workers of America, again called upon Secretary of Labor Hodgson to impose a monitorship over the UMWA to control its

finances. [Copies of correspondence are attached.]

Joseph L. Rauh, Jr. and Joseph A. ("Chip") Yablonski noted that the Union under Boyle's leadership had since the contested 1969 election "suffered a series of legal setbacks that truly threaten its solvency." The MFD lawyers pointed to several cases, including the recent pension fund decision, which have or may cost the Union \$73 million in damages. The Union's assets most recently valued by it at \$86 million, are called "inflated."

A monitorship would insure that all Union funds are properly spent and accounted for. The lawyers accused the Labor Department of dereliction of duty in failing to insulate UMWA funds from Tony Boyle's control, citing his removal by court order as trustee of the Union's Welfare Fund and his removal as a director of the Union-owned National Bank of Washington following his indictment for embezzlement, conspiracy and illegal political contributions.

RAUH AND SILARD,
Washington, D.C., May 29, 1971.

HON. JAMES DAY HODGSON,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On May 7, 1971, we wrote you calling upon the Department of Labor "to move promptly and forcefully for a monitorship over the affairs of the union [UMWA] until the miners can themselves choose different leadership in a new election." Your press office immediately began telling reporters that there was no legal power for such a move. Now we are in receipt of the Department's letter of May 19, 1971 which concedes that there is such authority, but argues against doing anything with that authority in a letter that can only be regarded as a whitewash of Tony Boyle and his crowd.

We respond herein, point by point, to your letter:

1. We pointed out in our letter of May 7th that Boyle had been indicted for embezzlement from the UMWA and for corrupt political practices with union funds and forced to resign as Director of the National Bank of Washington because of this. You brush aside this indictment with the suggestion that "the Government is bound to respect the presumption of innocence which is fundamental to our system of jurisprudence."

It is surprising that the Department should be so totally unaware of the meaning of "presumption of innocence" and of the position taken by the Attorney General on this point: that the sole effect of the presumption is at the trial of the defendant and has no effect outside the courtroom. This is what Attorney General Mitchell writes:

"The presumption of innocence is not a presumption in the strict sense of the term. It is simply a rule of evidence which allows the defendant to stand mute at trial and places the burden upon the government to prove the charge against him beyond a reasonable doubt." 55 Virginia Law Review 1231 (1969).

The Attorney General made his statement in the context of judicial proceedings in the criminal case itself after indictment and prior to trial. While one may question the proposition in that context, there can be no question but that the Attorney is correct in the context here presented of a different proceeding and one wholly civil in nature.

The fact is that the grand jury had to have probable cause to indict Boyle for embezzlement and the presumption of innocence does not negate the grand jury's finding of probable cause that he committed embezzlement. For example, if a taxi driver is indicted for rape, you don't have to leave him as a taxi

driver because at his trial for rape there is a presumption of innocence; all known facts are used to determine whether he should continue as a taxi driver. And if a bank teller is indicted for embezzlement, you don't have to leave him as a teller because of his presumption of innocence at trial. Indeed, the government (Comptroller General) recognized this very point when it forced Boyle to resign as Director of the National Bank of Washington simply on the basis of his indictment. We do not go nearly that far; what we say is that the Department should move in Court for a monitorship on the basis of the facts that caused a grand jury to find probable cause of embezzlement. You simply dodge that point with a general statement about the presumption of innocence which is wholly in error and wholly at odds with the position of your own Administration.

2. We pointed out that Boyle had been removed as a trustee of the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund because of his illegal conduct in increasing pensions during the election campaign for the purpose of winning reelection, a breach of his fiduciary duty to the Fund. You seem to challenge us on the point that Judge Gesell removed Boyle because of the pension increase. Your refusal to act has now become even a refusal to read. Here is what Judge Gesell said in removing Boyle as trustee:

"Boyle, however, violated his duty as trustee in several particulars. His actions in forcing through the pension increase, partly by misrepresentation, in haste and without consulting the neutral trustee, reflect an insensitivity to fiduciary standards . . ."

Equally erroneous is your suggestion that Judge Gesell's decision "did not deal at all with the management of union affairs." One wonders how a pension increase to effect a union election can be other than a union affair.

3. We pointed out in the letter that Boyle and the United Mine Workers had been found guilty of failing to maintain the required records for the expenditures of millions of dollars of union funds. You do not question this in your reply, but suggest or at least imply that the UMWA will behave in the future without a monitorship. Maybe the UMWA will begin to keep records; more likely the officers will continue to hide wrongful expenditures as they have in the past. But the real point is that your letter does not deal at all with the danger of wastage of assets while Boyle remains in office. As we pointed out to you in our first letter, Section 402(b) of LMRDA expressly provides that "the court shall have power to take such action as it deems proper to preserve the assets of the labor organization." A monitorship is necessary for that reason, too.

On the current LM-2 Report, the UMWA International Union lists its assets at \$86,310,415, a net decrease of \$760,216 from the beginning of the year. International salaries and expenses were up \$600,000 from the inflated payroll of 1969 with no substantial increase in union organizing activity or membership. The Union lists \$11,992,173 in loans receivable, but your Department permits the Union to itemize only \$686,509 of these loans. One of these itemized loans for \$375,000 is to the Freeport Coal Company, a company in bankruptcy. Another loan to A. H. Bull Steamship Company for \$311,509 has proved uncollectible. No interest has been received on either loan and it is doubtful that even 10 cents on the dollar could be recovered. Thus, it is clear that the Union's assets are substantially overstated.

Since the election of 1969, the UMWA under Boyle's leadership has suffered a series of setbacks in court that truly threaten the

Union's solvency. Thus, in the *Tennessee Consolidated¹ Dean and Parton²* cases, the UMWA was forced to surrender \$2,117,454.25³ of the coal miners' funds to satisfy court judgments. In the *Blue Diamond⁴* case it will pay out \$281,990.57 plus interest. Just last week the Union was assessed \$3,783,178 plus interest when the Supreme Court denied certiorari in the *South-East Coal Company* case.⁵ Another \$8,000,664 (presumably carried as an unitemized loan receivable) was lost in 1970, when the District of Columbia voided a promissory note in that amount.⁶

Three weeks ago, Judge Gesell found that the UMWA, its bank (the National Bank of Washington) and trust fund conspired to defraud the pension fund.⁷ The Union's liability either directly or through its bank will amount to \$5,000,000 to \$30,000,000. Additionally, as a result of losing the *Ramsey* antitrust case,⁸ the Union's potential antitrust liability in pending litigation exceeds \$30,000,000.⁹

Thus, as a result of current court judgments and pending litigation, the Union since December, 1969, has lost or may lose \$73,183,286. The reckless and irresponsible leadership of this Union has already endangered the solvency of the Bituminous Welfare Fund; are you going to sit by and watch the same thing occur to the dues contributed by miners over their lifetimes?

4. We pointed out that Boyle and the UMWA had been found guilty of forcing pensioners to maintain membership in the union involuntarily as the price of receiving the pensions due them. You admit that Judge Gesell found that applicants for pensions were misled "into believing that union membership was a prerequisite for pension eligibility", but you defend your inaction on the ground that Judge Gesell also stated that "there is no proof that the trustees had actual knowledge of these improper practices..." The fact that the plaintiffs in Judge Gesell's case failed to prove Boyle's knowledge of what is going on in the union he runs with an iron hand hardly warrants your blithe assumption that he did not have such knowledge. Instead of trying to shove this issue under the rug, why don't you go out and get evidence of the obvious fact that Boyle runs the UMWA and knows what is going on?

