



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 24, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Reverend Charles B. Nunn, Jr., First Baptist Church, Bluefield, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, as we pray for the Members of this distinguished legislative body and all those who share in its labors, we pause to give Thee thanks, that Thou hast given to us another day of opportunity to serve Thee and the cause of our fellow man.

We would confess our need for Thee. The world is so big, our problems so immense, that we are often frightened by the burdens placed upon us.

We pray for the corrective power of faith that will make distinct our finest thoughts and make possible our most urgent hopes. In these days of darkness and doubts, may the light from Thee shine on us all.

We ask it in the blessed name of the One who has said: "As thy days, so shall thy strength be." 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.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 3094. An act for the relief of the estate of Capt. John N. Laycock, U.S. Navy, retired; and

H.R. 4848. An act to amend the act of November 26, 1969, to provide for an extension of the date on which the Commission on Government Procurement shall submit its final report.

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

S. 414. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the Central Dakota Nursing Home.

S. 1206. An act to amend subsection (d) of section 2 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, relating to the terms of office of the members of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States; and

S. 2133. An act to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, for 3 months.

CXVII—1375—Part 17

REV. CHARLES B. NUNN, JR.

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

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed with a deep feeling of humility to welcome our most capable and illustrious Rev. Charles B. Nunn, Jr. of my home city of Bluefield and especially his prayer delivered in the House of Representatives today which was most appropriate during this most critical period in the history of our Nation.

It was my distinct pleasure to know Reverend Nunn while he served his church faithfully in the city of Alexandria, Va., prior to his acceptance of his present assignment in southern West Virginia, which has resulted most beneficially from his dynamic leadership.

During the 3 years he has been in Bluefield he has served as secretary of the mayors committee on annexation; served as cochairman of the Bluefield Beautification Commission; a commissioner on the Bluefield Urban Renewal Authority; served on the board of directors, Mercer County Mental Health Association; board of directors, Bluefield United Fund; board of governors, Golden Age Center. He has likewise been secretary of the Bluefield Ministerial Association; vice chairman of the recent Police Recognition Week, in charge of the speakers bureau; recently appointed to the committee to assist trustees of Bluefield College in the selection of a new president.

He has previously served as "chaplain of the day" in the West Virginia Senate, West Virginia House of Delegates, the U.S. Senate, and today in the U.S. House of Representatives.

As a further recognition he attended the 1970 White House Conference on Children at the invitation of the President. On this coming July 7, he will receive from the city of Bluefield the very first distinguished service award ever given by the city board of directors. The public announcement of this forthcoming award was announced last Tuesday.

### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the bill making ap-

propriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

Mr. McDADE reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

### THE PEOPLE ARE ENTITLED TO THE WHOLE TRUTH

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have often been outspoken and critical of decisions of the Federal judiciary. Today I would like to applaud a recent decision of the Federal judiciary, and I refer to the decision rendered yesterday by the U.S. court of appeals permitting the publication of the McNamara study papers relative to our involvement in Vietnam.

The release of these papers and the publication of the truth of our involvement in Southeast Asia is like a fresh breeze blowing away stale and stagnant air.

The American people have a right to know the truth. Who got us into this mess? What officials—in and out of government—are responsible? I say, tell the truth, all of the truth, let the chips fall where they may and let the guilty be damned.

I suspect the main result in suppressing these papers will not be to protect our national security, but an effort to keep certain individuals from being embarrassed.

A point is made that we are causing a strain with our relations with other friendly countries who have been involved in the past. I submit that to suppress publication now is like waiting for the other shoe to drop and would be worse in the long run than letting all the truth come out now.

The American people who have suffered so much, parents, wives, children, are entitled to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in this matter.

### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 19, COORDINATED NATIONAL BOATING SAFETY PROGRAM

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

21867

on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 19, to provide for a coordinated national boating safety program.

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

There was no objection.

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House on Monday last, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 742) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

#### H.J. Res. 742

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of the Government for the fiscal year 1972, namely:

Sec. 101. (a) (1) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1971 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following Appropriation Acts for the fiscal year 1972:

Office of Education and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;  
Legislative Branch Appropriation Act;  
Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriation Act;  
Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;  
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriation Act;  
Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act; and  
Department of Housing and Urban Development; Space, Science, Veterans, and Certain Other Independent Agencies Appropriation Act.

(2) Appropriations made by this subsection shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriation Act.

(3) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this subsection as passed by the House is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the lesser amount or the more restrictive authority.

(4) Whenever an Act listed in this subsection has been passed by only one House or where an item is included in only one version of an Act as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the cur-

rent rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower: *Provided*, That no provision which is included in an appropriation Act enumerated in this subsection but which was not included in the applicable appropriation Act for 1971, and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution unless such provision shall have been included in identical form in such bill as enacted by both the House and the Senate.

(b) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities (not otherwise provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1971 and are listed in this subsection at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority—

activities for which provision was made in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1971;

activities for which provision was made in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1971;

activities for which provision was made in the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Act, 1971, notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-872;

activities for which provision was made in the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1971;

activities for which provision was made in the Military Construction Appropriation Act, 1971;

activities for which provision was made in the Public Works for Water, Pollution Control, and Power Development and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Act, 1971;

activities for which provision was made in Public Law 92-7, approved March 30, 1971, for the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies;

activities and allocations in accordance with previous eligibility criteria for waste treatment construction grants and water quality activities of the Environment Protection Agency; for child nutrition programs of the Department of Agriculture; and for activities provided for under the Act of August 1, 1958 (relating to studies of effects of insecticides and other chemicals on fish and wildlife);

activities of the Commission on Railroad Retirement;

activities of the Office of Saline Water, Department of the Interior;

activities of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission; and

activities of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

(c) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities for which disbursements are made by the Secretary of the Senate, and the Senate items under the Architect of the Capitol, to the extent and in the manner which would be provided for in the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1972.

(d) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing the following activities, but at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate—

activities relating to military credit sales to Israel;

activities for (1) civil rights education, and (2) emergency school assistance activities for which an appropriation was made in the Office of Education Appropriation Act, 1971;

operation of hospitals, institutions, and stations of the Public Health Service;

activities relating to payments to air carriers, Civil Aeronautics Board;

activities of the National Commission on

Fire Prevention and Control; activities of the National Tourism Resources Review Commission; and activities transferred to the Action Agency by Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1971.

Sec. 102. Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall remain available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) enactment of the applicable appropriation Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) August 6, 1971, whichever first occurs.

Sec. 103. Appropriations and funds made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in subsection (d) (2) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

Sec. 104. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

Sec. 105. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

Sec. 106. No appropriation or fund made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity which was not being conducted during the fiscal year 1971.

Sec. 107. Any appropriation for the fiscal year 1972 required to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, may be apportioned on a basis indicating the need (to the extent any such increases cannot be absorbed within available appropriations) for a supplemental or deficiency estimate of appropriation to the extent necessary to permit payment of such pay increases as may be granted pursuant to law to civilian officers and employees and to active and retired military personnel. Each such appropriation shall otherwise be subject to the requirements of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution is necessary as the result of the fact that the appropriation bills for fiscal year 1972, which begins next week, have not been enacted into law.

We have passed through the House several of the bills. According to the present schedule, we shall have passed half the annual appropriation bills for 1972 through the House by the end of this fiscal year—by June 30—of this year—of course not all of those will have passed the other body by that time. Then there are seven additional appropriation bills for 1972 which we hope to pass through the House in July.

So, this is a "stopgap" measure to provide the departments and agencies of the Government with operating funds from July 1 until August 6, at which time Congress is expected to take a summer recess, or such earlier date as the regular appropriation bills are signed into law. Prior to August 6 we shall have to

take a reading of the status of the appropriation bills and, if necessary, pass another continuing resolution. But by August 6 we are hopeful that most of the appropriation bills for fiscal 1972 will have been enacted into law.

Let me say that this continuing resolution is, generally speaking identical with initial continuing resolutions of past years. I would hope, in view of the fact that it is in the standard form and that it is for only 1 month plus, that we could promptly send this measure to the other body so that they may promptly get and thus assure the departments and agencies that they will not have payless paydays or be unable to operate because of lack of funds.

We are especially anxious to pass this measure in this conventional, time-tested form, because if it should be modified or changed or amended in some way different from the standard procedure of the past, we could encounter all manner of delay in the House and in the other body.

That, briefly, is about all I think I need to say in regard to this matter.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the committee yielding, especially in view of our colloquy on the floor earlier in the week when the gentleman obtained permission to bring this joint resolution up. He and his very excellent staff have provided me a copy of the joint resolution and of the report. I have reviewed them. This meets every requirement I have. Certainly we must act with fiscal responsibility, and I certainly have no objection, in view of the inherent and customary limitations.

Mr. MAHON. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I include exploratory excerpts from the committee report, No. 92-302:

#### CONCEPT AND TIME PERIOD OF THE RESOLUTION

The resolution follows the basic form and concept of similar resolutions of past years. Last year's initial continuing resolution—for fiscal 1971—became Public Law 91-294, approved June 29, 1970.

The time period covered by the accompanying resolution is the month of July and 6 days of August—in other words, the scheduled summer recess. Judged by comparison with some earlier years this is a very limited time extension of funding authority for the new fiscal year, but it is not inconsistent with the situation of the moment. It is expected that seven of the regular 1972 appropriation bills will have passed the House by July 1; two have passed both bodies. Barring major authorization bill hang-ups, the announced goal is to pass all the bills through the House before August 6. There are high hopes that many of these will be legislatively finalized by that date.

Of course, if any appropriation business is pending final legislative disposition when this continuing resolution expires, it would be necessary to make appropriate interim provision for maintaining necessary functions of government.

#### STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

The following is the best current estimate of the status of the 14 regular appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1972:

#### TENTATIVE SCHEDULE—FISCAL YEAR 1972 REGULAR APPROPRIATION BILLS

Bill	Reported	House Floor
1. Education.....	March 30.....	April 7
2. Legislative.....	Tues., June 1....	Fri., June 4
3. Agric.-EPA, etc.....	Fri., June 18....	Wed., June 23
4. Tr.-P.O.-Gen. Govt.....	Fri., June 18....	Mon., June 28
5. S.J.C.J.....	Mon., June 21....	Thurs., June 24
6. HUD-Space-Science- Veterans.....	Wed., June 23....	Wed., June 30
7. Interior.....	Thurs., June 24....	Tues., June 29
8. Transportation.....	Thurs., July 8....	Tues., July 13
9. Public Works-AEC.....	Hearings concluded. Report about mid-July or so. Plan to clear House before August 6 recess.	
10. District of Columbia.....	Hearings conclude about end of June. Reporting depends partly on revenue legislation. Plan to clear House before August 6 recess.	
11. Defense.....	Hearings concluded. Reporting depends significantly on authorization bill developments, but plan to clear House before August 6 recess.	
12. Military Construction.....	Hearings conclude about June 28. Reporting depends on authorization bill, but plan to report and clear House before August 6 recess.	
13. Labor-HEW.....	Hearings concluded June 17. Report about mid-July (OEO; health manpower; juvenile delinquency; etc. not yet authorized). Plan to clear House before August 6 recess.	
14. Foreign Aid.....	Hearings conclude end of June. Reporting depends on authorization bill, but plan to report and clear House before August 6 recess.	
15. Supplemental, 1972.....	Latter part of session.	

<sup>1</sup> Exact floor dates to be worked out in cooperation with Leadership.

#### DETAIL ABOUT THE RESOLUTION

Comporting with continuing resolutions over a period of many years, the emphasis in the resolution is on the continuation of existing projects and activities at the lowest of one of three rates, namely, the current (fiscal year 1971) rate; the budget request for 1972, where no action has been taken by either House; or the more restrictive amount adopted by either of the two Houses. The whole thrust of the resolution is to keep the Government functioning on a minimum basis until funds for the full year are otherwise determined upon.

In this latter connection, last year the Committee became aware that the Department of Defense, under the authority of the continuing resolution for fiscal 1971, had obligated funds for certain programs—programs which were undergoing considerable questioning and criticism by the Congress—at rates which to some considerable extent effectively precluded later action by the Congress to reduce funds for the programs. For many years, it has been necessary to provide stop-gap appropriations through continuing resolutions for the several departments and agencies. Officials having responsibility for managing programs during such interim periods are not—certainly should not be—unaware of the fact that the whole thrust behind these measures is to do only the minimum necessary for orderly continuation of activities, preserving to the maximum extent reasonably possible the flexibility of Congress in arriving at final decisions in the regular annual bills. Recognizing the almost countless differing situations involved in operating the far-flung activities of government, continuing resolutions have by design always been drawn rather broadly, counting heavily on administrators to follow a prudent and cautious course in respect to a particular program encompassed within an overall appropriation item.

Without laying down any hard and fast rules and short of encumbering administrative processes with detailed fiscal controls, the Committee nonetheless thinks that to

the extent reasonably possible, departments and agencies should avoid the obligation of funds for specific budget line items or program allocations, on which congressional committees have expressed strong criticism, at rates which unduly impinge upon discretionary decisions otherwise available to the Congress. Otherwise, it may become necessary to curtail the interim flexibility now provided in continuing resolutions—a procedure which over the years has generally served its purpose rather satisfactorily.

The general basis of operation is this:

If the applicable 1972 appropriation bill has passed both Houses but not cleared conference, and the particular amount or authority therein differs, the pertinent project or activity continues under the lesser of the two amounts and under the more restrictive authority. Section 101(a)(3) deals with this.

Where a bill has passed only one House, or where an appropriation for a project or activity is included in only one version of a bill as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity continues under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current fiscal year 1971 rate or the rate permitted by the one House, whichever is the lower. Section 101(a)(4) deals with this.

Where neither House has passed the applicable appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1972—and that will, as things now look, be the case for 7 of the 14 scheduled annual bills for 1972—appropriations are provided for continuing projects or activities conducted during fiscal year 1971 at the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate for 1972, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority. Section 101(b) deals with this. If there is no budget estimate, special provision is made for continuation until the question is disposed of in the course of processing the applicable regular bill. Section 101(d) deals with this.

The resolution does not in any way augment the appropriation for a given project or activity in the regular bills for the fiscal year 1972. In the words of section 105 of the resolution itself:

"Sec. 105. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law."

In other words, while this resolution—as in the case of similar resolutions of previous years—does not enumerate specific amounts that may be obligated and expended for the countless activities of government during the period of the resolution (or such shorter period as the resolution may operate as to particular departments or agencies), the controlling factor, known to all who have any responsibility for the management of the programs or the obligation of the funds, is that whatever is used during this interim must be taken out of, or charged against, whatever amount is finally appropriated, or otherwise made available, for the whole year.

Section 101(a) and following subsections of that section of the resolution are drawn along conventional lines of similar past resolutions and deal with appropriation bills that, according to the present schedule, will have passed at least one House before July 1.

Section 101(b) and following subsections of that section of the resolution are drawn along the conventional lines of similar past resolutions and, generally, encompass those activities to be considered in connection with appropriation bills not yet reported from the Committee on Appropriations or which are otherwise not presently included in a bill.

Section 101(c) relates to Senate house-keeping operations and is identical in substance to previous resolutions.

Section 101(d), also drawn along conventional lines, generally deals with activities being conducted in the fiscal year 1971 for which at the moment there is no fiscal 1972 budget estimate or authorizing legislation, and such items are not effectively covered by previous subsections of Section 101.

Section 102 provides that the resolution ceases to apply to an agency or activity concurrent with approval by the President of the applicable appropriation bill in which provision for such agency or activity is made. Thus the scope of the continuing resolution constricts as each bill is enacted; the resolution will be wholly inoperative after the last bill for 1972 is approved, or August 6, whichever first occurs. Any bills not legislatively finalized by August 6 will have to be covered by another continuing resolution.

Section 103 is standard, and obviates a lot of unproductive paperwork that would otherwise be necessary.

Section 104 is standard in continuing resolutions, and is self-explanatory.

Section 105 is also standard and self-explanatory.

Section 106 is also standard in continuing resolutions, forbidding the use of funds provided in the joint resolution to initiate any new project or activity or to resume any which was not being conducted in fiscal 1971.

Section 107 is a standard-type provision made necessary when general civilian or military pay raises, which are mandatory insofar as administrative discretion is concerned, have not been specifically appropriated for or were not in effect for the full period of the prior fiscal year but which by their operation will be annualized in the fiscal year to which the resolution relates. The going salary rates authorized by any pay raise legislation must be continued uninterrupted at the higher rates even though the related specific appropriation increases have not been enacted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 744) making an appropriation for the fiscal year 1972 for the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

#### H.J. RES. 744

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sum is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, namely:

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

For the summer programs of the non-school feeding program for children, as provided for in H.R. 9270, Ninety-second Con-

gress (as passed by the House of Representatives), to be immediately available, \$17,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution which provides \$17 million for the summer programs of the nonschool feeding program for children. I would like to read it to the House:

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE—CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

For the summer programs of the non-school feeding program for children, as provided for in H.R. 9270, Ninety-second Congress (as passed by the House of Representatives), to be immediately available, \$17,000,000.

The regular appropriation bill handled by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), H.R. 9270, passed in the House last night, will not be enacted into law within the next week or so. We do not want to hinder the summer feeding program for children for which about \$17 million was included in H.R. 9270. The whole object of this special resolution is to make funds available immediately.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. BOW. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding to me.

I am in full agreement with the joint resolution. These funds were contained in the bill that was passed yesterday, and unless they are made immediately available, this is an exercise in frustration, because the program starts now. If we have to wait until the regular bill clears all of the legislative hurdles, we will deprive these children of the nutrition that we are trying to provide for them. It seems to me to be proper to do this.

I would like to ask this one question for clarification. It is true, is it not, that the \$17 million will come out of the appropriation which was passed yesterday?

Mr. MAHON. This is my understanding.

Mr. BOW. This is not an additional \$17 million but is \$17 million that was included in the bill?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi who managed the regular bill on the House floor yesterday for a response to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. We wanted to handle it separately and not get it involved in the other bill. It is handled as a separate item here.

Mr. BOW. This will be made immediately available and it is included in the bill that was passed yesterday?

Mr. WHITTEN. A similar amount is included in that bill. I would contemplate that they will balance each other off, but rather than get complicated here and have some trouble getting this approved, we did not do so at this point.

Mr. BOW. I understand that, but do I understand that when we do go to conference on the Agriculture bill this will be considered as being in that bill and this is not an additional appropriation?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would be willing so to act myself.

Mr. BOW. I hope that is right, be-

cause if we were appropriating an additional \$17 million, then it seems to me it would take a great deal of more debate and substantiation. I would hope we are.

Mr. WHITTEN. I say I would certainly be of that mind. The reason why we have not done it the other way at this time is to keep from getting the whole bill involved in this one. That might result in not getting this through.

Mr. MAHON. I agree with the gentleman that we should keep this whole matter connected with the regular bill when we go to conference with the other body on it.

Mr. BOW. And, the gentleman does not expect it to be an additional appropriation of \$17 million.

Mr. MAHON. We would certainly hope not.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, and just to further drive home the point that my distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member on the Appropriations Committee has made, is it not obvious, as stated in the Joint Resolution 744 that this is "a summer program for non-school feeding of children"—the feeding of nonschool children is the way I would express that—"as provided for in H.R. 9270, 92d Congress," which was the agricultural appropriation bill that we passed last evening. Therefore, this additional \$17 million, which was the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi for \$11.2 million, as I recall it and the \$5 million some odd, that was already in the bill, has to be only those funds included in that appropriation.

I think we need to really wrap up this legislative record or else I shall be constrained to vote against this joint resolution, if there is any possibility that this is an additional \$17 million.

Mr. MAHON. As the author of the joint resolution now pending before us, it is not my intention that it be an additional appropriation.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to yield further to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the author of this resolution.

Mr. MAHON. The purpose of this resolution, of course, is to make funds immediately available for these summer feeding programs. They are programs for children who would be in school during their regular school year but the facilities of the schools and the recreational facilities will be used to try to give them recreation during the summer months.

The cities are very much interested in the program. I think the program is an excellent one. It is an authorized program. It is contained in the budget. What this resolution does is to provide the funds immediately.

That is the purpose of this resolution and if it were otherwise I would be in-

clined to follow the reasoning which has been pointed out by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate that and that is the legislative record that I wanted to make.

Mr. Speaker, I believe no one can object to the purpose as stated here on the floor and as written into this joint resolution that the funds be made immediately available. However, we want to be sure that (a) they are not duplicating those passed in the Subcommittee on Appropriations Agricultural Act last evening and, indeed, are those self-same funds and they will be taken out of that appropriation when it finally becomes law either directly or via conference, as stated by the gentleman from Ohio and agreed to by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

The second point is there has been much colloquy on the floor recently about breakfast funds to the added extent of about \$35 million for schoolchildren, authorized by the Committee on Education and Labor. These funds we are now talking about that were considered in the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture are made to those nonschoolchildren; is that a correct statement?

Mr. MAHON. My understanding is that the gentleman's statement is absolutely correct.

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

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

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The origin of this resolution was an article that appeared in the Washington Post which I called to the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) and that article read in part as follows:

The Agriculture Department has informed big cities throughout the country that they will not receive expected funds to feed hundreds of thousands of poor children this summer.

Mr. HALL. I think the gentleman ought to quit while he is ahead.

Mr. YATES. I just wanted to finish my statement, if the gentleman will yield further. If not, I will get my own time.

Mr. HALL. I would be glad to yield further to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Mississippi was kind enough to start the machinery for making this money available. That was the purpose of this emergency resolution.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman agrees with the last response, that it is not duplicative?

Mr. YATES. Yes. This resolution will provide needed funds this summer for needy children.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I regret that I was not here when this dialog started, but is this purely for lunch programs, for the feeding of schoolchildren? Is this \$17 million

solely for the purpose of furnishing nourishment to them?

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the distinguished chairman for an answer.

Mr. MAHON. This is for these day-care programs in the summer for the children, and for their lunches in connection with the recreational programs. This is what these funds will be expended for. This is the amount it is estimated will be required to carry on the program.

Mr. GROSS. I just want to make certain, if the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I just want to be sure that this in no way finances the \$40 a week each for some 1,000 elementary pupils in the District of Columbia to go to school this summer for 2 or 3 or 4 hours a day because of failures in class-work during the past school year.

Mr. MAHON. It does not do so at all.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) the chairman of the committee.

The chairman yesterday mentioned cities and again today he mentioned cities in relation to this amendment. All I want to ask is whether these funds are specifically designated for the cities only, and not for the rural areas also?

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor which handles the basic legislation, is here, but I am sure I can speak with authority and say that the funds are not just for the cities, but rather for communities generally.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will yield, it is allocated under section 13 in the school lunch program.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky in just a second. I am concerned that the rural areas such as the one that I represent might not be included. These rural areas have the same problems, although smaller in nature, but nonetheless they are the same problems as those of the larger cities. I believe that too much emphasis has been placed lately upon the plight of the cities, at least, in the colloquies here, but I am concerned with the plight of the rural areas that basically, as the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) and I represent.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, this program is for the nonschool food programs throughout the country, both rural and city, under section 13 of the National School Lunch Act. When the administration made a check, they checked and found a great demand from several of

the large cities. I know the Department did not make a check of the rural areas, but the authorization under section 13 is \$32 million which is allocated to all the States on an equitable formula under the appropriation you can provide food for the nonschoolchildren in day-care centers. You can feed them breakfast, and you can feed them dinner, and you can feed them supper, just so they are not in school, and as long as the children are in day-care centers.

The summertime programs are outstanding. The demand is there, and this will permit the funding of the nonschool food programs in both rural and urban areas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I think the chairman and I agree with the intent of the amendment, and the purpose, but I want to be perfectly clear that it is understood in the legislative history that this is for all children, regardless of whether they are in rural America, or in the large cities. We must not disregard the plight of rural America.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) for this timely amendment. I have received many calls from Chicago from people who are concerned with this program, particularly referring to the amount that the State of Illinois received last year.

I wonder if the distinguished chairman would address himself to that point, as to whether or not the State of Illinois will receive the same funds as it did last year?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I do not have here a breakdown of just how much each area or State will receive, but the funds I would think would be at least equivalent to what the funds were last year for the areas generally.

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) might wish to add to this.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that I understand that the Secretary of Agriculture, in a press release, has indicated that the additional \$11.2 million, which the House has now approved, will assure that every city will receive at least as much money as they had last year. It would be hoped that it would be larger, but we have been given the assurance that it at least would reach the level they had last year.

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois. I would like to say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) on behalf of Dr. Deton Brooks, the administrator of our program in the city of Chicago, that we are grateful to you for your timeliness.

Mr. MAHON. We thought we ought to do something quickly about the situation because we felt it was an emergency. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois. If I may ask the gentleman one further question. Is my understanding correct with reference to this amendment that immediately on

the passage of this amendment, the funds would be available for this program?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct; when the joint resolution is enacted into law, the funds would be immediately available.

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material in connection with both resolutions that have been considered by the House and that other Members speaking on the resolution may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9272) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9272, with Mr. Abernethy in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chair-

man, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 9272, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies carries a total of \$4,036,898 in new obligatory authority and is \$168,099,000 below the total request presented to the committee. It is \$213,545,700 over the

total appropriated for the current fiscal year.

Of this increase, about \$80 million is required for increased pay costs submitted in House Document No. 92-93.

The following table summarizes the amounts recommended in the bill in comparison with the budget estimates for fiscal year 1972 and the appropriations for fiscal year 1971:

Department or agency (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972 (3)	Bill compared with—		
			New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971 (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1972 (6)
Department of State.....	\$462,234,800	\$509,598,000	\$491,673,000	+\$29,438,200	-\$17,925,000
Department of Justice.....	1,250,862,000	1,577,471,000	1,552,696,000	+301,834,000	-24,775,000
Department of Commerce.....	1,054,976,000	1,258,020,000	1,176,772,000	+121,796,000	-81,248,000
The judiciary.....	153,665,100	178,679,000	169,531,000	+15,865,900	-9,148,000
Related agencies.....	901,614,400	681,229,000	646,226,000	-255,388,400	-35,003,000
Total.....	3,823,352,300	4,204,997,000	4,036,898,000	+213,545,700	-168,099,000

The first of the agencies with which we shall concern ourselves in this bill is the Department of State. The budget estimates for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1972 total \$509,598,000. The committee has included in the accompanying bill \$491,673,000, which is a reduction of \$17,925,000 in the total amount of the budget estimates and is an increase of \$29,438,200 over the total appropriations for the current fiscal year.

I might say with regard to the Department of State appropriations that the largest item, and the lifeblood of the Department of State as well as the Foreign Service, is the appropriation entitled "Salaries and expenses." There is included herewith for salaries and expenses \$244,750,000. This total amount will provide for 13,560 positions, of which 8,469 are American, and 5,091 are local or foreign employees. The total number of positions is 1,263 less than the total of 10 years ago.

At this point I should say that the American taxpayer owes thanks for this situation, whereby the number of positions is 1,263 less than it was 10 years ago, to former Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the present Secretary of State William P. Rogers.

I shall skip the portion of the report entitled "Representation allowances" for the reason that that item is in the same amount as it has been for a number of years now.

Next, we get to the item "Contributions to international organizations." There is included in the bill a total of \$152,774,000 for payment of the annual obligations of membership in certain international multilateral organizations pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific acts of Congress. This amount is an increase of \$11,455,000 over the total appropriated for the current fiscal year. The major portion of the increase is for the United Nations and specialized agencies, even though the committee has included no funds for the International Labor Organization.

Much misinformation has been published concerning the withholding of ILO funds by the Congress. In fact, we expect an amendment will be offered here in the Committee of the Whole to restore the ILO money. It would appear that the amendment that is going to be offered will be offered by Members who cannot say that they are thereby representing the thoughts of the top people in the Government of the United States.

As I have said, much misinformation has been published in this regard, alleging that it was done because of a single undesirable appointment. That was but a catalyst. According to the testimony, the deterioration of the ILO has been going on for many years.

The following is an excerpt from the testimony of President George Meany, AFL-CIO, before the subcommittee on July 31, 1970:

Mr. MEANY. What has happened since the Soviets came into the ILO is that the ILO has become a sounding board more and more each year for political discussions. Those of us who have attended ILO meetings in the last few years have been subjected to the indignity of listening to speaker after speaker on the resolutions committee denouncing the United States of America. This has become a forum for Russian political propaganda, and there is no effort made by the Office of the ILO to stop this.

Since no other effective means had been used, the Congress cut off funds last year. What were the results?

This is what Hon. George H. Hildebrand, Deputy Under Secretary for International Affairs, Department of Labor, testified on March 10, 1971:

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Secretary, would you say that in the past 6 months, you have made more progress than you did heretofore in the ILO?

Mr. HILDEBRAND. Well, within the period I have served in this job, yes. I have been in the post only a little less than 2 years.

Mr. ROONEY. Taking the 2 years, you have made more progress in the ILO in the last 6 months than you did in the previous year and a half?

Mr. HILDEBRAND. Exactly.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. HILDEBRAND. Thank you, sir.

I want to point out that the ILO is not a U.N. organization in the full sense of the word. The ILO is an American organization which was founded in 1920, following World War I, by Samuel Gompers, the head of the American Federation of Labor. It can be a very, very good organization, and there is not a single member of the committee who feels that we should at any time, abandon our membership in this organization.

Do Members know that the Soviet Union has never contributed a ruble to the \$100 million loan that was made to the U.N. some years back when they were strapped for money? Do Members know they never contributed a ruble to the Congo operation, which was very expensive, and that they never contributed a ruble to the Middle East police force, either?

If they can do these things and let their arrears go on and then come in just before the 2-year period is up and pay 6 months' dues, I say we can do the same. We do not need anybody pussy-footing around this place talking about the sanctity of the United Nations. We do not intend to withdraw from the United Nations and we do not intend to withdraw from the ILO. But we want to have the say we are entitled to in the ILO when we contribute 25 percent of its funds.

This organization has become drunk with power under an Englishman named Jenks. I will give an example of this. I was in Geneva in January on this very matter. I was utterly amazed to find out that there was then and there under construction a \$25 million new building for ILO. I had never heard of this building before. The State Department has admitted in testimony, by Assistant Secretary De Palma, that neither the Senate nor the House was notified of such a project. They were already digging the foundations, if you please, and inserting the basic steel work for the new \$25 million ILO building.