5. We pointed out that Boyle continued his flagrant misuse of the United Mine Workers Journal. You answer this by suggesting that the use of the Journal is "an issue in the pending election case." Of course, the use of the Journal during the election is an issue in that case; we won on that issue during the election in both the District Court and Court of Appeals. What we are asking now is that you stop the present misuse of the Journal which, if continued, will make the next election just as meaningless and rotten as the last one. Your refusal to act against the present misuse of the Journal and your pretense that there is no problem because you are using past misuse of the Journal in the election case is double-talk pure and simple.

6. We pointed out that a local UMWA president had been indicted for the murder of Jock Yablonski and that enough had already been revealed to leave no doubt that the murder was directly related to the UMWA election. Your answer—that "This Department has not been made aware of any factual evidence that the murder of the Yablonski family was so related"—is incredible.

On May 4, 1970, your predecessor, Secretary Shultz, said the same incredible thing. On May 26, 1970, we wrote Chairman Williams as follows and this letter is printed in the Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Labor, Investigation of Mine Workers' Election (p. 511). This is what we said then:

"The Secretary says this was just another election campaign, and then in an effort to publicly cleanse his conscience he says twice that the murders had nothing to do with the election. Who is the Secretary of Labor to make such an assertion? Has he read the indictments returned by the Cleveland Grand Jury? Is he aware that one count deals with a conspiracy to violate a union member's rights, and that another involves an obstruction of justice to prevent Mr. Yablonski from testifying before a UMW Grand Jury Probe in Washington, D.C.? Is he aware that Mr. Silous Huddleston, President of a Local Union of the UMWA in LaFollette, Tennessee, has been indicted on these charges? Is he aware that the United States Attorney in seeking the grand jury indictment had to have evidence of probable cause and that the grand jury had to find that probable cause to indict? While no one questions that all five of the indicted persons are innocent until proven guilty, the fact remains that all the evidence to date points to a clear connection between the murders and the election through the participation of Huddleston (and another Local Union President indicted for perjury); the presumption of innocence does not require an administrative official to reject known facts. Indeed, the real remaining question is not whether this was an election-connected offense, but just how high in the union the culpability runs. What Secretary Shultz did in his testimony was to challenge the F.B.I., the United States Attorney and the Grand Jury; only a guilt-stricken man would deliberately undercut the enforcement efforts of his own Government."

Yet you now repeat the Shultz canard despite even further revelations since he was proven wholly wrong. A careful *Fortune* Magazine piece in January, 1971 reported that the Pennsylvania prosecutor believed that the higher-ups of the union are involved in the murders. And, indeed, as Mr. Rauh informed the Department last December, the prosecutor told him that he believed that Mr. Boyle arranged for the funds. An official propagandist for the UMWA would not have put their defense any different than you did.

As much as your answer to each of our specific six points demonstrates the Department's desire even at this late date to cover up for Boyle so as not to be proven wrong in its refusal to investigate the UMWA while Jock Yablonski was still alive, equally sad is your stubborn refusal to answer the bulk of our letter. There is not a word of answer to the basic questions in our original presentation:

"Under all these circumstances, it is a national scandal to leave Boyle as President of the UMWA. He has been removed as a director of the National Bank of Washington because one accused of embezzlement cannot retain a fiduciary position; but under LMRDA a union president acts as a fiduciary with respect to the union's funds. Are the deposits of the well-to-do in a bank more entitled to honest management than the dues of the miners paid into their union? Boyle has been ordered by the District Court to give up his post as a trustee of the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund because he irresponsibly used the treasury of the Fund for his own political ends. Is a man who has evidenced such fiscal irresponsibility to pensioned and disabled miners fit to handle the funds and affairs of the working miners? Boyle failed to have the UMWA keep the financial records required by LMRDA. Should a man who directs the expenditures of millions of dollars of funds without legally required records continue to manage the funds of the union? Boyle has forced pensioners into the union involuntarily and illegally in

order to maintain his political control over the union. Is such a man fit to continue his office?"

All you really say in your letter is that you will not act. That's all the Department has ever said to us—when you refused to investigate the UMWA in 1969, when you refused to press the trusteeship case now 6½ years old and still without a trial in District Court, when you refused to move against the bogus locals, when you refused to include in your election case the pension increase for which Judge Gesell removed Boyle as trustee of the pension fund. We pleaded in our letter that "the Department of Labor . . . reverse its previous halting course and swing into action." Our two years of pleading once again fell on deaf ears.

One additional point must be made. Your letter leaves no doubt that you deem your role as one of sitting back and evaluating what we produce rather than going out and getting evidence yourself. When you say that you have "not been made aware of any factual evidence that the murder" was election-connected, you make clear that you have not examined the evidence which the Department of Justice and the Pennsylvania prosecutor have. When you refuse to move against Boyle even though a grand jury found probable cause to believe him guilty of embezzlement, you make clear that you have not examined into the evidence available on that point. The Department puffs a lot about its investigation of the December, 1969 election, but practically all of the evidence to be adduced at the trial of the election case is that which we provided the Government. Fantastic as it may seem, your Department was wholly unaware of vital evidence in the files of the Senate Labor Subcommittee until we informed your staff about it. The sad truth is that you really believe that you have no responsibility to do anything to clean up the United Mine Workers.

Down the road a new day will dawn for the Mine Workers Union. The epitaph of the Boyle crowd will read: "Almost but not quite saved by the United States Department Labor."

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,
JOSEPH A. YABLONSKI,

Attorneys for Miners for Democracy.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Tennessee Consolidated Coal Co. v. UMWA*, 72 LRRM 2312 (C.A. 6, 1969), cert. denied, 73 LRRM 2600 (1970).

² *Dean Coal Co. v. UMWA*, 421 F. 2d 1380 (C.A. 6, 1970), cert. denied 74 LRRM 2421.

³ John Owens Semi-Annual Audit Report, 1/1/70 to 6/30/70.

⁴ *Blue Diamond Coal Co. v. UMWA*, 76 LRRM 2003 (C.A. 6, 1970), cert. denied. 77 LRRM 2023.

⁵ *South-East Coal Co. v. Consolidation Coal Co.*, 75 LRRM 2636 (C.A. 6, 1970), cert. denied, 77 LRRM 2242.

⁶ *UMWA v. District 50*, 74 LRRM 3001 (C.A. D.C., 1970), reversing 298 F. Supp. 1262 (D.D.C., 1969), cert. denied, 76 LRRM 3027.

⁷ *Blankenship v. Boyle*, 77 LRRM 2140 (D.D.C., 1971).

⁸ *Ramsey v. UMWA*, 76 LRRM 2547 (U.S. Supreme Court, 1971).

⁹ The relief prayed for by the sixteen plaintiffs in *Ramsey* is \$30,000,000. Other antitrust litigation has been held in abeyance pending the decision in *Ramsey*. Cf. *Big Three Coal Co. v. UMWA*, (E.D. Ill., Civ. No. 5173).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1971.

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr., Esq.
Rauh and Silard,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RAUH: The Secretary has asked that I respond to your letter of May 7, 1971,

urging that the Department move for a monitorship over the United Mine Workers of America in the presently pending suit to set aside the UMWA's 1969 election.

As you well know, Title IV of the LMRDA specifically provides that union officers are presumed to have been validly elected pending a final court ruling to the contrary and such officers are accorded the right, if not the responsibility, to carry on the affairs of the union. In light of that basic statutory provision, it is our judgment that the imposition of even a limited monitorship requires the development of an extraordinary factual case. Apparently you agree, for you have set forth a discussion of six factors which you believe constitute such an extraordinary case.

The major difficulty between us seems to stem from the fact that your letter of May 7 relies, in substantial part, upon assumptions, inferences and conclusions, which, when examined, do not result in the extraordinary factual case necessary to sustain the relief you are urging.

Thus, you refer first to the indictment of President Boyle for embezzlement and for corrupt political practices. As an outstanding civil rights lawyer, you know that indictment is not the equivalent of conviction, and that the Government is bound to respect the presumption of innocence which is fundamental to our system of jurisprudence. The same comment applies to your sixth factor, the indictment of the president of a UMWA local union for the Yablonski murders.

Your Points 2 and 4 refer to the recent decision of Judge Gesell in *Blankenship v. Boyle*. Judge Gesell concluded that the trustees of the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund had breached their fiduciary duty to the Fund; the decision did not deal at all with the management of union affairs. You state that Boyle has been removed as a trustee of the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund "because of his illegal conduct in increasing pensions during the election campaign for the purpose of winning reelection." Judge Gesell noted in his opinion that Boyle for many years before the election had urged an increase in the amount of the pension, and that "election considerations . . . were not the primary factor motivating Boyle," who "genuinely believed that a pension increase should be made in the interests of the miner beneficiaries."

You further state that Boyle and the UMWA "have been found guilty of forcing pensioners to maintain membership in the union involuntarily as the price of receiving pensions due them." Judge Gesell found that applicants were misled by the use of a form referring to membership in the UMWA, and by local unions which carried out administrative functions in connection with these applications, into believing that union membership was a prerequisite for pension eligibility. Judge Gesell specifically noted: "There is no proof that the trustees had actual knowledge of these improper practices by Union locals."

Third, you state that Boyle and the UMWA have been found guilty of failing to maintain required records for the expenditures of millions of dollars of union funds. Your reference appears to be to the court's findings of fact and conclusions of law in connection with the preliminary injunction which is now in force and effect requiring the Union to maintain such required records. We believe the order recently entered by the court affords protection for the assets of the Union at this time.

You next refer to the April 15, 1971, issue of the United Mine Workers Journal as a "build-up of General Counsel Carey for Vice President of the UMWA on the Boyle slate."

We do not know the source of your information concerning Carey's alleged proposed candidacy. However, the Department has taken cognizance of the contents of the article as well as all issues of the Journal and the use of the Journal is, as you know, an issue in the pending election case.

Finally, you state: "A local UMWA president has been indicted for the murder of Jock Yablonski and enough has already been revealed to leave no doubt that the murder was directly related to the UMWA election." This Department has not been made aware of any factual evidence that the murder of the Yablonski family was so related.

I recognize the sincerity of your personal convictions regarding the United Mine Workers. However, it would be a complete derogation of the responsibilities of public office for this Department to proceed in the manner you have urged based upon the information now available to us. I have too much respect for the principles underlying that responsibility which you personally, as much as any other individual in recent times, have fought to establish. I truly regret that your deep and committed involvement with the mine workers, has resulted in our present divergent views.

Sincerely,
PETER G. NASH,
 Solicitor of Labor.
RAUH AND SILARD,
 Washington, D.C. May 7, 1971.

Hon. JAMES DAY HODGSON,
 Secretary of Labor,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the name of Miners for Democracy, the internal reform organization seeking to bring integrity and democracy to the United Mine Workers of America, we call upon the Department of Labor to move promptly and forcefully for a monitorship over the affairs of the union until the miners can themselves choose different leadership in a new election. It there was ever any doubt as to the Department's legal and moral obligation to move for such a monitorship over the UMWA, those doubts must long since have been put to rest. And last week's decision by District Judge Gesell is the final proof of the desperate need to remove Tony Boyle from his dictatorial control over the welfare of the miners of the Nation and to place the affairs of the union temporarily in the hands of an honorable and neutral third party.

There is a ready vehicle at hand for an immediate Labor Department move for a monitorship over the affairs of the UMWA. Boyle's "election" on December 9, 1969 was riddled with flagrant illegality and the Labor Department brought suit in March, 1970, to upset the election. Although that suit did not include a request for a monitorship over the union's affairs, Undersecretary Silberman later promised the Senate Committee considering his nomination that he would do "everything in [his] power to see that the lawsuits which the Department has brought against the United Mine Workers are vigorously prosecuted and that such equitable remedies authorized by law as will be necessary to fully remedy violations of the Landrum-Griffin Act [including the appointment by the Court of some form of monitorship or other third party with appropriate supervisory power to preserve the union's assets] are sought." For many reasons this would appear the appropriate time for the Department to move in the election suit for a monitorship over the affairs of the union:

1. Boyle has now been indicted for embezzlement from the union and for corrupt political practices with union funds and has been forced to resign as Director of the National Bank of Washington because of this indictment.

2. Boyle has been removed as a trustee of the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund because of his illegal conduct in increasing pensions during the election campaign for the purpose of winning reelection, a breach of his fiduciary duty to the Fund.

3. Boyle and the UMWA have been found guilty of failing to maintain required records for the expenditure of millions of dollars of union funds.

4. Boyle and the UMWA have been found guilty of forcing pensioners to maintain membership in the union involuntarily as the price of receiving the pensions due them; Judge Gesell ruled last week that "There is ample documentary and testimonial evidence that applicants were improperly led by this form [the pension application] and by the locals to believe that Union membership was a prerequisite for eligibility, and were often forced to make substantial payments, sometimes running into hundreds of dollars, as 'back dues' to reinstate their Union membership" and the NLRB has issued a complaint against the UMWA on the same premise.

5. Boyle has continued the flagrant misuse of the UMWA Journal of which he was found guilty by the courts during the 1969 election campaign. The April 15, 1971 issue of the Journal, for example, is largely a build-up of General Counsel Carey for Vice President of the UMWA on the Boyle slate and a violent attack on the leaders of Miners for Democracy.

6. A local UMWA president has been indicted for the murder of Jock Yablonski and enough has already been revealed to leave no doubt that the murder was directly related to the UMWA election.

Under all these circumstances, it is a national scandal to leave Boyle as President of the UMWA. He has been removed as a director of the National Bank of Washington because one accused of embezzlement cannot retain a fiduciary position; but under LMRDA a union president acts as a fiduciary with respect to the union's funds. Are the deposits of the well-to-do in a bank more entitled to honest management than the dues of the miners paid into their union? Boyle has been ordered by the District Court to give up his post as a trustee of the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund because he irresponsibly used the treasury of the Fund for his own political ends. Is a man who has evidenced such fiscal irresponsibility to pensioned and disabled miners fit to handle the funds and affairs of the working miners? Boyle failed to have the UMWA keep the financial records required by LMRDA. Should a man who directs the expenditure of millions of dollars of funds without legally required records continue to manage the funds of the union? Boyle has forced pensioners into the union involuntarily and illegally in order to maintain his political control over the union. Is such a man fit to continue his office?