The American taxpayers will have to pay 25 percent of that. But there was no notice to the taxpayers of America, no notice either to the Senate Committee on Appropriations or to the House Committee on Appropriations.

This is the kind of fiscal irresponsibility that we are not going to permit any longer.

The U.N. and the State Department had the effrontery to come before us twice with a project for a \$92 million building complex in New York City. I am a New Yorker, and I pay taxes in New York City. Under that proposal of the United Nations they planned to have the American taxpayers who live in New York City contribute to a total, by way of Federal taxes and by way of city taxes, of \$65 million out of the \$92 million, or 70 percent.

Now, this is utter fiscal irresponsibility, and we do not intend to permit it. We will have more to say upon this if and when an amendment is offered today.

We shall now proceed to the Department of Justice. The budget estimates for the fiscal year 1972 for the Department of Justice total \$1,577,471,000. The

committee in the accompanying bill recommends \$1,552,696,000. The amount recommended is an increase of \$301,834,000 over the total of the appropriations for this Department for the current fiscal year.

There is, as Members must have noticed, included in the bill the full amount requested for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This would provide for a total of 20,727 full-year employees, of which 8,873 are special agents and 11,854 are clerks.

The full amount has also been allowed for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which includes the Border Patrol.

With respect to the Federal prison system, the bill contains \$174,342,000.

In connection with buildings and facilities, there is set forth at page 11 of the committee report the facilities for which funds are being appropriated in order of priority as given to the committee by the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice.

With regard to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the committee has included in the bill the sum of \$698,919,000, which is the full amount of the budget estimate for grants, contracts, loans, and other law enforcement assistance authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended.

There is included in this bill the full amount requested, to wit, \$57,089,000, for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

Now we refer to the Department of Commerce.

The revised budget estimates for this department for fiscal year 1972 amounted to a total of \$1,258,020,000 in new budget authority plus \$240,544,000 for liquidation of contract authorization. The committee recommends the full amount requested for liquidation of contract authority. There is an increase of \$121,796,000 in new budget authority over the comparable amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1971, but there is a reduction of \$81,248,000 from the total funds requested for fiscal year 1972.

As we get to this point in the bill, and also with regard to certain items in the related agencies as well as in the Department of Justice, I want to point out that the bill represents the thinking of a majority of the committee. It does not represent the judgment or the thinking of the chairman of the subcommittee in every instance, particularly in the instances where appropriations were cut for enforcement of civil rights. However, the overwhelming majority of the committee wrote the amounts included for the enforcement of civil rights, and I must present them to the Committee of the Whole.

With regard to trade adjustment assistance, which is an item that has been on the statute books since 1962, to wit, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, there is included in the bill the huge sum of \$65 million for financial assistance to firms that are injured and threatened by increased imports under the provisions of that act.

With regard to the item for the Maritime Administration, the bill includes a total of \$524,505,000, for the six items which make up appropriations for this Administration. This amount includes \$283,961,000 in new budget authority and \$240,544,000 for the liquidation of contract authority. There is included for ship construction the amount of \$229,687,000. These figures represent the amount authorized by the House in the bill authorizing appropriations for the Maritime Administration.

Now we get to the Federal judiciary. This includes all of the courts in the land from the Supreme Court of the United States down, with the exception of the Tax Court. The total amount of the estimates for fiscal year 1972 as prepared and presented by the judicial branch of the Government is \$178,679,000.

The committee has allowed a total of \$169,531,000, which is a reduction of \$9,148,000 in the total amount requested and is an increase of \$15,865,900 over the appropriation for fiscal year 1971.

The amounts allowed for the Supreme Court of the United States are set forth in detail at page 19 of the committee report.

Now, with regard to the related agencies included in this bill, if my memory serves me right, there are 12 such agencies, some of them quite large, such as the Small Business Administration and the U.S. Information Agency. A total of \$646,226,000 is included in this bill for the 12 different agencies. This represents a reduction of \$35,003,000 and is \$255,388,400 below the total appropriated for the current fiscal year.

Supplemental appropriations of \$365 million for the disaster loan fund for the Small Business Administration were necessary in the current fiscal year, which accounts for the substantial decrease in the overall comparative figures for this title in the bill.

There is included in the bill for the Small Business Administration a total of \$398,787,000 in four separate appropriation items.

In connection with the business loan and investment fund, the committee was requested for an allowance of \$25 million to be made available to increase the number of direct loans. The committee doubled the amount and made the amount available out of the total for direct loans \$50 million. This may be found at page 601 of part 4 of the hearings.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this generally accounts for many of the important items contained in this large appropriation bill and at this point I shall conclude. I shall be glad to yield to any Member who desires to direct a question at this time. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow), and other members of the subcommittee for refusing to put into the bill any money

for the International Labor Organization.

It was my privilege to serve on a subcommittee some 5 or 6 years ago which went into the ILO situation then and anyone could see then that it was almost inevitable that the ILO, insofar as we were concerned, was becoming a meaningless organization, insofar as the U.S. voice in this organization was concerned.

So, I compliment the gentleman and the subcommittee for refusing to put money in this organization until the organization—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We intend to let payments go until the last minute.

I must remind the gentleman that there is no interest on any arrearages that we owe or will owe. But we will wait until the last minute.

Mr. ROONEY. I doubt that I would pay anything at all until the 2 years expire.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Oh, we have no intention of doing it before then. I said, "At the last minute."

Mr. GROSS. I thought, perhaps, that would be sometime this year.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Not so soon.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any money in this bill for any building expansion of the Tower of Babel in New York, otherwise known as the United Nations?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No; there is not. I might remind the gentleman from Iowa that a \$20 million request was before the House of Representatives and the Senate on two separate occasions, and was defeated each time.

Mr. GROSS. But we are still putting up some \$52 million a year for the upkeep of that outfit?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I think the regular share at the U.N. comes to a much larger amount than that.

Mr. GROSS. I am speaking of the money in this bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes; that is what I am thinking of.

Mr. GROSS. What are the arrearages to date, the unpaid dues to this club?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman is correct insofar as the U.N. itself is concerned, but I do want the committee to understand that, as set forth at page 55 of the report, there are also contributions to UNESCO, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the World Health Organization, and so forth, and they come to a total of \$107,888,041.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from New York for that figure. I was alluding, as the gentleman knows, to the U.N. itself.

What are the arrearages, the delinquencies in the payment of dues to the organization?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. They are listed in the printed hearings, and if the gentleman will permit me I will find the page number. We always set forth and include in the printed Record a statement of the various nations and the amount of money that they are in arrears.

Mr. GROSS. Our contribution of \$5 million is almost the amount of the debts owed to the United Nations by other

member countries, is that not a gospel fact?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That may be true.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder how much longer we are going to contribute to this dead-beat organization?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am hopeful that the committee will be supported today when we get to the vote on the ILO. That will have a great bearing on this very thing. We think that they are not fair to us in agreeing to pay the amount that we do to UNESCO. I know that they are not fair to us in the regular U.N. budget.

Does the gentleman know that these international organizations, without notice to us at all, are in the construction business, I might say, all over the world? There is presently under construction in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, a new building. I think there is another one in Karachi—no, in Bangkok, Thailand.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and we are putting up at least a third of the cost of that U.N. building in Thailand.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct. Right now there are two huge buildings being constructed by ILO and the U.N. in the city of Geneva, Switzerland. The United Nations is presently constructing, at a cost of 27-plus millions of dollars, an addition to the Palace of Nations in Geneva, so that it can seat 2,700 delegates in it and hold U.N. meetings there. They are not fair with us at all. It is unfortunate that we have had some people in the State Department in this area who do not report these sorts of things to the Congress of the United States or the taxpayers.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, what is more important to me is that they are not being fair to the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is exactly so.

Mr. GROSS. The American taxpayers who are staggering under a terrific load these days—they are not being fair to this country and, as the gentleman says, they are not being fair to the Congress of the United States.

A few years ago there were some 74 or 76 members of the U.N., and at that time we put up, as I recall, 33½ percent. In recent years we have put up 31.5 percent as this bill provides although the membership in this club known as the United Nations has increased to 126. How in all conscience—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It is in the 120's.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and why in all conscience should we be loaded with this high appropriation for the United Nations in view of the tremendous increase in the membership?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I just think we are not competently represented at the budget meetings of the U.N. and the U.N. organizations.

Of course, we have had Members of this body and of the other body attend the U.N. as observers—but nobody who was doing any such observing ever came back and reported anything to the Committee on Appropriations except that

they were complaining about not having a sufficient per diem allowance.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman a few moments ago mentioned the representation allowance for the State Department and I believe he said that is static or being held at the level of last year at some \$900,000. This causes me to ask the gentleman a question—whether the price of liquor has gone down or whether the striped pants crowd are drinking less?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The committee has no information to the effect that the price has gone down. It is claimed that prices and wages all over the world have gone up.

Mr. GROSS. Then they must be drinking less—is that the gentleman's conclusion?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That might be one conclusion, but I am not sure I would rush to it. They may be using different brands.

Mr. GROSS. Or using contingency funds or something of that nature?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not think so. I think they would be afraid to do that.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman is right.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I hope so too.

Mr. GROSS. It is hard to understand why there is all this increase.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. In connection with this bill, I was very much amazed to find out that the lady running the passport office had been collecting an extra \$2 fee to "expedite the issuance" of passports. That is utterly illegal, not authorized by law. The fee for the passport was \$10 and there were signs in the passport agencies saying that if the public wanted the issuance of a passport expedited, they should pay \$2 extra.

Now do you know this fund reached the total of well over a half million dollars in a year, and that over a period of years the State Department did not know about it and that the appropriations committees of the House and Senate did not know about it. What do you think happened to this money collected over those years? The lady spent it as she pleased. She decided to spend so much for printing and so much for personnel and for this, that and the other thing. She never appeared before the Congress to request an appropriation nor was there ever deposited any of the money in miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury as required by law.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I wonder what will happen to the \$2 now being collected for the issuance of passport applications in the post offices of the country. Do you suppose that revenue will go for knickknacks?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No, I do not think so. That goes directly to the Post Office.

Mr. GROSS. To the funds for the operation of the new postal corporation?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman is going to be able to keep tabs on that.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We will look it over as best we can.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman's subcommittee handle that?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We shall look it over. As a matter of fact we were surprised to learn during the hearings that the employees of the Post Office in a number of areas in these United States did as good a job as clerks of courts who had been accepting passport applications for many years.

Mr. GROSS. I doubt that the gentleman can say that with respect to security. Moreover, the rate of error, I am told, has been substantially more than that of the passport offices and trained employees.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not think that is the case.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I disagree with the gentleman on that, and I will be interested to see where the \$2 goes. Does the gentleman know who fixed the \$2 fee to be paid for the issuance of an application through the post offices? Does he know where the \$2 fee was set up?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That was done by legislation that was passed by both Houses of the Congress and signed by the President.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman will find the fee was arbitrarily fixed in the beginning. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman, the ranking member, and the other members of the subcommittee on the excellent work which, as usual, they have done on this legislation. I do have one question, however, related to the Department of State and the International Boundary and Water Commission between the United States and Mexico.

It appears from the report that construction funds for the next year have been put in one lump sum. We have in my area the Lower Rio Grande Valley flood control project, and I wonder if the distinguished chairman could shed some light as to the prospects for funds for the next fiscal year.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. As the gentleman knows, the committee has always been more or less quite favorable to the Lower Rio Grande River flood control project. We can assure the gentleman that the amount allowed in the present bill will provide sufficient funds, not less than \$3.8 million to proceed with construction in the coming year.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I appreciate the reassurance of the Chairman in this respect. We are approximating the hurricane season. We must continue with the project as fast as possible, and I feel that if we continue, at least at the present rate of construction, it would serve the purpose under the circumstances.

Again I thank the gentleman for his cooperation, as always.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman. I would like to get an indication of whether or not the United States is presently delinquent with respect to its dues to the International Labor Organization. If it is delinquent, I wonder if the committee could be provided with the dollar amounts in which we are presently in arrears.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We are not in arrears to the point where we have lost any of our rights and privileges, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I recognize that. I wonder if the gentleman would be good enough to tell us the amount of the delinquency, and also when we will be delinquent for long enough to be no longer considered a voting member of the ILO?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Two years.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. When would that deadline be? January 4, 1972?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No. We are going to watch the deadline very carefully, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Would the gentleman inform the committee what the present arrearages are?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman is an outstanding member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I thought we might get that sort of information from him.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be glad to provide it to the gentleman from New York, but I assumed he must know. And I would assume it is quite possible that members who are not on the Foreign Affairs Committee do not know that we are presently delinquent almost \$4 million, and that this delinquency will increase by some \$8 million more this year if we do not pay our dues. I think this is of sufficient importance to be called to our attention.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Does the gentleman know how much interest we must pay on these dues as the result of the pathetic situation he is painting?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am not sure to what pathetic situation the gentleman refers.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The one which was just described by the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think it is pathetic that we should be in arrears in our obligations to an international organization.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman is evading the question. The question was: Does the gentleman know how much interest has accrued as the result of the situation to which he referred?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Interest owed to whom and by whom, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Interest to either the ILO or anybody else as the result of not paying the dues on time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think it is a humiliating spectacle—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. If the gentleman does not wish to answer this simple question, it is all right with the gentleman from New York.

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

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer an amendment at the proper time. Meanwhile, I have some questions I would like to direct to the very distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. It has to do with the so-called community relations services. In your committee print, on page 9, it is stated that this resulted from title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Was this community relations service set up since then, or was it not a service that was quite substantially put into being, into essence, after 1967?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I must say to the distinguished gentleman that the service was established by title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to provide assistance to communities in resolving disputes, disagreements and difficulties arising from discriminatory practices which disrupt or threaten to disrupt peaceful relations among citizens and also, where efforts are being made to eliminate disparities between groups, to achieve compliance with the act and to reduce and prevent racial disorders.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Yes. I know that is the intent or professed purpose of this Bureau. The question I had is, is it not true it was not until about 1968 or 1967.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No, no. The Congress appropriated \$1.1 million in the Supplemental Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1965, and appropriated \$1.3 million in fiscal year 1966.

Mr. GONZALEZ. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. And \$1.5 million in fiscal year 1967.

Mr. GONZALEZ. That is right. But they are now asking for five times that amount, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. GONZALEZ. So I think I am correct when I say that.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman understands the committee cut this request; does he not?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I understand.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That was the judgment of the majority of the members of the committee. It was not my judgment. My judgment was to allow the full amount.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am going to try to develop later, when I present my amendment, another point, if given an opportunity to develop it, an essential thesis which the committee may not be in full possession of all the facts about concerning the activities of this division, and, if it were to have this, would seriously revise the budgetary allocations for this particular activity.

I am sorry to report that the experience in my particular area is the very opposite of what was intended by law and by administrative fiat should be the basic purpose of this Service. If so, I believe the committee should be aware of it.

I wrote a letter on May 20. I addressed it to the overall chairman, the illustrious GEORGE MAHON. To my knowledge I have not had any acknowledgment. This letter concerns a matter of vital concern to me

and the community I represent. I will offer it later as a part of the Record, because it indicates there are serious miscarriages of the intended purpose of this Community Relations Service.