Boyle still operates the union as though he owns it, using its personnel, funds, newspaper, etc. as his private domain. The continuation of this situation makes a mockery of what Congress sought to do in LMRDA. Ironically the Teamsters were placed under a monitorship for far less corruption before there ever was an LMRDA. The failure of the Department of Labor to act under a law specifically passed for the purpose of cleaning up the very type of corruption here involved would be a sad inversion of Congressional intention.

The failure of the Labor Department in the past to take certain actions urgently requested by the Yablonski forces inside the UMWA compounds the necessity for a monitorship and the near hopelessness of any rerun election with Boyle in continuing control of the union. The Department's suit to lift the trusteeships in the various districts filed back in December 1964 remains un-

tried after almost 6½ years despite our pleas for action; unless Boyle is neutralized by a monitorship over the union's affairs, he will continue to maintain dictatorial control over the union machinery in 23 of the 27 UMWA districts in the United States through district officials appointed by him. The Department's failure to act against Boyle's continuing misuse of the UMW *Journal* leaves him in control of the major means of reaching miners.

The Department's refusal to include in its election suit the misuse by the incumbent officers of "bogus" locals (ones without working miners) leaves Boyle free to continue the practice of voting pensioners as a block for the incumbent officers. And the Department's refusal to include in its complaint Boyle's illegal conduct in increasing pensions for the purpose of winning reelection (for which Judge Gesell removed him as trustee of the pension fund) makes it possible for Boyle to appeal to this block of voters on the very basis of judicially-declared illegal conduct. What makes even worse the failure to outlaw the "bogus" locals and stop Boyle's appeals to the pensioners on his illegal use of their funds is the fact that Boyle's margin in the 1969 election, even on his figures, came from pensioner votes. See Statement, Mr. Nagle, *Senate Labor Subcommittee Hearings*, March 20, 1970. Only a monitorship can neutralize Boyle's misuse of his position and make any sort of fair reelection possible.

There can be no question concerning the authority of the Department of Labor to move in the election case for a monitorship over the union. The power of the Court to appoint a monitor over a corrupt union existed even before the LMRDA was enacted. And Section 402(b) of LMRDA expressly provides that "The court shall have power to take such action as it deems proper to preserve the assets of the labor organization." Furthermore, such authority is inherent in the Department's power to insure a fair election; there will never be a fair election in the UMWA as long as Boyle controls the coffers of the union, the personnel of the union, the votes of the pensioners, the district officials in the trusted areas whom he appoints and directs and the union's newspaper and continues to wield the mighty power of Godfather in a Mafia-like government outside the laws of the land. Indeed the relevant officials of the Justice Department informed counsel for Miners for Democracy long ago that they believed the authority for such a monitorship exists.

In the name of the miners of America, we call upon the Department of Labor to reverse its previous halting course and swing into action. We call upon you, Mr. Secretary to move with new-found determination and zeal to help us remodel the UMWA from an ugly dictatorship into an honest and democratic union.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH L. RAUH, JR.,

JOSEPH A. YABLONSKI,

CLARICE R. FELDMAN,

Attorneys for Miners for Democracy.

SECOND FEDERAL JUDGE FOR WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today creating a second Federal judge for the western district of Wisconsin.

There is a pressing and immediate need for the new judgeship. Currently, Wisconsin's western district's sole judge han-

dles a caseload of approximately 465 cases per year. This total is the second highest caseload per judgeship in the entire country, almost twice the national average. According to the district's presiding judge, James E. Doyle:

Cases are not being terminated as fast as they are filed.

In fact, the average length between filing and eventual trial is 2 years compared with only 1 year delay nationally.

Judge Doyle has stated that the accumulation of pending cases points to only one thing—a new judgeship in the district. Recently Appeals Court Judge Luther M. Swiggert, chief judge of the seventh Federal circuit, publicly concurred and strongly urged that a second judge be added.

Mr. Speaker, citizens living in Wisconsin's western district are being denied the right to a speedy trial and there is no hope of reversing the situation unless Congress acts. While I recognize that in the past Federal judges have been created once every 4 years, by failing to move now we are denying citizens their constitutional rights. Such a situation is intolerable and relief should be granted as soon as possible.

HISTORY RECORDS RELIEF ACTION OF HIALEAH-MANAGUA SISTER CITY COMMITTEE

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the friendship which spans the Caribbean to bind the sister cities of Hialeah, Fla., U.S.A., and Managua, Nicaragua, was never more apparent than early last year when a disastrous fire raged through the Atlantic port city of Bluefields, Nicaragua.

From 175 miles away a fire brigade was airlifted from the capital to help extinguish the blaze which roared out of control for 7 hours. And from a much greater distance came food and clothing gathered by the citizens of Hialeah and airlifted across the Caribbean to the victims of the fire.

This courageous act in hemispheric cooperation has been noted in the 1971 yearbook published on page 375 of the Crowell-Collier Encyclopedia, covering the year 1970.

The publication is a fitting tribute to the response of the Hialeah-Managua Sister City Committee which produced immediate relief to the victims of the fire. More recently, the committee organized the dispatching of more than 10 tons of relief supplies to Leon, a neighboring city of Managua, which was inundated by volcanic ash.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include page 375 of the Crowell-Collier Encyclopedia Year Book 1971 which records the work of the sister cities of Hialeah and Managua:

1971 YEAR BOOK COVERING THE YEAR 1970

(By Jane L. Rieker)

In Hialeah, Fla., sister city of Managua, a local relief drive brought donations of food and clothing which were promptly dis-

patched to the victims of the fire. Major Ida Degenie, a Nicaraguan army nurse who directed the aid program in Bluefields, headed a delegation to the United States to thank the Hialeah donors.

NICARAGUA

The year began badly in Nicaragua when a fire on January 4 leveled more than 100 buildings in Bluefields, an Atlantic port city 175 miles east of the capital, causing US\$3 million in damage. Only one death occurred, but the blaze (which started in a boarding house) left several hundred persons homeless and affected an estimated 2,000 persons in the city. A fire brigade airlifted from Managua helped to extinguish the blaze, which roared out of control for seven hours.

Education. In late October it was reported that President Anastasio Somoza Debayle had fired the nation's primary and secondary school teachers and closed the schools. The teachers had been striking for higher pay and for the opportunity to take part in the nation's social security plan.

Foreign affairs. In March a report of the Organization of American States showed Nicaragua to be more than a year overdue in paying its share of OAS operations. However, the report also indicated that other Latin American countries were even more in arrears.

On July 15, the 54-year-old Bryan-Chamorro Treaty giving the United States the right to construct an interoceanic canal through Nicaragua was terminated. The agreement ending the treaty also canceled the right of the United States to build a naval base on Nicaraguan territory.

The Nicaraguan government continued to mediate the border conflicts between El Salvador and Honduras that had erupted in the 1969 "soccer war." President Somoza, in noting the economic loss resulting from the war, said that progress toward economic integration through the Central American Common Market would eventually resume.

Economic developments. Tourists began to discover Nicaragua, which has for several years been building resorts and hotels. Lake, mountain, and ocean regions are now open to and welcoming tourists.

Area and population. Area, 50,193 sq. mi. Pop. (est. 1969), 1,780,000. Principal cities (1967): Managua (cap.), 300,000; León, 61,649; Matagalpa, 61,383.

Government. Constitutional republic with bicameral legislature. Pres., Anastasio Somoza Debayle; for. min., Dr. Lorenzo Guerrero.

Finance. Monetary unit, córdoba (C\$); C\$1=US\$0.143. Budget (est. 1970): balanced at US\$98.03 million.