I believe every one of us in the Congress, not only on the committee, ought to know and ought to take appropriate action. If the intended purpose as set forth beautifully in the committee report is to alleviate the tensions and discrepancies that exist between our social entities—if that is the intended purpose—my experience and the facts I have garnered in my district indicate that they are doing the very opposite. They are bringing about cleavages. They are bringing about the very things the law says they are set up to try to prevent. This is very disturbing to me.

I will not take time further now. I just wanted to ask if this had not been the history. I believe the gentleman's answer corroborates that this agency has been multiplied 500 percent since 1968. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I might point out to my distinguished friend from Texas—and I did know him before he became a Member of this body, for I met him on one memorable day down at the Alamo—

Mr. GONZALEZ. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I must say his complaint is not singular. We have a member of the Appropriations Committee who makes a similar complaint. But the same sort of complaint is made with regard to all the civil rights items in this bill, and there are a number of them—the Civil Rights Commission, the Office of Minority Business Enterprise in the Department of Commerce, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. But it is not my intention, so far as I am concerned, to burn down these houses because of these complaints.

I think the matter of fairness to minority peoples is too important to take such a drastic step. However, that merely represents my own thinking.

Mr. GONZALEZ. The chairman I think expresses a very sound philosophy. In fact, it is my thought that he is quite correct when he says our acquaintance antedates my coming to this very important body. We did meet at the Alamo in San Antonio. It was a very, very happy occasion and one that I still cherish, because I have always looked up to this distinguished Member of Congress and share his sentiments. In fact, I think I have been identified in earlier and harsher days, when I was in the State senate in Texas in 1957 and fought vigorously against prejudicial legislation.

However, that is not the point here. Two wrongs do not make a right. I agree that even though the stated purpose for which this service has come into being is correct, and I am for it, I still think we should look into its activities and see how it is being administered and what is happening under it, because if what is happening is what is reflected in my section of the country and if that is generally true in other sections of the country, then I believe it behooves the chairman and the committee to revise its oversight of

this particular activity in this particular part of its function.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York may recall that I spoke to him at one time in the early spring about a matter of failure of service on the part of our consular office at Guadalajara, Mexico.

Before the Congress convened in January we happened to be in Mexico for a few days. We were in the city of Guadalajara on a Saturday. I made a diligent effort but no one connected with the office of our consul could be located. After several calls I learned several of our consular staff were on the golf course. Now I needed to mail an important, official document back to the States through the diplomatic pouch. When I was finally able to reach some of these people, and they said, "Oh, no. We are never available on Saturday." Remember there was not even a duty officer on duty.

Remember, too, Guadalajara is a city of 1 million people. I notice at the bottom of page 3 of the report you have an item for emergencies which is in the sum of \$2.1 million. Now the people in our consular office suggested there was no money for overtime there. They work only 5 days a week with no one covering the office on Saturday or Sunday. There is no answering service when you call the listed number. Finally with the help of the manager of the hotel I was able to reach the home of one of the consul's staff.

Now Mr. Chairman, if this kind of thing can happen to a Member of Congress how could an ordinary American citizen ever expect to get any weekend service from our consular office in the city of Guadalajara? I think if we do not have enough money for a duty officer to serve on weekends, then perhaps I will offer an amendment when the time comes to provide some funds.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman's proposed amendment would have no effect if it were offered to the item that the gentleman refers to. Any such amendment, if offered at all, should properly be addressed to the item at the top of page 3, "Salaries and expenses."

Mr. RANDALL. Maybe it is a matter for the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I do not know. However, I feel this thing should be remedied somewhere along the line.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I must say to the gentleman from Missouri that I work 7 days a week. I have worked 7 days a week for at least the last 40 years. If I am darned fool enough to do that, that does not mean that everybody else has to work 7 days a week. You know, I assume the gentleman from Missouri works 6 days a week.

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, we do.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. But there are a lot of people who do not like to work more than 5 days a week.

Mr. RANDALL. Does not the gentleman agree with me, though, that in a city of that size somebody should be there on duty.

Let me finish telling you the full story.

We finally got ahold of some lady, the wife of one of the employees there. I said, "How do you spell your name? It is a little difficult." She said, "Are you going to make a complaint?" I said, "I certainly am when the appropriate time comes." She said, "I want to be sure you spell my name right, because we have no intention of doing anything on Saturday."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman is not accusing me of some misfeasance of office as a result of that; is he?

Mr. RANDALL. Oh, no.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Maybe the gentleman did not feel good that day.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman was feeling very good. However, the gentleman had a matter of official business that should have been attended to by the consular office.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It may be that the lady was not feeling well that day.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, maybe it was the Saturday morning after a Friday night.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I was not thinking so much of Friday night as Saturday morning.

Mr. RANDALL. Certainly the gentleman will agree that someone should have been available for emergency service.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have never failed to find someone who was available for emergency service at consulates and embassies all over the world. That has been my experience. However, it apparently was not the experience of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. I submit to the gentleman that it is a true incident that actually happened.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is saying that it is a question of good management and that there is enough money to run this consular office?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is right.

Mr. RANDALL. They said they do not have enough money to keep these people on duty on Saturday.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. You can listen to the same sort of thing from every branch of government. The gentleman knows that when you refer a constituent downtown for a job they tell you that they have budgetary problems.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, that may be the case, but in this instance it should be remedied.

Maybe there are budgetary problems but the problem it seems to me is someone willing to serve our citizens when they are in a foreign country and need the service of our consular service.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall consume very little time, I think there are some important amendments going to be offered to this bill and therefore I think much of the debate should be done under the 5-minute rule.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) has well explained this bill. I can see no reason for any lengthy further debate.

So at this time I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOW. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Am I correct in that there is \$38,000 going to the State Department for the Arts and Humanities or was that allowed?

Does the gentleman happen to know?

Mr. BOW. I will have to ask someone on the staff. I do not recall any \$38,000 for the Arts and Humanities to the State Department.

Mr. GROSS. The hearings indicate that a request was made for \$38,000 for the Arts and Humanities and \$400,000 for the Smithsonian Institution.

I am curious to know why the State Department would be requesting those sums.

Mr. BOW. I would say to the gentleman that I am not familiar with the state the gentleman is making.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am advised by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey that the item to which the gentleman refers is in the Department of the Interior budget and they had a full committee meeting on it this morning.

Mr. BOW. The Smithsonian is in the Interior Department and the Arts and Humanities in the amount of \$7 million is in the Interior bill. I do not recall the details.

Mr. GROSS. Let me see if I can find it in the hearings.

Mr. BOW. I do not recall any funds that went into this bill for the Arts and Humanities.

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

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

Mr. WALDIE. Would the distinguished gentleman tell me whether or not to his knowledge there are in this appropriation bill any funds for the Central Intelligence Agency?

Mr. BOW. In this bill as far as I know there is none.

Mr. WALDIE. Does the gentleman have any knowledge or is the gentleman made privy to that information?

Mr. BOW. I will say that there are no funds in this bill for the CIA.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. On page 1012 of your hearings, under the subhead "National Endowment for the Humanities," Mr. ROONEY of New York asks this question:

Can you tell us what this last item is—National Endowment for the Humanities, \$38,000? Their total appropriation is a round \$30 million.

And, on page 1013, at the top of the page, we find the Smithsonian Institution asking for \$406,000.

I cannot tell whether these amounts are in this bill.

Mr. BOW. I would be perfectly frank with the gentleman in saying I do not believe that there is any money for an appropriation for the National Endowment for the Humanities or the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. There are funds in the Interior bill for both of them.

Mr. GROSS. The request was made, however.

Mr. BOW. I see it was, but I am not familiar with it.

Mr. GROSS. I am just curious to know what the State Department would be doing in this field.

Mr. BOW. After the things that have happened in the international organizations, I would not be surprised at all at what we find here. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa that it is time we cut down on these international organizations, and try to get somebody on the budget committee up there to cut it down. We are spending altogether too much money in these areas.

Mr. Chairman, if no one else has any questions, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, which has general legislative jurisdiction over commercial fishery programs and sport fishing programs—and I would very much appreciate it if the gentleman from New York would refer to page 15 of the report, and to the words, "Salaries and expenses" in the report—and I would like to ask the gentleman exactly what the amounts are, that are set out for the offices which are listed underneath there.

I have no concern about the gentleman doing so at this time, but I would appreciate it if the gentleman will do so by extension of his remarks, so we can understand precisely the amounts that are being made available.

I note, and it does trouble me, it says:

The amount is less than the budget request, but it will permit continuation of programs at the current level plus \$5,549,000 for program expansion. The distribution of these additional funds is left to the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce for items of highest priority.

Then appear the words:

Salaries and expenses, Environmental Science Services Administration, Commerce. Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor, Interior.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary, Interior.

Management and investigations of resources, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Interior.

Then on top of page 16 it says:

General administrative expenses, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Interior.

Can the gentleman give us an understanding of what amount that would be that is set aside for each of these programs?

Frankly, I dislike very much giving that much discretion to the agencies.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This is a typical example of what happens when we have a reorganization.

Pages 15 and 16 of the report list the various items which have been placed under NOAA as a result of the reorganization. The reports sets them forth by name, but not by amount. It becomes practically impossible to tell the amounts.

Mr. DINGELL. That is the major problem that I have: what is the amount?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This is the problem we always have with reorganizations. This very outfit, as the gentleman knows, was originally, the Weather Bureau, the Coast & Geodetic Survey, and part of the Bureau of Standards. When Secretary Connor was Secretary of Commerce he took the advice of a Professor Hollomon, who was his science adviser who later became President of the University of Oklahoma—but is no longer there, he did not last too long.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I can remember specifically asking Professor Hollomon and Secretary Connor if they could guarantee that the following year under this amalgamation, there would not be an increase by including them in an organization which became known as ESSA—Environmental Science Services Administration. Of course what we suspected would happen did happen. The increase the following year was tremendous. And that is what has happened with regard to NOAA. They have discontinued ESSA, it is now called NOAA. Lord knows what they will do with this in the future.

Mr. DINGELL. I very much opposed the reorganizations to which the gentleman alludes. I think it is bad. I think what is happening here today tends to buttress that statement.

I wonder—will it be possible for the gentleman to tell us whether or not next year we are going to have these functions broken down by dollar amounts.

These are programs under the jurisdiction of my subcommittee and, therefore, I am very anxious and very much interested to know precisely how these funds will be allocated in the future, even though I cannot find out at this time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We would only be able to set them forth by activity.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman would permit me, I would call the gentleman's attention to page 16 of the report where we find this language.

*Research, development and facilities.*—The Committee has included \$100,000,000 for research and development and for acquisition of facilities to support the operational programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. This amount is \$13,460,000 less than the total requested for 1972 but it is sufficient to fund programs at the current year level in the amount of \$89,284,000 plus \$10,716,000 to fund increases of the highest priority.

Then further on the report mentions matters which are of particular concern to me such as:

Management and investigations of resources, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Interior.

General administrative expenses, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Interior.

Federal aid for commercial fisheries, research and development, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Interior.

Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation, Bureau of \* \* \*

Then, finally, at the bottom of the page, there are these items:

Construction, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Interior.

Construction of fishing vessels, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

Can the gentleman give me any understanding as to how the funds are going to be allocated among those?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No, but they have indicated that they would proceed at the current level, as they were in Mrs. HANSEN's bill.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not like to get into the business of having to authorize these programs, but I am troubled by the fact that I am really not able to get a full understanding of these matters that come under the jurisdiction of the legislative subcommittee which I chair.

I ask my good friend, the gentleman from New York, to assist me by advising me what is happening in the dark on these matters.

I think that NOAA did a poor job and the Bureau of the Budget did a poor job.

Certainly, I make no charge that my friend, the gentleman from New York, has done a poor job because I think he is as much a victim on this bill as I am.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I assure my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan, that no member of my subcommittee sought to have these items transferred to our subcommittee. We already had enough trouble with ESSA.

Mr. DINGELL. I am aware of that.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The same gentleman who is head of ESSA is now head of NOAA.

Mr. DINGELL. And I am sure he will perform the same with NOAA as he did on ESSA.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We do the best we can but it looks like a whale of a job.

Mr. DINGELL. I would appreciate it if the gentleman from New York would inform me in his extension of remarks the amount of these authorizations and it would be my hope that next year my good friend, the gentleman from New York, will give us some assistance by making the agencies give a precise breakdown on these programs so that we will have an opportunity to find out how the programs are funded and whether they are going forward or whether they are going back or how they are being administered. We have to come to my good friend, the gentleman from New York, because this is again his responsibility. I hope the gentleman will help me next year in getting that kind of understanding in the report because I think, frankly, this administration's reorganization is very poor and has led to some very bad and undesirable results, not the least of which is this miserable situation we have before us today.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment to H.R. 9272, the State Department appropriation bill, that will add \$11,600,749 in contributions to international organizations. This additional appropriation will be earmarked for the U.S. contribution, already authorized by Congress, to the International Labor Organization.

Mr. Chairman, in past years the United States has vigorously urged other nations of the world to pay promptly assessed contributions for the United Nations and its constituent agencies like the International Labor Organization. The fact that the United States is now in arrears on its calendar year 1970 contribution to the ILO makes a mockery of this position that has been supported by all postwar administrations. The prospect of congressional failure to fund the calendar year 1971 assessment of \$7.8 million further compounds the embarrassment.

In recommending that the administration's request for funds to support the ILO be deleted from the State Department appropriation bill, the Committee on Appropriations asserts that this action does not constitute formal withdrawal from the ILO. I would like to point out, however, that failure to pay our assessed contributions places in severe jeopardy America's influence in the world's most important labor organization. This is because under the ILO Constitution, nations that are in arrears in an amount exceeding their contribution for the preceding full 2 years, lose their voting rights. In the case of the United States, we would lose our vote not only in the conference, but in the ILO's governing body.

Mr. Chairman, I think it should be emphasized that a broad spectrum of American opinion supports the International Labor Organization and the constructive role America has traditionally played in it. In part this is a result of the unique system of tripartite representation that is characteristic of the International Labor Organization. American labor, business, and government are all represented in the ILO, and all have participated vigorously in its discussions over the years.

Mr. Chairman, payment of the U.S. contribution is supported not only by the Nixon administration, but also by the U.S. employer delegate, Edwin P. Neilen, representing the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and by George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, who has at times been critical of some aspects of the ILO but who recognizes the folly of an abrupt American withdrawal from the organization.

In a background statement on the American role in the ILO, Mr. Chairman, the administration makes some points in support of continued American support of the ILO and leadership in it. This background paper, which was printed in full in yesterday's RECORD, argues that American withdrawal would leave the Soviet Union as the dominant power in the Organization, and afford it a valuable opportunity to exploit the ILO for its own purposes. In view of the particularly

helpful role of the ILO in the less developed countries of the world, especially in the critical field of manpower development, this advantage handed to the Soviet Union would be unconscionable.

The administration also argues that American withdrawal would work against President Nixon's announced objective, supported, I believe, by providing more and more Members of Congress, a greater proportion of U.S. aid and technical assistance through international agencies.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, American withdrawal from the ILO would raise the prospect of our withdrawal from other international agencies with which we can expect from time to time to have disagreements, but which contribute much to economic development and international understanding.

Mr. Chairman, although many thoughtful people have criticized the ILO, surely the way to press the improvements that will make the ILO a more effective force is not to cut and run from our obligations and opportunities. Rather the United States should participate fully in the work of the organization, with full and unprejudiced rights as a voting member.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the funds necessary to pay the valid American assessment for the International Labor Organization.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to observe that the committee has included in the appropriation for the National Institute on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice the full amount requested, namely \$13,500,000.

The National Institute affords an opportunity for the Federal Government to display leadership and direction in various aspects of the fight against crime. This vital research arm of the Department of Justice has the potential of revealing new techniques, equipment and systems for investigating criminal activities and for apprehending the perpetrators of crimes.

Mr. Chairman, as the author in the House of the amendment to the omnibus crime bill which resulted in the establishment of the National Institute, I am most pleased that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to recommend the full amount of funds requested by the Director of LEAA and by the President.

Mr. Chairman, the National Institute should be capable of attaining its real potential during the next year—and the goal of this important new agency in the comprehensive attack against crime in America—should appear.

Mr. Chairman, I am hoping that the other body will retain the sum of \$13½ million in this bill, and that the basic value of the National Institute will be recognized throughout the Nation—as it is already by most law enforcement agencies.

Again, I commend the chairman and the members of the Appropriations Committee for including in this bill the full amount budgeted for the National Institute.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to highlight just one of the agencies within the Department of Justice, whose

funds are included in this bill, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

Established within the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in 1968, the institute was designed to give the Department of Justice a research and development capability to improve the effectiveness of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies in combating crime. In the 3 years of its operations, the Institute has started to provide answers to immediate problems and to indicate long-range solutions to the problems of crime in society. It has attacked many of the unanswered questions and the unquestioned assumptions about the causes of crime and how to prevent it. Its research projects range across the entire field of criminal justice, from improving police communications, recruitment, and management to developing new controls over organized crime and white collar crime.

The National Institute is budgeted for \$21 million for fiscal year 1972, only 3 percent of the budget for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. This relatively small sum is an investment in the future effectiveness of our society's crime control programs. The Institute could spend 10 times as much effectively. It is actively seeking new methods and increased understanding of the causes and prevention of all types of crime and is disseminating the results throughout the country.

I urge my colleagues to support this appropriation. While other agencies which are funded in this bill provide support to operational programs in the war on crime, the National Institute is developing the technology, the knowledge, and the new systems of approach to reduce the impact of crime in our society, and increase our capacity to deter or prevent crime, to apprehend the criminal to expedite a fair and just trial process, and to provide corrections, rehabilitation and parole programs which work. We have starved the Institute for funds until this year and it is encouraging to me that at long last the Institute is being given sufficient funds to enable it to proceed with its research and development work on a business-like serious basis. I believe that within a year or two we will see new techniques, new technology, new systems of crime control which will repay this modest \$21 million appropriation for research and development a hundred fold.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

As a former member of the bench and presently serving on the Judiciary and Crime Committees, I am very concerned over the need to improve our Nation's penal institutions.

If we are to develop creative programs of rehabilitation for prisoners in the U.S. Federal penal facilities, we should have complete funding of recommended programs.

The Office of Budget and Management has proposed to Congress a very tight budget.

However, in many areas, we have increased the proposed allocations. I do not

feel that we can afford to reduce recommended amounts in this critical area.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to bring up to the recommended amount the money for fiscal year 1972 for the Federal prison system.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, the proposed budget for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, \$334 million, represents a 13-percent increase over the current fiscal year's level. Among the causes of this increase is the hiring of almost 1,400 new employees.

No one doubts the need for strong responses to criminal behavior. If I thought that the FBI was devoting its efforts to fighting crime—real crime—I would be giving this portion of the bill my full support.

Unfortunately, the FBI takes an incredibly broad, disturbingly political view of its responsibilities to the Nation, to the individual members of the public, and even to its own employees.

Thus, the FBI's idea of possibly criminal activity includes participation by Members of Congress and other concerned citizens in Earth Day rallies.

The FBI's concept of its responsibilities includes the warrantless tapping of the phones of Members of Congress. I note in this connection that any time Mr. Hoover wants to listen in on my line, I will be more than happy to give him an earful.

The FBI, as a law-enforcement body, should be the last Government agency to infringe constitutional rights. Regrettably, however, we find it in the forefront of those who would destroy our hard-won civil liberties.

Recently, the FBI's Director made grave charges against leaders of the Catholic movement against the Vietnam war before a congressional committee considering the Bureau's appropriations. These charges had not then been brought before any grand jury, and apparently were only brought before a grand jury later in an effort to justify the reckless behavior of Mr. Hoover. To make matters even more ridiculous, the investigation of the case by the FBI appears to have taken place after the grand jury handed down its original indictments. This process of conviction, followed by indictment, followed by investigation, would be fine as a part of "Alice in Wonderland," but it is unacceptable as the policy of a law-enforcement agency.

We have, as another glaring example of the Bureau's gross and callous disregard for personal rights, the case of Agent Shaw. This FBI agent was fired "with prejudice" for having the temerity to write a letter which, in part, suggested that there were certain shortcomings in Mr. Hoover's administration of the Bureau. All Americans owe Mr. Shaw a debt of gratitude for refusing to let a petty bully deprive him of his liberties and his livelihood by mounting a successful lawsuit to have his record cleared.

I think that it is high time that we took a very close look at these and other examples of the FBI's constitutional bad manners. House Resolution 410, which I and 11 other Members introduced a number of weeks ago, would authorize the Judiciary Committee to investigate the

overall quality of administration within the FBI, including the administrative ability of the Director; the manner of the Bureau's publicizing of certain cases; the FBI's maintenance of massive dossiers on countless Americans who have never been convicted of any crime; and the FBI's personnel practices.

As the people's representatives, we have a duty to see to it that the Federal Government and its agencies respect their rights as individuals. We must demand that the FBI shape up and begin to demonstrate that it, too, is subject to the requirements of our Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the inclusion in H.R. 9272 of sections 704 and 705, which together would prohibit these agencies of the Federal Government, one, from paying salaries to any employee convicted of: "inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation of . . . laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned," and two, from making or guaranteeing loans, grants or salaries to anyone applying for admission, attending, employed by, teaching at or doing research at an institution of higher education who: "has engaged in conduct on or after August 1, 1969 which involved the use of—or the assistance to others in the use of—force or the threat of force or the seizure of property under the control of an institution of higher education, to require or prevent the availability of certain curriculum, or to prevent the faculty, administrative officials, or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies at such institution."

#### FEDERAL EMPLOYEE "ANTIRIOT" RIDER

I would first like to speak about the provision involving Federal employees, which, I understand, was first enacted in the wake of the April 1968 disorders in Washington after the death of Dr. Martin Luther King. Current Civil Service Commission regulations provide that convictions are one of the factors to be taken into account in evaluating the suitability of an employee or applicant for a Federal job. Each case is evaluated on the merits. There is no absolute bar. The circumstances under which individuals might come within the scope of this provision, as with any other kind of conviction, can vary greatly. I see no reason to treat employees under this provision any differently from other Federal employees whose individual records must be examined.

At the same time this provision does not appear to be as troublesome to me as the student riders which I will discuss in a moment. Unlike section 705, at least one part of section 704 requires a conviction by a court before any action can be taken against the individual. If such riders must exist at all, this minimum safeguard is essential. Even section 704 is ambiguous, however, because the last clause, "found to be in violation of—laws designed to protect persons or property," does not clearly require a conviction. In light of the vast numbers of innocent people illegally arrested just recently in the May Day disturbances, we

have no business enacting a provision which could be read by the CSC as giving them the duty to determine for themselves whether people arrested, whose charges were dismissed, nevertheless can be "found to be in violation" of certain laws.

#### STUDENT ANTICAMPUS DISORDER RIDER

My most serious objections are reserved for section 705. I find it both totally unjustifiable and fundamentally unwise for the Congress of the United States to interfere with the internal disciplinary structure of a university. Such an act is contrary to the twin principles of local autonomy and academic freedom central to our system of education. If the university determines that an individual charged with this kind of conduct should, nevertheless, remain in school, the Congress should not second-guess this judgment by cutting off the funds which make that education possible. My opposition to this kind of Federal interference is shared in many quarters. Even the present administration shares this view, as reflected in the fact that both Attorney General Mitchell and Robert Finch have officially opposed such student riders.

Moreover, this provision, which nowhere contains the word "conviction," would permit the denial of funds to students and faculty members in the total absence of any kind of due process of law. The student is guaranteed no right to a hearing to determine "whether he has engaged" in the proscribed conduct, nor is he assured any other procedural safeguards. Intended to discourage campus violence, this law may indeed contribute to it by further alienating students and faculty taught to believe that our society exists on due process and fairness.

In a single move, then, enactment of this law would threaten the independence of the American college and university which has been carefully nurtured throughout our history and jeopardize the already tenuous and battered respect for our institutions held by many of our students and young people.

American society, off as well as on our college campuses, is passing through a difficult and often turbulent period. The role of the Congress in such a time is to provide leadership to insure that overzealous persons, in the name of protecting our institutions, do not destroy them instead. In contrast, enactment of this legislation would be just such an act of destruction.

Mr. Chairman, the Subversive Activities Control Board is the embodiment of the evil now tearing our country apart. To renew its appropriation would deepen the cynicism among our citizens.

Reasonable men and women can differ without destroying each other. But the SACB substitutes hysteria for reason and attempts to destroy dissent by innuendo. Deplored and mocked in private as a pasture for old bloodhounds, it is still continued and refunded year after year. Why?

Our constituents ask—as they should—why we give the nearly half a million dollars provided for in title V of H.R. 9272 to a body that violates the most basic

American principles of free speech—while thousands of Americans go hungry and homeless and jobless. They ask, what has this group done? and the answer is "nothing."

Tradition, it is said, carries the Board along. But it is precisely this kind of outworn tradition that our constituents demand that we break. If our institutions are to serve the needs of this decade, we must understand those needs. We must realize that the security of the United States in 1971 is most threatened by the alienation of citizens from Government, and their growing cynicism about the ability of Government to meet their needs.

They have put us on notice that they will tolerate no more of big brother: His invasion of public and private lives, his secret wheeling-dealings. Regardless of party, the people have had it with this kind of "protection." As the shocking story of high-level duplicity unfolds, disbelief becomes despair, and then determination: no more.

The funding of this useless and dangerous Board will no longer slip by unnoticed. No young person and no woman, black or white, would vote for its continuance. New constituencies are aware as never before—and in every community, are challenging the "buddy" system that our Congress has become.

Nor need representatives fear, now, that opposition to this committee will bring them "into the files." We are already in the files and on the computer tapes. Every voice of dissent, whether in the streets, in business, or in the Halls of Congress, has a dossier—as Senators, Governors, and elected officials at all levels are aware.

We cannot contribute our votes, and commit our country's money, to continue surveillance, repression, blackmail, and intimidation. We cannot allow ourselves to be pressured or intimidated into approving what we know is evil.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9272, but wish at the same time to register my deep disappointment that the Committee on Appropriations did not see fit to provide in the bill the sum of \$6 million that the State Department had strongly recommended for the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West in Hawaii, better known as the East-West Center.

The \$5.26 million which is actually provided in the bill, even if it is described in the committee report as "the same amount as has been provided for the past 3 years," in effect carries a hidden mandate to curtail this program. The requested \$740,000 additional amount would in fact enable the East-West Center to maintain most of its current operations in status quo.

I have been informed that the \$740,000 represents a "bare-bones" addition involving the following budgetary items: First, \$490,000 for much needed, very modest increases in student stipends; for example, the married grantee's rental allowance would be raised from \$80 per month—an unrealistic figure in view of

the high cost of real estate and building construction in Hawaii—to \$120 per month—still a very modest allowance; and second, \$250,000 for mandated salary increases, necessary repairs to buildings, cost-price increases, within-grade pay increments, higher costs on such things as social security payments, air fares, and so forth.

The East-West Center was founded in 1960 as a means of promoting cultural and technical interchange between East and West. At that time, it was anticipated that Federal support for the center would increase along with our steadily growing relations with the nations of Asia. Regrettably, however, Federal appropriations to the Center have not kept pace with the growing demands which have been made on the Center. In recent years, the East-West Center has been compelled to reduce its staff, abandon plans for the development of new programs, and forego much-needed expansion of its physical plant. I am fearful that the amount the committee has provided the Center to carry on its operations during fiscal year 1972 will result in further curtailment of the Center's operations and prevent it from achieving its goals.

Sensing the mood of the House, I will not even attempt to offer any amendment to restore the reduced amount, for such an effort will be futile. But I hope that the Senate will see fit to increase the East-West Center funds to the \$6 million figure that the State Department has recommended. If this should happen, I do hope then that this House will agree to the Senate amendment, for certainly the East-West Center is proving to be America's greatest bargain investment in peace.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, once again we Members are presented with a money bill whose actual impact on the country is veiled by innocuous language.

H.R. 9272, the bill currently under consideration by the House, seems at first glance to be free of controversy—if one would believe its title, "Making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes." The joker is concealed behind that legislative catch-all, "for other purposes."

In reality, H.R. 9272 is another proposal to entangle us in a foreign web and continue to pump the wealth of this country into foreign and alien programs that can only end when the United States has either lost its identity, its character, its traditions and becomes a member of a world government or has gone completely bankrupt.

This Congress is not being honest with the people of this country. The citizens will not be told that while \$274,651,000 is budgeted to the State Department for "Administration of Foreign Affairs," over one-half of this amount, or \$159,692,000, is delegated to "International Organizations and Conferences."

The following table listing this is very revealing and shocking:

United Nations and Specialized Agencies:	
United Nations.....	\$52,437,700
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization .....	12,018,330
International Civil Aviation Organization .....	3,972,383
World Health Organization.....	23,741,250
Food and Agriculture Organization .....	10,083,458
International Telecommunication Union .....	752,175
World Meteorological Organization .....	774,477
Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.....	131,120
International Atomic Energy Agency .....	3,977,148
Subtotal .....	107,888,041
Inter-American Organizations:	
Inter-American Indian Institute .....	61,561
Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences.....	2,909,280
Pan American Institute of Geography and History.....	151,300
Pan American Railway Congress Association.....	15,000
Pan American Health Organization .....	10,436,513
Organization of American States .....	19,317,540
Subtotal .....	32,891,194
Regional Organizations:	
South Pacific Commission .....	215,309
North Atlantic Treaty Organization .....	5,205,634
North Atlantic Assembly.....	67,760
Southeast Asia Treaty Organization .....	393,000
Colombo Plan Council for Technical Cooperation.....	9,045
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development .....	5,352,123
Subtotal .....	11,242,871
Other International Organizations:	
Interparliamentary Union.....	29,350
International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration .....	1,491
International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property .....	15,000
International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs .....	17,316
International Bureau of Weights and Measures.....	86,460
International Hydrographic Bureau .....	17,642
International Coffee Organization .....	280,000
International Institute for the Unification of Private International Law .....	8,529
Hague Conference on Private International Law.....	11,451
Maintenance of Certain Lights in the Red Sea .....	3,540
International Bureau of Exhibitions .....	6,820
Customs Cooperation Council .....	\$274,295
Subtotal .....	751,894
Total .....	152,774,000

Most interestingly, this table does not appear in the bill H.R. 9272, which is what most Members read. The United Nations is not even mentioned.