Trade (1969). Imports, US\$174 million; exports, US\$158 million. Principal imports: manufactured goods, machinery and vehicles, chemicals, foodstuffs. Principal exports: cotton, coffee, meat, sugar.

Education. Enrollment; primary (1967), 234,685; secondary (1967), 29,642; higher (1966), 4,056.

Armed forces. National guard 5,410; air force, 1,500.

A SOVIET MILITARY TRAMPOLINE IN THE CARIBBEAN

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a very significant address by Dr. Manolo Reyes, Latin American news editor of television station WTVJ in Miami, on May 21, before the Miami Council of the Naval League of the United States.

Dr. Reyes is a distinguished journalist and commentator on events in Cuba. I have personally found him extremely knowledgeable on the activities of the Soviet Union in regard to Cuba, and I wish to give the other Members of this body an opportunity to read his account of the very successful efforts of the Soviet Government to make Cuba "a military trampoline for Soviet power in the Caribbean":

SPEECH BY DR. MANOLO REYES, LATIN AMERICAN NEWS EDITOR, WTVJ TO THE MIAMI COUNCIL OF THE NAVAL LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES, MAY 21, 1971

I am not a military or naval expert. The information which you are about to hear was sent to us by the Cuban Patriotic Resistance. We believe this information to the first of its kind to be said publicly. It is all related to Fidel Castro's Navy, which is a vital tool for the exportation of his so-called revolution. We say "so-called" because there is no such revolution, rather that Castro is an agent for international communism and what he is exporting is international communism.

To begin this analysis, we must say that before Castro the Cuban Navy was highly respected by the Cuban people. It was always a non-political body. Presently, Castro's Navy is despised because, among their missions of hate, they must persecute and machine-gun defenseless Cubans (men, women, and children) who try to flee through the Florida Straits.

Before Castro, the Navy was made up of 28 surface units: three frigates, one cruiser, twelve sub-chasers and twelve Coast Guard vessels. The pre-Castro Navy's main mission was to guard the coasts. It's mission was strictly defensive.

The Merchant Marine before Castro was made up of 18 surface units which represented approximately 48,000 tons. None of these units was more than 5,000 tons. Hence Cuba's Naval force totaled 46 surface units.

Now the question: What is the present Naval situation of the Red Regime in Cuba? Directed by the Russians, Fidel Castro has divided his Navy into three parts: the War Fleet, Merchant Marine and so-called "Fishing Fleet."

Castro's War Fleet has been tripled by the Russians since early in 1970. Presently it is made up of about 80 units. Among them are torpedo boats, missile boats, konsomal boats and sub-chasers. The Komar boats have two missiles with a range of 40-50 miles. All of these are for offensive purposes. Also, British sources have reported that the Russians have given Castro 8 small submarines. This brings the total of offensive naval units to 88.

The Castro Merchant Marine, under the direction of the Russians, now has 49 units with a displacement of approximately 327,000 tons. Of this number, some 18 units exceed 5,000 tons each. This Merchant Marine, as we will explain later, is completely dedicated to the transportation of men and arms for the expansion of international communism.

Finally, Castro, following the Russian dictates, has established the so-called "Fishing Fleet" in Cuba, made up of some 100 Russian made trawlers, each approximately 800 tons, and almost 100 wooden Lambda boats. The "Fishing Fleet" has everything except a fishing boat and its purpose is for the infiltration of international communist agents, transfer of arms, espionage and counter-espionage.

To sum it up, the Navy before Castro totaled 46 defensive units. Now it totals some 337 offensive units and has only one purpose: to export the revolution of the Castro-Communist regime.

In a rapid analysis of the twelve-and-a-half years in Cuba since Castro, it can be said that the economy is in ruin. The Cuban people are suffering from tremendous rationing and there is almost no fuel (charcoal or petroleum) in Cuba.

Now, how is it possible for Fidel Castro to maintain his present navy if Cuba's economy is in ruin? If there is no money to buy the articles of primary use, how were so many naval units obtained? If there is no fuel, how are these units operated? Where did he get the officers for a Navy that grew so fast?

It is our belief that there is only one explanation: Cuba is the Russian trampoline of the Caribbean. Cuba is being used as the base for military and political expansion of the Russians in the Western Hemisphere. The Russians have provided and today maintain Castro's Navy—even if the navy does fly the Cuban flag—for the exportation of international communism. The majority of the Naval officers of these ships were born in the Communist World even though their passports list them as Native Cubans. This is the Russian Navy with the Cuban flag.

How was this situation initiated? In the year 1963, according to reports received from the Cuban Patriotic Resistance, a Russian Admiral, Ivan Balkov, Director of the Russian Naval Academy in Leningrad, took charge of the Cuban Navy. That began a complete change. The Russian Admiral said that the traditional Naval Academy in Cuba, in Mariel, was obsolete. It would be considered third level.

The Naval Academy was then transferred to the Monteverde farm, which was the property of a North American citizen, in the area of Boca del Mariel.

Later, two superior naval centers were created: One in Tarara and the other in Barlovento in Havana. The students of these centers receive strong communist training, as training in the sabotage of port installations, intelligence, espionage and counter-espionage. The most outstanding students are sent to Russia for final indoctrination.

Admiral Balkov declared that the new naval center in Havana was to be used as the seat of the Russian Joint Command in peace time. And that underground installations should be built so that the Russian High Command could function in times of pre-war and war.

The Naval system in Cuba was operated by departments similar to that of the United States Navy. Balkov divided it up into sections and sub-sections.

In the center of the Port of Havana, it is easier to find a Russian officer in uniform than it is to find a Cuban. The orders which proceed from there are signed by Cubans, even if they are illiterate. Said orders are prepared by Russian bilingual personnel and later authorized by a Russian naval officer. In this way, secret cargo can be transported under the Cuban flag, never under the Russian flag.

Each Cuban boat has an experienced Russian officer who speaks Spanish and carries a native-Cuban passport (possibly with a Cuban name). He is the actual ship commander. Sometimes he is merely a first-class sailor.

Each ship is an integral part of Castro-Communist territory. This is why there is an Russian security officer on board. It is understood that at each port the communist agents know precisely who is on board each ship. For the few who are not communists and sail under Castro's flag, to transfer to a ship is to leave one prison for another.

The Russian Admiral (Balkov) authorized Captain Daniel Alvarez (alias Captain Ramirez) to direct Castro's Merchant Marine. Captain Alvarez is approximately 60 years old, with more than 40 years of naval experience in Spain's Communist Navy. He

served on the cruise ship "Canarias", later seeking asylum in Algiers, France. From Algiers, he went to Moscow. There he was named an agent of the NKVD and had several interviews with Stalin. Later, he fell into disgrace and was deported to Siberia where he has lost a lung. He was brought back to Moscow by Nikita Khrushchev and placed in his former position. Currently, in Cuba, his title is "Delegate of the Soviet Union in Control of the Merchant Marine".

The flag ship of the Merchant Marine of Cuba is the Sierra Maestra and it displaces 17,350 tons. This ship was built in Eastern Germany and was first received and commanded by Jesus Jimenez Escobar. Escobar received several levels of communist indoctrination. Jimenez Escobar, along with Captain Alvarez (Ramirez), formed the shipping lines of Mambisa Navigation in different parts of the world to provide ports for Castro's ships.