For simplicity's sake and quick legislative passage, the funding paragraph that gave away \$152,774,000 reads:

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND  
CONFERENCES  
CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL  
ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet annual obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations, pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific Acts of Congress, \$152,774,000, of which not less than \$2,100,000 shall be used for payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

And this list does not tell the full international cost. Additional funds for U.S. missions, congressional expenses, and contributions for international conferences and contingencies are listed in the following table:

United States Mission to:	
United Nations.....	\$2,106,300
International Organizations, Geneva .....	1,445,300
International Organizations, Vienna .....	516,900
International Civil Aviation Organization .....	140,600
Organization of American States .....	173,100
United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization .....	200,900
The Food and Agriculture Organization .....	93,000
Subtotal .....	4,676,100
United States Congressional Groups to:	
Interparliamentary Union.....	26,900
NATO Parliamentary Conference .....	30,000
Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.....	30,000
Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.....	30,000
Subtotal .....	116,900
Total .....	4,793,000

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES AND  
CONTINGENCIES

The sum of \$2,125,000, a decrease of \$200,000 below the budget estimate, is provided for the necessary expenses of participation by the United States, upon approval by the Secretary of State, in international activities which arise from time to time in the conduct of foreign affairs and for which specific appropriations have not been provided pursuant to treaties, conventions, or special acts of Congress.

And furthermore, \$5,260,000 of the State Department budget is allocated for cultural and technical interchange between East and West, I suppose to complete the bridges between this country and Communist Russia and Red China.

Second, the people of this country will never be told that of the \$1,552,696,000 budgeted for the Department of Justice, \$5,250,000 is allocated for "Community Relations Service," the program designed to implement the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and further deteriorate race relations in this country.

The public has noticed the increased incidence of riots, but few have yet learned of the activist support given in

many instances by these civil rights fronts, under high sounding names like Community Relations Service.

Also included in the budget allocation for the Department of Justice is \$698,919,000 for the law enforcement assistance program—the "ongoing" Federal agency that will establish an interdependency between the Federal Government and the State judiciary systems. I have previously remarked on the dangers of this policy in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4 at page 18343, June 14 at page 19775, June 16 at page 20390 and June 23 at page 21856.

Many Members are still persuaded that this money is to be used to "upgrade" police officers, while in increasing instances its use results in financing obstructions to police action. Thus working adversely to the very purpose for which this money was originally intended—to control crime and make the streets safe.

What these figures mean, Mr. Chairman, is that of the \$1,552,696,000 budgeted for the Department of Justice, \$704,169,000—or almost half—is delegated to agencies designed to create a totally controlled environment for the American people—all under the supervision of the "moralists" in Washington who seek to do what God Himself would not—or could not—make men equal. And this immoral program is being sold to the people in the name of justice.

The people of this country are not told that of the \$1,176,772,000 allocated to the Department of Commerce, \$32,261,000 is designated for "International Activities" and "Foreign Direct Investment Regulation." All of this is designed, to borrow William Faulkner's phrase, as an attempt to unite the people of the world in "the communal anonymity of brotherhood." I cannot believe that the informed people of this country would support this, let alone feel that this is a legitimate use of their hard-earned tax dollars under the guise of advancing commerce.

My people would not approve of the \$1,255,000 designated for the Federal Judicial Center in the budget allocation for the Judiciary. And I feel most people would object to underwriting a Federal agency specifically committed to work toward a uniform judicial process. I have warned time and again against attempts to create a uniform national code of laws or a national judiciary. People just are not uniform. The Constitution provides for but one Supreme Court. Why use our people's money to advance a "Ministry of Justice" similar to the one in Soviet Russia that controls, supervises, and disciplines the various judges?

Mr. Chairman, the joker runs wild in title V of this bill. Under the heading "Related Agencies," we find that this House is asked to allocate \$9,000,000 for "Arms Control and Disarmament." It seems absurd that we allocate money for arms and defense through one Government agency and turn around and allocate additional millions to control and disarm the military. And on the disarmament appropriation the usual priority crowd are silent.

This section also includes a \$3,500,000 grant to the "Commission on Civil Rights" and \$22,000,000 to the "Equal Employment Opportunity Commission." I cannot find a single penny specifically allocated for the rights and job opportunities of the poor, unfortunate people who happen to be in the majority. Those in the majority have become aware that equal employment opportunity is a misnomer. What is really meant is that preference will be given to the blacks. In other words, the program is a fake and a coverup operation of compensatory racism that attempts to achieve some sort of mystical solution through racial proportions. And this at a cost of \$22 million.

Perhaps most shocking is that the House intends to allocate only \$450,000 for the "Subversive Activities Control Board." This is an absurdly small figure—\$450,000—compared to the \$25,500,000 allocated to the causes of civil rights and equal employment opportunity. It is little wonder that we are losing our country to subversive actions and Communist causes when this Congress indicates by our appropriations that we discriminate against America by failing to protect its ideals and system of government.

Mr. Chairman, in light of the facts that I have just mentioned, it seems that this bill should have been referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee, instead of the Appropriations Committee. It contains more foreign aid than it does essential constitutional programs. If passed as written, a large percentage of the wealth of this country will continue to go to support organizations and activities that seem bent on changing everything we hold dear.

This bill contains the appropriations for the FBI. To vote for the bill to support the FBI, one must also vote to support the United Nations—the antithesis of law and order and justice. A vote against the United Nations is also a vote against the FBI. This is precisely the reason for the massing of so many unsavory programs under this one bill—the hope that no one could oppose the United Nations and the internationalist programs because to do so would seem to be voting against the FBI.

The only way the Members of this body can protect themselves against such a stacked deck is by voting down some of these appropriations. Then, we would find cleaner bills being presented to the House. It is absurd to think that in order to support the FBI, one must vote for the U.N., a myriad of foreign aid, civil rights agitation, equal employment opportunity and disarmament of our own country.

I am satisfied I know what the overwhelming majority of my people would want me to do. I am casting their vote accordingly. I am voting "No."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

[Roll No. 162]

Abourezk	Dulski	Murphy, N.Y.
Addabbo	Edwards, La.	Nedzi
Anderson,	Fascell	Patman
Tenn.	Fish	Pepper
Ashbrook	Flowers	Podell
Ashley	Ford, Gerald R.	Purcell
Baker	Ford,	Rangel
Baring	William D.	Reid, N.Y.
Blaggi	Griffin	Rhodes
Blanton	Gubser	Runnels
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Schneebeil
Bray	Harsha	Smith, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.	Hathaway	Springer
Buchanan	Hicks, Mass.	Staggers
Cabell	Hogan	Stuckey
Clark	Howard	Taylor
Clawson, Del.	Latta	Thompson, N.J.
Clay	Leggett	Tierman
Conable	Long, La.	Ullman
Culver	Lujan	Watts
Davis, Wis.	McCulloch	Widnall
Dent	McKevitt	Wiggins
Devine	McKinney	Wilson, Bob
Diggs	Madden	Wright
Donohue	Martin	Young, Tex.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Boggs) having resumed the chair, Mr. ABERNETHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 9272, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 359 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND  
CONFERENCES  
CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL  
ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet annual obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations, pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific Acts of Congress, \$152,774,000, of which not less than \$2,100,000 shall be used for payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: Page 5, line 21, strike out "\$152,774,000" and insert "\$164,374,749."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to restore the funds for the payment of the dues of the United States to the International Labor Organization, the ILO. This is a most emotional issue. As the gentleman from New York pointed out during general debate, the ILO was funded—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, since I have had many inquiries as to how long we are going to take to-

day, I am prompted to ask the gentleman how much time he thinks would be needed on his amendment.

Mr. YATES. I would say to the gentleman I do not know how many Members wish to speak on my amendment.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am sure the gentleman would not mind if I sought to ascertain by asking unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment—

Mr. YATES. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would permit me to finish my statement and then asking permission after I have concluded.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. YATES. As I indicated, as the gentleman from New York pointed out so well during general debate, the ILO was begun in 1920 under the sponsorship of Samuel Gompers, who was then president of the American Federation of Labor. It has always been an organization in which the United States has played a most prominent part.

Then in 1954, the Soviet Union was admitted to membership. Over the years the Soviet Union has become increasingly more aggressive in its activities in the ILO until today the ILO has been considered by some, as a sounding board for Soviet propaganda.

In his testimony before the Rooney subcommittee last year, Mr. George Meany, who is the president of the AFL-CIO, expressed indignation at having to sit before the resolutions committee at its annual conferences and to hear speech after speech by the Soviet Union and all its bloc satellites directed against the United States. I know well his feelings. As the U.S. Representative to the U.N. Trusteeship Council, I became furious with the speeches of the Soviet representatives.

Secondly, the objection has been made over the propriety of the appointment of a representative of the Soviet Union to the official hierarchy of the ILO.

The third objection that appears in the hearings is that the ILO has permitted to be printed certain articles which are by Soviet authors and which relate the glories of Lenin and the "free trade movement" of the Soviet Union.

Acting upon the testimony of Mr. Meany, of Mr. Ed Neilan who was president of the International Organization of Employees, and the ILO adviser to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Congress last year, upon the recommendation of the subcommittees of the Senate and the House on the State Department, refused to appropriate the funds to pay the last half of the annual dues of the United States to the ILO.

When one reads last year's hearings one gains the impression that the committees' action had the approval of the witnesses who appeared before them. One gains that impression.

Assuming that was true, and if in fact those witnesses did approve the committee action last year, this is another year and they have changed their minds.

This year it is clear that the witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee last year no longer have that opinion.

Mr. George Meany, for example, no longer has that opinion. I shall read from his press conference dated May 11, 1971, when he was asked by a reporter as to what his attitude was on the payment of dues by the United States to the ILO. He said this:

Well, I want to make it clear that the AFL-CIO, along with the employers and certainly with the State Department and Labor Department, has been unhappy for a number of years about the way the ILO has been diverted from its original purpose into a political sounding board, political debating society, where our country is pilloried by representatives of the bloc countries at every conference.

Now, as far as the appropriations are concerned, our position is quite simple—

This is Mr. Meany speaking—

We owe the money and we should pay it.

Later on in the same press conference he said this:

Insofar as the money is concerned, we have consistently taken the position that sooner or later we had to pay the money. We owe it and it is a legal obligation.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask if the original colloquy, wherein the gentleman in the well yielded to another Member, came out of his time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it came out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. HALL. If it did, I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request at this time. Since the Chair has so advised, I will withdraw my reservation, but I do not expect to grant unanimous consent for extended debate hereafter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, that was the statement by George Meany, to the effect that the dues which are owed by the United States to the ILO should be paid, paid now.

The representative of the employers as well appeared before the Rooney subcommittee and stated that he believed those dues should be paid.

Third, Mr. Hildebrand, who is Deputy Under Secretary of Labor, appeared before the committee and stated that the dues owed by the United States should be paid, as well.

So the question before the House, posed by my amendment, is whether nonpayment of dues is the way to overcome the so-called Soviet strength in the ILO, or whether we should stand and fight on that ground and win on the strength of our ideas.

That was advocated, for example, by one person who has been a representative of the United States to the ILO many times.

In response to a question by Mr. Bow, he said:

Mr. Bow. It isn't so much the question of the amount we pay as it is the activities within the organization itself against the United States.

Mr. Reuther—Victor Reuther of the UAW—said:

Well, I am familiar with the fact that on occasions in meetings of the ILO some delegates engage in polemics against the United States. I face this many times in international trade union gatherings. I think the way to answer that and deal with it is not to run away from it but to take it on.

Where falsehoods are stated, where unfounded charges are lodged against the United States or against American employers and American trade unions, they should be answered. But to leave the field free to those who engage in those kinds of polemics does not help us.

I think we ought to pay our dues. I think we ought to continue to belong to the ILO and not handicap our delegates by the charge that will be made by other delegates to the ILO that the United States has not paid its dues. The ILO is still a predominantly American organization and will remain an American organization through the strength of our representation at the ILO and our willingness to fight for the ideas that we think are right.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

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

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY OF NEW YORK

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 3 o'clock.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

It is my judgment that as meritorious as the position is for those who have suggested that we withhold dues, in the long span of time, we cannot disassociate ourselves from an organization that we hope some day will give greater expression and meaning to those principles of human dignity that we as Americans stand for. I cannot see us making our point in persuading this important world labor organization to alter its course if we are going to be on the outside looking in.

We belong to many international organizations. I regret that I was unable to attend the conference in Geneva even though the House was good enough to pass the resolution authorizing such travel because of the vote on the welfare reform bill and social security amendments.

But I do believe if there is any criticism

of our participation and if there is any criticism of the ILO itself, perhaps we ought to accept and assume some of that criticism because, perhaps we have failed in providing the kind of leadership to the ILO that we ought to have had. The way to redirect ILO to espouse our views and our cause is to take a more vigorous role in formulating ILO policy.

So, it seems to me that the way to correct the situation is not to walk away from it but, rather than walking away, stay and make our point. This organization can be a formidable force in helping eliminate poverty in the world. It can also be a strong force in fighting communism and for that reason I do not believe we should withdraw by not paying our dues.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the Yates amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 5, line 21, strike out "\$152,774,000" and substitute "\$141,319,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would simply put the appropriation for international organizations back to where it was last year \$141,319,000. In other words, it would take out the \$11,455,000 increase that is in this bill.

We have absolutely no business, in the light of the desperate financial situation that faces this country and its taxpayers, of increasing the U.S. contribution to international organizations by that amount. It ought to be drastically cut, not increased.

I am opposed to the Yates amendment not only because it would provide for buckling down to the International Labor Organization, but because it would add millions of dollars to the committee increase of \$11.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, with the staggering debt and deficit with which we are confronted, I urge and plead with the Members of the House to support my substitute amendment and put this appropriation back to where it was last year. This is a simple plea for just a little economy in this \$4 billion bill and I can think of no better place than in these international handouts through which Americans have been milked and bilked for far too many years.

I would remind you that foreign countries are at least \$100 million in arrears on their dues and assessments to international organizations and the citizens of this country should no longer be called upon to foot the bills for these deadbeats.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I suffer from as much irritation as any Member of this body in the fact that the Soviet Union all too often converts the forum in which they find themselves, converts it into a propaganda sounding board instead of serving the uses to which the organization ought to be put.

Nevertheless, it seems to me that the record is clear in this case as to what we in the House of Representatives ought to do on this amendment. The former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the employer representative testified at the hearings that he was in favor of making this dues contribution and did not believe we use this means to withdraw from the ILO, that is, to withhold the payment of the dues that we are legally bound to pay.

Mr. Chairman, we have the testimony of distinguished representatives of labor that they are in favor of continuing our membership in the ILO and do not believe we should act to withhold the payment of dues at this time.

The President of the United States was asked at a press conference whether or not he favored a continuation of our membership in the ILO and he responded in the affirmative.

So, Mr. Chairman, here you have the responsible representatives of government, business, and labor united in their opinion that we ought not to adopt this means of expressing our disapproval—and I disapprove along with many others of some of these things that the Soviets have done in the ILO. The Soviets did not pay their dues to the United Nations because they disagreed with certain policies of that organization and we took them to task, and rightfully so at that time for their conduct.