In 1968, Jimenez Escobar was named to the Cuban delegation to the United Nations. Months later he was expelled from New York by the United States for his non-diplomatic activities. Apparently he was supporting the Black Panthers.

Presently, there is a Russian naval base at Cienfuegos and a military arsenal at Havana. There are two large docks. One is a 20,000-ton dry dock and the other is a 10,000-ton floating dock.

Operations are directed by eight high-ranking Russian naval officers. Strong security is maintained by frogmen and an electric net. On land, there is a color-coded control system.

To describe how Castro's Navy performs espionage and the exportation of international communism, here are some examples:

In 1960, the ship "Bahia de Nipe" took arms from Cuba to the so-called "Liberation Front" in Algiers, which was still under French jurisdiction. In 1962, the ships "Aracello Iglesias" and "Gonzalez Lines" carried tanks and cannons, automatic arms and troops to take part in the war between Algiers and Morocco.

In 1965, the motor-ship "Uvero", weighing 10,250 tons, left with arms, men and equipment for Africa to Dar El Salam. We were told that all this equipment and some of the men later were sent to the guerrilla operation in Bolivia. During the voyage to Africa, the captain of the ship never spoke with the officers and meals were served to another high ranking person in the captain's cabin (no one knowing who he was). We believe it was Ernesto "Che" Guevara.

In 1965, the Sierra Maestra took a special trip to Communist China. It embarked from Cuba empty and was so important, that two Cuban freighters, "Antonio Maceo" and "Jose Marti", escorted her from the islands of Cape Green in South Africa to Santiago de Cuba, in Oriente province. She brought back a load of special arms which were unloaded in Santiago de Cuba. These secret arms were taken to Gran Piedra under great security. Gran Piedra is near the Guantanamo Naval Base.

Meanwhile, Castro's Russian masters have continued their expansion work in Cuba. Presently, great naval activity is reported on the two extremes of the island.

In Oriente Province, (in the region known as Saetia, to the north of the Bay of Levisa near the Bay of Nipe) the Russians are dredging as they did when they began their base at Cienfuegos.

At the Western tip it is reported that the prisoners on the Peninsula of Guancabibes have been removed and a military road is being built (more than 6 meters wide) from "El Cayuco" to the Cape of San Antonio. This area is totally deserted and a great distance from other activity on the island. It should be an ideal location for subversive

activities. It is expected to help in the transportation of arms in barges to or from mother ships, anchored nearby. The initial analysis of this activity is that it will aid in the transportation of arms to Latin America.

This is a short and sketchy summary of the Cuban Naval situation under Castro-Communism. A navy which means a real and actual threat to the peace and tranquility of the entire American Continent. A Russian Navy with the Cuban flag.

MOST DECORATED HERO OF WORLD WAR II CARRIED HIS REPUTATION WELL

(Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, one of our great American war heroes died in a plane crash Friday. That he was beloved in civilian life as he was honored in military life is the finest tribute we can pay Audie L. Murphy.

His daring actions during World War II are well remembered by most of us, particularly through the film about him and in which he starred, "To Hell and Back." His exploits lived with him, because for several years after the war, he slept with an automatic pistol beneath his pillow to minimize anxieties while he slept.

When asked how soldiers mentally cope with a war, Mr. Murphy said:

I don't think they ever do.

Perhaps it was because of the effect that war had on Mr. Murphy as well as his upbringing, that he was humble about his achievements and self-effacing about narrating them.

His exploits were certainly remarkable. Mr. Murphy received 24 decorations, running from the Purple Heart to the Medal of Honor, and killed or captured 240 enemy. Given mostly to children through the years, his decorations included the Distinguished Service Cross, the Legion of Merit, the Silver Star with Oak Leaf cluster, the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart with two Oak Leaf clusters, and the Croix de Guerre with palm.

True heroes are so few nowadays and those that some of us would consider for veneration are quickly demeaned by others who are opposed to the recognition of heroism. Mr. Murphy is and was a hero to those of us who lived through World War II. He began in Casablanca in 1943, went through Sicily and on to Anzio. Out of 235 men in his company, he and a supply sergeant were the only troops to survive the advance through Italy into Southern France.

Mr. Murphy was a very modest man who often said that others should have received combat awards instead of himself. His accolades never swelled his ego to that proportion that destroys heroes. Rather, his quiet and serious demeanor became a model for carrying the praise that comes with being recognized for outstanding courage.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the record a description of the heroics for which Audie Murphy was awarded the Medal of Honor:

Second Lieutenant Murphy commanded Company B, which was attacked by six tanks

and waves of infantry. Lieutenant Murphy ordered his men to withdraw to prepared positions in a woods, while he remained forward at his command post and continued to give fire directions to the artillery by telephone. Behind him, to his right, one of our tank destroyers received a direct hit and began to burn. Its crew withdrew to the woods. Lieutenant Murphy continued to direct artillery fire which killed large numbers of the advancing enemy infantry. With the enemy tanks abreast of his position, Lieutenant Murphy climbed on the burning tank destroyer, which was in danger of blowing up at any moment, and employed its .50 caliber machinegun against the enemy. He was alone and exposed to German fire from three sides, but his deadly fire killed dozens of Germans and caused their infantry attack to waiver. The enemy tanks, losing infantry support, began to fall back. For an hour the Germans tried every available weapon to eliminate Lieutenant Murphy, but he continued to hold his position and wiped out a squad which was trying to creep up unnoticed on his right flank. Germans reached as close as 10 yards, only to be mowed down by his fire. He received a leg wound, but ignored it and continued the singlehanded fight until his ammunition was exhausted. He then made his way to his company, refused medical attention, and organized the company in a counterattack which forced the Germans to withdraw. His directing of artillery fire wiped out many of the enemy; he killed or wounded about 50. Lieutenant Murphy's indomitable courage and his refusal to give an inch of ground saved his company from possible encirclement and destruction, and enabled it to hold the woods which had been the enemy's objective.

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING FOR URBAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced H.R. 8853, a bill to carry out the administration's recently refined proposal to enable the Federal Government to share its revenues with the States and localities in order to provide vital assistance for urban community development.

It is a source of great satisfaction to me to be associated with the administration in this historic proposal. This bill, along with other special revenue-sharing proposals and the general revenue-sharing bill, would remove from our States and localities the tangled bonds in which they have become enmeshed as a result of a multitude of overlapping, categorical grant-in-aid programs.

All activities which are eligible for support under the present urban development categorical grant programs would be eligible for support from the new urban development revenue-sharing funds. Local governments could use the money to acquire, clear and renew land, to construct public works, to build streets and malls, to enforce building codes in deteriorating areas, to rehabilitate residential properties, to support the types of activities for which model cities supplemental grants have been authorized, to fund demolition activities, and to provide relocation payments and assistance for those displaced by program activities.

No program currently funded by cate-

gorical grants need be stopped under revenue sharing. Communities could maintain—even expand—any of these current programs, if they wished to do so.

No Federal approval would be required for any activity. Neither detailed applications nor matching local shares would be required. Cities would have to state in advance how they plan to use their funds. And there would be an audit at the end of the year to insure that funds had been used for eligible activities.

Eighty percent of the total amount of funds available each year for urban community development revenue sharing would be allocated to the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area—SMSA's—for distribution to units of general local government within those areas. There are now 247 of these areas comprising nearly 70 percent of the Nation's population. And they include every single person living in the circle of the SMSA down to the rural areas which somehow or other intrude into that circle. A metropolitan area's share would be based on a four-part statutory formula—the area's (first) population, (second) its density, (third) extent of poverty, and (fourth) housing deficiencies.