I think it would ill behoove us to set the example in the eyes of the world that we are going to engage in what is manifestly illegal conduct in not meeting a legal obligation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JACOBS yielded his time to Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me his time.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt very much that I can say anything that has not already been said by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) the author of the amendment. I think again, at the risk of being repetitious, that a clear reading of the record of the testimony that was taken in the hearings, and I took the pains this morning to go over it, as did the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) that it indicates that notwithstanding the attitudes expressed in 1970 at the time the decision was made to cut off half a year dues to the ILO, that these same people expressed a different opinion, as I read the record this year.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. ICHORD. Is the distinguished gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Illinois, (Mr. ANDERSON) familiar with the way labor unions operate in Soviet Russia?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I certainly do not think that by remaining in that organization and by paying our dues which we are legally committed to do, that we are expressing approbation in

any form of the manner in which labor unions operate in the Soviet Union. I disagree thoroughly, and as thoroughly as the gentleman from Missouri, as to the way in which they operate.

Mr. ICHORD. That is not the question I asked the gentleman. I do not see how one can speak effectively on this question unless he knows how labor unions operate in Russia.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I do not profess to be the great student on communism that the gentleman from Missouri is, but however I did live—

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SCHEUER yielded his time to Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me his time.

Mr. Chairman, I would merely like to say, in further response to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) that at the risk of indulging in some personal reminiscences this afternoon, I did for 2½ years of my life live in West Berlin. At the time I was a member of the U.S. Foreign Service. One of my assigned tasks was to report periodically to the Department of State on the Communist federation of trade unions in the Soviet-occupied portion of Germany, so I have some small knowledge of the fact that trade unions in Communist countries do not function freely as they do in our country.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is beneath the dignity of our great Nation to renege and waltz on its dues. There are many gentlemen in this Chamber who have had more experience with international organizations than I, but I have had some. Before I was a Congressman, I attended international organization meetings as a delegate on housing and planning—

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) is out of order at this time.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) yielded his time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that what happened was that the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) yielded his time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON). Therefore the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) has control of the time.

The gentleman is now standing, and therefore the Chair believes that the gentleman is in order. However, the Chair will further announce that the additional time yielded to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN).

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. For the past several months I have been following the

developments relating to our obligations as members of the International Labor Organization with increasing dismay and frustration.

The ILO originated as a direct result of American initiatives. Its founding and goals reflected our conviction, which I believe we still maintain, that whatever we could achieve in stimulating growth of more viable economies in the world's developing nations would contribute measurably toward world peace and stability. The paramount importance, in this framework, of the labor movement and labor economics is obvious. The problems of unemployment in nations which are experiencing recent and rapid growth of industry at the expense of old patterns of labor, the problems of industrial relations in societies where old social bonds are being replaced by new types of relationships—these are the inescapable challenges which will face us now and in the foreseeable future as we deal with the developing nations. They are difficult tasks, sometimes apparently intractable.

As the wealthiest Nation on earth, we know that we will be the object of impatience, frustration and envy on the part of less abundantly endowed nations. Proceedings in the ILO have not proved an exception to this proposition. We have been assailed there by the Communist bloc. Their labor representation is frequently a mere shadow of the independent labor voice which the ILO tripartite structure was intended to foster.

But now how shall the United States respond to this situation? As a matter of international law there can be no uncertainty about our status. As long as we do not pay our assessed contribution to this organization to which we voluntarily subscribed and whose charter we are bound to observe, we are in violation of international law. The assessment itself was certainly valid. Nobody disputes that. It is a treaty obligation. Second, the principal purpose of our withholding our contribution has been to seek to influence the organization through its new director general toward policies and practices more suited to our position. This attempt contravenes the ILO charter's specific command that members not seek to influence the director general, an international civil servant, in the discharge of his responsibilities. It is also clear that the appointment of the Soviet national which has been objected to is in complete conformity with regulations approved by the ILO governing body granting the director the prerogative of appointing his own staff.

It does seem ironic to me that while on the one hand the ILO's critics charge it with having too often deferred to Soviet and Communist bloc pressures, we now seek to further attack the organization's independence by unlawfully withholding our dues. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot insist that the ILO show a greater independence in the face of Soviet polemics while we ourselves assault that independence. Our best bet for an effective ILO is to have a determined leadership there. The new director has shown that he can be that kind of leader and will assemble a competent staff that

will not accept continued political attacks by the Soviet delegates. Edward Neilan, the leader of the employer delegation to the ILO conference, has reported to the subcommittee examples of recent meetings where ILO officials had cut off gratuitous attacks on the United States. His positive view was shared by a representative of the Labor Department and by a spokesman from the AFL-CIO maritime committee and by Leonard Woodcock of the UAW.

Mr. Meany has stated he feels the United States must pay its dues. The State Department told the subcommittee the United States should pay up, that we should not admit defeat and say we cannot do anything but withhold funds.

The proposed amendment puts the question to the Congress in the clearest possible terms: Shall we pay our dues or shall we be in default? If we do not appropriate our contribution, this will be the first time, as far as I am aware, that the Congress has deliberately determined to put the United States in violation of clear norms of international law.

Now I too am disturbed by the roadblocks we have experienced with the ILO. But I am confident that by working inside the organization and abiding by its rules we can move the ILO to stop these attacks on the United States and at the same time increase the effectiveness of our delegation.

If we really want to make the ILO more effective we are badly damaging our own cause by not contributing our share of its expenses. The organization is now operating at a level \$5 million below that authorized for the current calendar year. If the ILO does not get any U.S. payment by October, it will be forced to release its personnel—and the first to go will be the newer, younger, and presumably more progressive and responsive staff.

To go into default would be an admission that when it comes to the skillful use of the available instruments of international law and international organization we cannot compete with the Soviet Union. Surely all of us can imagine that our deliberate default will be used by our enemies for even more bitter and more justified attacks against us within the ILO, and probably within the United Nations as well.

Six weeks ago most of us were firmly and confidently assuring the potential May Day demonstrators that the way to change a system is to persist in employing all lawful means to turn it around. Now I think we have to pause and ask ourselves what kind of example we are going to set today. I do not see how we can tell those who disagree with some aspects of American society not to violate its norms when we, in dissatisfaction with an international society, violate international norms. It is also difficult to perceive how we can insist that our allies or our foes meet their international obligations—whether in NATO or the U.N. or in multilateral negotiation—if we do not meet ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN).

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I think all of us know there have been frustrations and difficulties with the ILO. Its tripartite composition makes it difficult to understand how the Soviet Union or any of the Communist countries can participate in the ILO.

However, that question was resolved when the United States joined with other members of the ILO in agreeing to the membership of the Soviet Union.

It seems to me that all of these questions can certainly be debated and good arguments made on both sides. But we are in a position now of having really three choices.

We have one choice of opting out of the ILO—of getting out and being through with that organization. I would say as to that choice that the withdrawal of the United States would leave the Soviet Union as the dominant power in the ILO. Much of its work is done in the underdeveloped nations like Africa and South America and we would be leaving the Soviet Union in the position of dominating the organization that is doing this good work in those areas.

Another option is to pay our dues and fight in the ILO. That is what is suggested that we do here today by the Yates amendment.

The third option is the very poorest option of all and that is the one that apparently the committee is leading us into and that is to not pay our dues but to stay in the organization. This, to me, makes very little sense at all. We would lose our influence in the organization and, yet, we would be there and subject to attack. We will lose our voice in the organization as of January of next year. So of these three options facing you, do not choose the worst of the three options—please. Support the Yates amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the Committee to some documents that I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday at page 21695 and the following pages of the RECORD.

These documents include a background memorandum issued by the Nixon administration in support of the payment of the ILO dues, and two items from the AFL-CIO news of this month. One of them is dated June 19, 1971, and the headline reads:

Free Workers Win Agenda Battle at Start of ILO World Conference.

The article goes on to describe how well the workers of the free world are doing at the ILO at this time.

Then there is also included a joint statement of Rev. Msgr. Marvin Bordelon, director of International Affairs and Reverend Msgr. George G. Higgins, director, Division for Urban Life, U.S. Catholic Conference, in which joint statement they argue in favor of the payment of the United States dues.

Mr. Chairman, in support of what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) said about the position of the administration, and just to leave no doubt about

that, here is the answer given in a White House statement dated May 27, 1971, as to the attitudes of the administration.

Mr. Ziegler said in part:

We are asking Congress for the funds to pay our dues for this year and our arrearage for last year so that we will not continue to be in default on our International Obligations.

On June 1 the President at his news conference said the same thing in effect.

The principal argument made in support of the committee's action is, in effect, that this is what the Russians did and we should follow their example. What a remarkable argument that is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Yates amendment.

I think what we have before us today is a little different situation than we had a year ago because it is the beginning of next year, the 2-year expiration date comes and then if we do not pay our dues, we will be out of ILO.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We would not be out of the ILO until January 1, 1973.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for the correction of date.

I would say there is a good understanding why there is a difference of opinion because the National Association of Manufacturers decided not to take part in the ILO and do not send delegates, but the Chamber of Commerce has decided to do it and they still do. They want us to pay our dues.

Organized labor, although they are critical of the way the Russians and other Communists operate, have still participated in it and continue to participate. So our decision really has to be whether we are going to pay our dues and stay in, and whether our delegates will stand up to the Communists and give it back to them as hard as they give it to us.

I think what was stated in the letter from the gentleman from New York, quoting Mr. Meany that we are constantly abused by the Communists, is true. However, that does not mean that we have to sit quietly and take it. It is just like someone saying something derogatory of any of you. You do not have to sit there quietly and take it. Nor would you leave Congress because of it. I think we are better off being a part of the organization and active in it, rebutting any accusations and condemning the wrong doing of the Communists. Let's not drop out of the ILO, but send delegates with guts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI).

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

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

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOW. Has not the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) already addressed the committee on the amendment?

Mr. YATES. There is now a limitation on the time.

Mr. BOW. I object to the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) is recognized.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, may my time be delayed to a later time in the debate than that of the gentleman in the well?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I regret that I have no time to yield. The time limitation is so restrictive that I shall have no opportunity to yield to the gentleman, much as I would like to oblige him. It seems unfortunate in a matter of this consequence that we are not given an adequate time to discuss the serious situation that exists.

I rise in strong support of the Yates amendment. I agree with George Meany—and I find it difficult to feel that there are many who do not—that we owe this money, and that we should pay this money. In fact, the chairman of the subcommittee himself has indicated that there will be a payment eventually. His argument is that we should wait until the last minute, and then pay only 6 months of our dues.

This makes no sense to me, Mr. Chairman. How can we say, "We want more say in an international organization," "yet at the same time attempt to cripple it by withholding funds which we owe under a legal obligation? If we want to have more influence in the ILO, we should pay up. Surely we should not put ourselves in the same status as those who have failed to pay and who thus no longer have voting rights. It would make more sense to withhold if this were a part of a move to pull out of the ILO. But we have had a frank recognition from the appropriations committee that within the next 6 months we should pay some of the back money. It is asserted that by doing this, we shall in some way increase our influence in the ILO.

I would suggest that the simplest way to increase our influence is to strengthen our own leadership by sending delegations that can represent us well.

I would not suggest for one moment that we do not have a problem with the ILO, but it should be self-evident that this suggestion of the committee makes no sense at all. I do hope that the Yates amendment is accepted.

The President has said we should pay up our assessment; the employer repre-

sentatives also believe we should pay up, and so too does Mr. Meany. Nothing can be accomplished by refusing or delaying payment, or making only partial payment, except to give the United States an unnecessary black eye in the world community.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. FRASER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore funds for the payment of the dues owed by the United States to the International Labor Organization. Others have already discussed some of the principal reasons why it would be very wrong for the United States to attempt to withhold its dues. I would like to cite some supplementary evidence to those arguments.

It seems to me that the International Labor Organization is still deeply involved in the cold war. This is not surprising. We are all heirs of the policies and the rhetoric of the past.

The Subcommittee on Europe, which I am privileged to chair, recently completed 2 weeks of hearings on the origins and development of the cold war. Several of the distinguished historians who testified stated that the cold war—the most enduring foreign policy doctrine in our history except for the Monroe Doctrine—developed into a system of absolutes within both our Government and our society. We ceased slowly to question the assumptions of the cold war; we merely wandered from room to room in the cold war palaces we built.

The International Labor Organization is the oldest international body. It was founded in 1919 as one of the few enduring results of the Versailles Peace Treaty. The ILO certainly predates the cold war; how did it become involved in the antagonisms between the United States and the Soviet Union?

For 15 years after its founding, the ILO proceeded without American membership although we had encouraged and participated in its foundation.

Since we joined in 1934, American delegates and American citizens have played key roles within the organization. Since 1935, an American has served, for example, as either Director General—the top position—or Assistant Director General in almost unbroken succession in Geneva, the headquarters city. An American, David Morse, who retired as Director General 2 years ago, served for 21 years in that position.

We are now threatening to withdraw from the ILO by withholding our dues—an illegal step, incidentally—because Morse's successor named a Soviet citizen as one of the five Assistant Directors General. Our irritation cannot, in my judgment, be attributed ultimately to anything but a continuation of the Cold War rhetoric.

Critics of the ILO cite many examples of alleged hostility toward the United States either through the use of ILO meetings for anti-American tirades or

through an increase in Communist participation, dating from the Soviet Union's resumption of ILO membership in 1954. I will not comment on the details of those charges which are well ventilated.

I must say that I believe the United States, and its employer and union delegates to ILO, developed a proprietary and even a paternalistic view of the international organization over the past 37 years. Disbelief and anger that we no longer control ILO is behind much of the antagonism today toward Director General Jenks.

Perhaps David Morse, a distinguished public servant, served too long as ILO chief officer. His tenure, during the heart of the cold war years, tended to make some Americans think that ILO should be a bastion of anticommunism. Mr. Morse himself, to my knowledge, never proclaimed this view but American delegates to ILO did.

How one can proclaim the virtues of international organization and maintain, simultaneously, that one side should dominate that organization in the midst of the cold war is difficult for me to comprehend. We must either accept the fact that the ILO, in a mixed world, must itself be mixed or we revert to a petty form of petulance of which this dues controversy is an excellent example.

I do not deny that the Communist delegates to ILO have caused a generous share of trouble. Perhaps many of them think the Communist countries should control the ILO and other international organizations. That is an equally wrong view but it is not the issue today.

We must decide whether we as a country of immense power and influence in the world will support the principle of international organization. We must decide if we can accept the need to work with other people with whom we may regularly disagree on quite profound questions of value and yet still work with them for common goals.

For the ILO these common goals are the development of better social institutions to improve labor-management relations, to foster cooperative associations and other institutions to aid rural communities; to assist in improving working and living conditions and to defend and improve the human rights of all workers.

These are worthy goals toward which the United States should work within the ILO even when the delegates cannot agree on ultimate principles. We should stay in the ILO and not take home our marbles just because we cannot win every game.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, one of the strange things about the failure to pay dues is that we spend some \$70 or \$80 billion a year to defend ourselves against communism, and many billions more to fight wars against communism, and yet in a peaceful forum the Russians drive us out without firing a shot. It is one of the most effective devices the Soviets have ever developed. They have found ways to discourage the United States from continuing to participate in forums which are important to the world community. I think the tradition of the United States is one of toughness,

one which says when we do not like what is going on in an international organization, we hang in there. We battle and slug it out, because we believe what we stand for is more real, more honest, and more fundamentally right than that of any other system. It seems really strange that we should have complained about France and the Soviet Union defaulting on their assessments, and then we turn around and default on ours. What hypocrisy we could be charged with any time we go back to the Soviets, to France, or other countries, and say, "Why don't you pay your assessments?"