Central cities and cities over 50,000 in the SMSA will receive an automatic distribution of funds on the basis of this 4-part formula. In addition, there will be funds—first, to "hold harmless" these cities—so that they will not receive less under revenue sharing than they had been receiving annually under present urban development categorical grant programs; and, second, to distribute to smaller cities within the SMSA.

Twenty percent of the total amount of funds available will be distributed by the Secretary of HUD to units of general local government. These funds would be used to, first, assist localities of under 50,000 population; second, assist localities which have demonstrated special needs or special performance capabilities; third, provide "hold harmless" funds in cases where the SMSA allocation is insufficient; and, fourth, provide incentives for achievement of national growth objectives.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members that this bill differs from the legislation proposed earlier by the administration. The original proposal would have included the program of grants for the construction of water and sewer facilities. These were authorized by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, along with the urban renewal, model cities, and section 312 rehabilitation loan programs. The bill I am introducing excludes the water and sewer facilities grant program, but would add the program of grants for neighborhood facilities also authorized under the 1965 act.

It has been my contention for some time that the water and sewer grant program should continue as presently authorized. I am most gratified that the administration is now of my persuasion. At the same time, I would like to remind the Members that our States and localities could, if they chose, apply special revenue-sharing funds to the same purpose.

It is my thought that the critical need of many of our smaller communities to expand their water and sewer systems warrants this change in the legislation. There is no public facility more basic to the needs of community life. And yet this need has not been met as populations shifted and expanded. It is for this reason that in the past I have proposed additional authorizations and appropriations for the water and sewer program. It is also why I suggested to the administration that these considerations were sufficiently important to small towns, suburbs, and rural areas to cause it to modify its original proposal. In so doing the administration once again revealed its willingness to entertain suggestions originating in the legislative branch.

Let me here pay tribute to Secretary George Romney and Assistant Secretary Floyd Hyde of HUD whose understanding and cooperation were most helpful when I suggested an alternate measure. I have also had the support of the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan, for which I am most grateful. And too much cannot be said for the minority members of the Banking and Currency Committee who have agreed to co-sponsor the legislation I have today introduced. Their support has been most gratifying.

I urge upon the House its early consideration and passage of the measure now sponsored by 17 Members of this body.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. SHIPLEY (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for Wednesday, June 2 and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MONAGAN, on Tuesday, June 8, for 1 hour.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 30 minutes, on June 4, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD), for 30 minutes on June 4, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TERRY), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas, today, for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER, today, for 15 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD, today, for 1 minute.

Mr. McKEVITT, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the re-

quest of Mr. COTTER), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RARICK, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. MINISE, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONER, on June 9, for 60 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. EDMONDSON in three instances, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. GRAY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TERRY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PEYSER in three instances.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in five instances.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. VEYSEY.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. SCHNEEBEL.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENDEL in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in seven instances.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. SCHMITZ in five instances.

Mr. WHALLEY.

Mr. ROBISON of New York in four instances.

Mr. KEMP in two instances.

Mrs. REID of Illinois.

Mr. GOLDWATER.

Mr. CRANE in five instances.

Mr. NELSEN in two instances.

Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. HALPERN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COTTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FLOWERS in two instances.

Mr. BURTON in two instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. SCHEUER in five instances.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in 12 instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. ABOUREZK in three instances.

Mr. FISHER in four instances.

Mr. MOLLOHAN in five instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. FRASER in two instances.

Mr. CARNEY.

Mr. REES in two instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in three instances.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina in two instances.

Mr. BROOKS.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in three instances.

Mr. MAHON in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. CHAPPELL.

Mr. FUQUA.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. ROUSH in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE in six instances.

Mr. KYROS in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE in five instances.

Mr. COTTER in two instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. TIERNAN in two instances.

Mr. PATTEN in two instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI in two instances.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KEE, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 3, 1971, 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:

787. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting notice of the location, nature, and estimated cost of a facilities project proposed to be undertaken for the Army Reserve, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a (1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

788. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate, simplify, and improve laws relating to housing and housing assistance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

789. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a quarterly report for the period ended March 31, 1971, on the export expansion facility program, pursuant to Public Law 90-390; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

790. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the laws relating to the regulation of insurance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

791. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on a study made to determine the best manner to coordinate Federal and State activities in the field of coal mine health and safety, pursuant to section 512 of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

792. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed supplemental and amendatory contract, and a draft of a proposed supplemental agreement to be executed thereunder, relating to proposed drainage and minor construction work exceeding a total cost of \$200,000 on the Wellton-Mohawk Division, Gila project, Arizona, pursuant to 70 Stat. 274; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

793. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports

concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

794. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

795. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d) (6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

796. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

797. A letter from the Acting Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, transmitting a copy of a proposed Highway Safety Program Standard on Pupil Transportation Safety, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 402(h); to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

798. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a followup review showing that long missing Government-owned materials in Vietnam are still unaccounted for, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

799. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on problems in providing proper care to medicaid and medicare patients in skilled nursing homes, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

800. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improvements needed in the management of the highway safety rest area program administered by the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee of conference. Conference report on 5575 (Rept. No. 92-237). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GRAY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 449. Resolution creating additional positions on the U.S. Capitol Police force for duty under the House of Representatives and providing a system of overtime pay for the U.S. Capitol Police under the House; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-244). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAWKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 1746. A bill to further promote equal employment opportunities for American workers (Rept. No. 92-238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1680. A bill to extend for an additional temporary period the exist-

ing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4590. A bill relating to the dutiable status of aluminum hydroxide and oxide, calcined bauxite, and bauxite ore; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 7767. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1973, the existing suspension of duties of metal scrap (Rept. No. 91-241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8293. A bill to continue until the close of September 30, 1973, the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1968 (Rept. No. 92-242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8312. A bill to continue for 2 additional years the duty-free status of certain gifts by members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones (Rept. No. 92-243). 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. BETTS: H.R. 8826. A bill to amend section 542 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL: H.R. 8827. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 so as to provide a deduction for contributions to qualified retirement plans for self-employed individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OELLER: H.R. 8828. A bill to prevent lawless and irresponsible use of firearms, by requiring national registration of firearms, by establishing minimum standards for licensing possession of firearms, and by restricting the availability of handguns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8829. A bill to change the minimum age qualification for serving as a juror in Federal courts from 21 years of age to 18 years of age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING: H.R. 8830. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON: H.R. 8831. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to establish a special emergency loan program for drought areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GONZALEZ: H.R. 8832. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for more responsible news and public affairs programming; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSS: H.R. 8833. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax

credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself, Mr. McCLURE, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BECICH, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. LENT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McKEVITT, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. THONE, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 8834. A bill to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in the State of Idaho, to temporarily withdraw certain national forest land in the State of Idaho from the operation of the U.S. mining laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON: H.R. 8835. A bill to authorize \$2 billion for assistance to municipalities in planning waste treatment facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HENDERSON: H.R. 8836. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the U.S. Secret Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. SARBANES): H.R. 8837. 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. MAZZOLI: H.R. 8838. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to completely exempt certain farm vehicles and a farm vehicle drivers from the provisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINISH: H.R. 8839. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the percentage depletion method for determining the deduction for depletion of oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL: H.R. 8840. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide premium pay for employees for time in an on-call status away from their duty posts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8841. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for maximum entrance and retention ages, training, and early retirement for air traffic controllers, and certain other FAA employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAILSBACK: H.R. 8842. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by adding a new section to prohibit sales below cost for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS: H.R. 8843. A bill to authorize and direct the Corps of Engineers to engage in public works for waste water purification and reuse; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. PICKLE, and Mr. MURPHY of New York):

H.R. 8844. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to provide increased manpower for the health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8845. A bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for training increased numbers of nurses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROY: H.R. 8846. A bill to create a National Agricultural Bargaining Board, to provide stand-

ards for the qualification of associations of producers, to define the mutual obligation of handlers and associations of producers to negotiate regarding agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 8847. A bill to provide for uniform and full disclosure of information with respect to the computation and payment of interest on certain savings deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. DORN):

H.R. 8848. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to investigate, plan, and construct projects for the control of streambank erosion; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. PICKLE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 8849. 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. WATTS:

H.R. 8850. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 14-percent credit for pollution control facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 8851. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, to increase the Federal contribution to 90 percent of the cost of shore restoration and protection projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 8852. A bill to establish drug abuse control organizations in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIDNALL (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WYLIE, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. CRANE, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. LENT, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. ARENDS):

H.R. 8853. A bill to provide Federal revenues to State and local governments and afford them broad discretion in carrying out community development activities and to help States and localities to improve their decisionmaking and management capabilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 8854. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 8855. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to enlarge the mission of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and to assist in enlarging the mission of the State maritime academies; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself and Mr. ARENDS) (by request):

H.R. 8856. A bill to authorize an additional Deputy Secretary of Defense, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 8857. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payments for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 8858. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to prescribe regulations with respect to the amount of recycled material contained in paper procured or used by the Federal Government or the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 8859. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the General Services Administration to insure the procurement and use by the Federal Government of products manufactured from recycled materials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MONAGAN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GIAIMO, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HARSHA, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KING, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. NIX, Mr. REES, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. TALCOTT):

H.R. 8860. A bill to establish drug abuse control organizations in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONAGAN (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. KYROS, and Mr. SISK):

H.R. 8861. A bill to establish drug abuse control organizations in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 8862. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, section 204; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8863. A bill to provide a penalty for unlawful assault upon law enforcement personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. KEE):

H.R. 8864. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to provide for the inclusion of child-care facilities in low-rent public housing projects, and to provide that the eligibility of a family to remain in such a project despite increases in its total income shall be determined solely on the income of the head of such family (or its other principal wage earner); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. METCALFE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. YATES, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 8865. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to provide for the inclusion of child-care facilities in low-rent public housing projects, and to provide that the eligibility of a family to remain in such a project despite increases in its total income shall be determined solely on the income of the head of such family (or its other principal wage earner); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POAGE (for himself and Mr. BELCHER):

H.R. 8866. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHMITZ (for himself, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.R. 8867. A bill to create a marine sanctuary from leasing pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in an area off the coast of California adjacent to State-owned submerged lands in which such State has suspended leasing for mineral purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 8868. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to increase unemployment and sickness benefits, to raise the contributions base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8869. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the western district of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYLIE:

H.R. 8870. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to promote the public health by strengthening the national effort to conquer cancer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 8871. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to allow for greater expansion of the export trade of the United States, to exclude Bank receipts and disbursements from the budget of the U.S. Government, to extend for 3 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves and against full reserves, insurance, and guarantees, to authorize the Bank to issue for purchase by any purchaser its obligations maturing subsequent to June 30, 1976, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 8872. A bill to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 8873. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, to assist producers in the marketing of their commodities at a fair price; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 8874. A bill to assist producers of agricultural commodities by providing an orderly means of bargaining with the handlers of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8875. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code, in order to implement a comprehensive program for treating and rehabilitating members of the Armed Forces who are drug addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 8876. A bill making appropriations to carry out the lead-based paint poisoning prevention program for the fiscal years 1971 and 1972; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 8877. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KYROS, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 8878. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, relating to qualifications for appointment and retention in the Civil Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 8879. A bill to provide for the treatment of members of the Armed Forces who are narcotics addicts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8880. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for the development and operation of treatment programs for certain drug abusers who are confined to or released from correctional institutions and facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8881. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that Federal welfare payments may be made with respect to an

individual who qualifies therefor on the basis of drug-caused disability or incapacity only if such individual is undergoing appropriate treatment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.J. Res. 674. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.J. Res. 675. Joint resolution to provide for the revision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H.J. Res. 676. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an Annual Youth Appreciation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.J. Res. 677. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of each year as "National Arbor Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.J. Res. 678. A joint resolution designating the month of October of each year as "Drug Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.J. Res. 679. Joint resolution: Stable purchasing power resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H. Con. Res. 323. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to take affirmative action to persuade the Soviet Union to revise its official policies concerning the rights of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Con. Res. 324. Concurrent resolution

urging review of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. VANIK):

H. Res. 458. Joint resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HATHAWAY (for himself and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts):

H. Res. 459. Resolution commemorating the 150th anniversary of English High School of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. WINN):

H. Res. 460. Resolution calling upon the Voice of America to broadcast in the Yiddish language to Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

203. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. EILBERG introduced a bill (H.R. 8882) for the relief of Maximo Rene Trabuco, his wife Della Irene Trabuco, and their children Gracila Lucia Trabuco, and Claudia Sandra Trabuco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Wednesday, June 2, 1971

The Senate met at 9 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, guide of the past and hope of the future, enable Thy servants here to use this new day wisely for the welfare of this Nation and the advancement of Thy kingdom. Spare them from squandering time on the wrong things or things which do not matter much. May nothing important be left undone and nothing badly done. Give them courage to make the hard decision and grace to live with the consequences. May they be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might. Teach the people of this land, young and old, the ways of Thy statutes to do them that we may fulfill the laws of Thy kingdom.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following measures:

On May 27, 1971:

S. 1181. An act to remove certain limitations on the granting of relief to owners of lost or stolen bearer securities of the United States, and for other purposes; and

On May 28, 1971:

S.J. Res. 29. A joint resolution to provide for the designation of the calendar week beginning on May 30, 1971, and ending on June 5, 1971, as "National Peace Corps Week", and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled joint resolution:

S.J. Res. 103. A joint resolution to authorize the President to designate June 1, 1971, as "Medical Library Association Day".

The enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) was signed by the President pro tempore.

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

H.R. 1907. An act for the relief of Arnold D. Smith;

H.R. 2110. An act for the relief of the estate of Julius L. Goepfinger; and

H.R. 3201. An act for the relief of Faith M. Lewis Kochendorfer; Dick A. Lewis; Nancy J. Lewis Keithley; Knute K. Lewis; Peggy

A. Lewis Townsend; Kim C. Lewis; Cindy L. Lewis Kochendorfer; and Frederick L. Baston.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 1907. An act for the relief of Arnold D. Smith;

H.R. 2110. An act for the relief of the estate of Julius L. Goepfinger; and

H.R. 3201. An act for the relief of Faith M. Lewis Kochendorfer; Dick A. Lewis; Nancy J. Lewis Keithley; Knute K. Lewis; Peggy A. Lewis Townsend; Kim C. Lewis; Cindy L. Lewis Kochendorfer; and Frederick L. Baston.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 1, 1971, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.