They will say, "Why did you not pay your dues? You admitted you owed yours, but we disputed whether ours was a legal obligation."

I hope, Mr. Chairman, in the light of the fact that Mr. Meany says we owe the money and ought to pay it, the President says we owe the money and ought to pay it, the chamber of commerce says we owe the money and ought to pay it, we will vote for this amendment.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) will increase the funds going to international organizations in the State Department appropriation from \$152,744,000 to \$164,374,749. This increase of \$11,600,749 will provide the funds for the American legal obligation to the International Labor Organization. Without these funds the United States will be unable to pay, first, the \$3,784,412 it owes to the organization as part of its 1970 dues. The remaining \$7,816,337 will permit the United States to pay its dues for this calendar year. Failure to pay both of these obligations could result in the United States losing its vote in both the governing body or the conference since our arrears will exceed our contribution for the preceding 2 years.

The United States has always played a preeminent role in the activities of the United Nations. However, our honest leadership in just and peaceful causes will be challenged and placed in serious jeopardy by our failure to appropriate these funds. It is not the time for the United States to be forced into what amounts to self-imposed isolation by its refusal to pay its dues.

Under the charter of this organization a country's right to vote may be challenged when it becomes 2 years in arrears in its obligations. This point, technically, may be raised in the February 1972 meeting of the International Labor Organization. An objection by one member of the organization to our continued voting would be sufficient grounds for the United States to lose its vote. It is within the power of the House of Representatives to avoid this embarrassing and degrading possibility.

I urge all Members to support the funding for the International Labor Organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I suppose two uniquely American characteristics are paying our bills and walking away from fights. In the adoption of the com-

mittee position I believe we would violate both those precepts. I rise in enthusiastic support of the Yates amendment.

There can be no doubt as the unanimity of those concerned in support of this; the President, the business community, and the labor community.

There can be no doubt that this body time and again has criticized the Soviet Union for its failure to pay its bills to international organizations.

It seems to me the least likely way to gain influence is to pick up the marbles, walk away, and become a delinquent contributor.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I commend the gentleman for his statement and express my enthusiastic support for the Yates amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the gentleman very much.

I urge adoption of the amendment. It is a serious question before us, and I hope that we will adopt the Yates amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the point I wanted to make in the exchange between myself and the gentleman from Illinois is that unlike labor unions in the United States, where labor organizations serve as the voice of labor to the Government and the employers, labor unions in the Soviet Union are the voice of the government to the workers.

So I would say to my distinguished friend from Minnesota, insofar as the Russian Government is concerned, it is not a forum of the people. It is quite simple why Mr. Meany was moved to testify before the committee—and I quote:

This has become a forum for Russian political propaganda, and there is no effort made by the Office of ILO to stop this.

I direct the attention of the members of the committee to the question asked by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, shown at page 4 of the report:

Mr. ROONEY. Taking the 2 years, you have made more progress in the ILO in the last 6 months than you did in the previous year and a half.

Mr. HILDEBRAND. Exactly.

The gentleman from New York has corrected the error that has been made. The question is not now before the House whether to continue in the ILO or to pull out of the ILO. Our membership in the ILO cannot possibly expire until January 1, 1973.

I will yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who I submit does make some commonsense. At least he has accomplished something in the 6 months that we have withheld our contributions to ILO.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to say that Mr. Meany testified before the committee that President Kennedy told him that when he was in Vi-

enna with Khrushchev, Khrushchev said, "You pay too much attention to your labor leaders. We solved our labor problem many years ago." Kennedy asked how he solved it. Khrushchev said, "We shot the leaders."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this indeed is a perverse kind of dollar diplomacy that will win us no friends and win us no additional influence within the ILO.

The committee says we have no intention of getting out of the ILO, yet the only way the United States can stay in the ILO is by paying its dues. It will have to pay its dues either now or in a few months. If the committee has no intention of getting out of the ILO no matter what happens, and that is the impression the committee attempts to give, we might as well pay our dues at the present time.

It is a strange kind of a report that the committee issued, also. It quotes two prominent witnesses in support of its position against payment of the dues, witnesses have an opposite point of view to that which the committee took. It quotes George Meany's testimony of last year. That is not in point today. George Meany today says that we should pay our dues to the ILO. He says we owe it, it is our legal obligation and we should pay it. The committee's quote to the contrary is contrary to the fact today. The committee also quotes Mr. Hildebrand of the Department of Labor. In the hearings on page 701, Mr. Hildebrand said:

But the Department also is convinced that if our efforts are to be effective, payment must be made of the remainder of our 1970 assessment as well as all of that for 1971. Delay in meeting these legal obligations would destroy our influence as a member state, and foredoom to failure the efforts we are now making to restore the ILO to its original purpose—the Gompers' conception—to improve the welfare of workers in every country.

That is contrary to the position of the committee, I submit the committee position should be overridden and my amendment approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES). Undoubtedly all of my colleagues join the gentleman in the well in expressing displeasure over recent trends in the ILO. Nonetheless, as I see it, we have only one choice. If the United States hopes to maintain its influence in that organization, we must remain a member in good standing and pay our dues.

On the other hand, if the United States withdraws, we will be literally handing over to the Soviet Union the very influence and leadership that they have been seeking for years. The Soviet Union will become the dominant power in the ILO, and our voice will not even be there.

I believe it is important therefore that we understand the consequences of our actions here today. If the United States

withdraws from the ILO we are not likely to gain either friendship or understanding abroad. Instead, the United States would be condemned for attacking an organization which renders a service to working people everywhere.

In the final analysis the question actually comes down to a decision on whether we are going to give up by default. To vote against this amendment I submit will be to do just that—to default, to make it impossible for the free labor movement to develop abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I believe one other point raised here a moment ago deserves clarification. I refer to the statement of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), regarding Khrushchev's comments to President Kennedy on the question of labor's influence on government. It is indeed ironical to hear the advice of a dictator to the leader of the free world on the question of free and democratic action. For someone who never had to listen seriously to any free-acting special interest group it is difficult to understand where he acquired his expertise.

However, the main point is that Mr. Khrushchev's statement was made many years ago—I might add, long before he was himself deposed.

The fact of the matter is that there is more than ample evidence reflecting the positive influence of labor and peasants in countries throughout the world. I cite, for example, the recent dramatic impact of labor unions in Poland resulting in a change of government.

The meaning of such events for us is clear. We must be prepared to assist the development of labor movements throughout the world. And what better way to do so than by continuing our membership in the ILO.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the payment of our arrears as well as our current assessment is supported by AFL-CIO President George Meany, the business community in the form of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and by the executive branch. Considering this broad-based support, I submit it is incumbent upon us to vote in favor of this amendment and I urge my colleagues to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG).

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Yates amendment and associate myself with much of what the others have said who are in support of the amendment.

I would like to add one point; that this is a moment in history when we should be seeking for the United States to have its influence felt in all international organizations and bodies where we can exchange ideas and where we can move countries of the world closer together. This is a moment when we should be seeking closer ties with other countries regardless of their opinions and differences in system so that we can influence each other in terms of the common good. This is not a moment to refuse to pay our dues and withdraw our influence from the ILO.

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

Mrs. ABZUG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the gentlewoman's statement in speaking of our position in other organizations. I would point out that what Mr. Hildebrand said about the damage that a refusal to pay dues does to us in the ILO also applies to all the other international organizations and to our reputation as a member of the international community.

I think the gentlewoman will agree.

Mrs. ABZUG. I do, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to seek international cooperation in our concerns for peace, our concerns for the working people in our concerns for health and the combating of disease and hunger all over the world. We must play a major role in international organizations in order to do this. This is therefore no time to withdraw our membership from the ILO, an important international organization.

The example we set here by the action we take will have important reverberations and influence over our effectiveness in all international organizations and endeavors.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOW).

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I am a bit surprised to see the number of people who have paraded here today complaining about the lack of payment to the ILO, and saying what a great disgrace it is not to use all of your power and influence.

I would point out to the members of the Committee that probably one of the most influential participants not only in the ILO but in the United Nations is the Soviet Union. But if you look on page 619 of the hearings you will find that the Soviet Union is in arrears, not to the ILO, but to the United Nations, to the tune of \$19,776,000.

Mr. Chairman, I have not heard anyone from that great committee who has been parading here today ever come on this floor and complain about the delinquencies of these other countries. There is a whole list of them in these hearings, a list showing the delinquencies not only of the Soviet Union but of other nations. This is the first instance and is the first time we have done that, and it has been advantageous to us. It is understood now that because of the denial of the payment last year attention has been directed to it.

I would urge the members of the Committee to vote against the Yates amendment. Let us have another year. Let us find out if we cannot straighten this out and do our best to remain in the Organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I just want to state what I believe to be the facts and to say that I think that 95 percent of what you have heard here has been irrelevant, incompetent, and immaterial.

The fact of the matter is that we are 6 months behind on our dues. The only question is, Shall we become 1½ years delinquent before paying up? That is the question. All the other talk is immaterial.

Mr. Chairman, I get the feeling as a member of the committee, from time to time, that we are sort of taken for granted by other countries. They are often in arrears but we never are. I sometimes feel they believe we are a sort of soft touch and will automatically pay the lions share on time no matter what.

While I favor paying before it would affect our membership, I think, perhaps, once in awhile we ought to also become as delinquent as others or do something a little bit different just to show them that they cannot always take us for granted.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

We are not leaving the ILO, but we think this is one way of getting that organization's attention directed to some of the problems that we feel exist and, perhaps, we can get some attention directed to those problems by this action.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) to close debate.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. The Yates amendment proposes to appropriate the \$7.8 million requested in the budget for fiscal 1972 but also the \$3.7 million deleted by the Senate last year and agreed to by the House.

Mr. Chairman, someone of the previous speakers said we should not do anything to criticize or interfere with the Director General, Mr. Jenks. I guess we should just sit by while Mr. Jenks in conjunction with his Soviet confederates spend our money to put out a publication called International Labour Review, vol. 101, April 1970, No. 4 entitled "Lenin and Social Progress," including how Lenin's ideas are embodied in Soviet social policies.

I already noted in general debate that this is the organization that without any notice to the House or the Senate, without any notice to anyone in the Congress, had gone ahead and started to construct a \$25 million building in Geneva, Switzerland.

Finally, the committee has no intention at all of getting out of this organization. We do not contemplate that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), has expired.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, as a Member who has served as a congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation at four ILO conferences, I am well aware of the criticisms leveled at the ILO, and I share some of them myself.

I am nonetheless convinced that the advantages we gain from ILO membership far outweigh whatever dissatisfactions we may have with its procedures.

I always make it a point to spend some time visiting the delegations from the developing countries when I am over there. They are always struck by the differences between the delegations of the Western countries and those of the Communist bloc.

Our freely selected and independent delegation of workers, employers, and Government officials stands in sharp contrast to the so-called worker and employer delegations of the Communist countries. We do not have very many forums in which our two systems can be compared at close quarters like this, and I might say compared to our great advantage.

I and other members of the delegation also make it a point to spend some time informally discussing issues with the Communist delegates outside of the regular sessions. I do not recall that we have made wholesale conversions to our point of view during these discussions, but I think we have opened up a lot of minds and cleared up a lot of misconceptions about our system.

So I think the annual convening of the ILO gives us a great opportunity to make points for our free enterprise system while at the same time we try to contribute to the solution of the social problems the ILO addresses during the conferences.

I might point out that the ILO does not go into hibernation in between conferences. It carries out a large number of manpower training and development programs around the world, to which we contribute separately. These technical assistance programs are aimed mainly at underdeveloped countries and have been highly praised on all sides.

We should also remember that the ILO has made a substantial contribution to the passage of legislation affecting workers around the world since its inception in 1919. Its conventions and recommendations on human rights and labor standards have had a gradual but far-reaching effect for the good in the lives of millions of workers.

But I would like to go directly to the issue at hand. Here is the situation.

We did not pay our dues to the ILO for the last 6 months of 1970. Since ILO dues are payable on January 1, we are already in arrears for 1971, making a total arrearage of 1½ years. If we have not paid up on January 1, 1972, we will be 2½ years in arrears, and stand to lose our right to vote.

Thus, unless the ILO funds are restored today, we are going to lose our right to vote 6 months from now.

Further, spokesmen for the administration which supports the restoration of the funds, have told me that the ILO is going to be in such financial straits by this fall that they will either have to bor-

row money or cut back sharply on their ongoing manpower training and development programs.

I think we are already in a very embarrassing position from the standpoint of world opinion. We admit that we owe the dues, but we say that we are not going to pay them until the ILO changes to our satisfaction.

Now we are in danger not only of losing our right to vote in 6 months, but of being cast as the villain when these technical assistance programs for underdeveloped countries are cut back or closed down.

I submit that the actions of the Congress last year have already had a salutary effect on the ILO. In particular, the ILO has come down hard in the last year, and in the main successfully, against the use of its forums for nongermane propaganda diatribes.

Now the proposition has become a losing one. Our reliability and sense of fairness in the international community is being increasingly questioned because of the episode, and I think the time has come to cut our losses.

The administration and the AFL-CIO have urged that these funds be restored, and have indicated that they are pursuing other avenues for reform of the ILO. I would likewise urge my colleagues to see to it that these funds are restored by voting for the pending amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to straighten out a couple of things, if I can. It is a bit painful, but there are obviously some misunderstandings.

In the first place, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) my good friend, says that we have until January 1973, when in fact we have until January 1972. And if we are not paid up by then, under the rules of the International Labor Organization, and under the determination as expressed by the director general in recent days, we could lose our voting rights in January 1972.

In the second place, I do not have the honor to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but with respect to notice of the building under construction in Geneva of the ILO referred to by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) I might say I did not consider that it was official notice to this body, or to the House of Representatives, but 3 years ago when I was an observer at the International Labor Organization I was taken to the site of, informed of the plans for, and was informed of the participation of an American architect in the prospective construction of the building to which the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) alludes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, a while ago the gentleman from New Jersey made the statement that the 2 years would be up in January of 1972.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I would

like to tell the gentleman that the State Department tells us that the 2 years will be up by January 1, 1973.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. But I respectfully state that I think the State Department is wrong in this instance. I know that you rely on that information, and I say to you, respectfully, sir, that you are wrong about it. My interpretation of the law, as one who has observed it, as one who has studied it, is that in January 1972 the 2 years will expire and the United States will be in default. They do not work on a fiscal year basis; they work on a calendar year basis.

Now, with respect to the International Labor Organization being a forum for the Communists, I say that is so. It has also, I might submit, been a great forum for us. Following the Hungarian incident in 1956, and the Czechoslovakian incident, the very things happened about which our Government is now complaining; namely, that the bloc countries and others have complained about, have made speeches during the discussion of the Director General's report, derogatory of the United States. I have witnessed them, and I have witnessed them being shot down by the Chairman of the Assembly. I might say that, following the Hungarian incident and the Czechoslovakian incident that this country, and this country's delegates, employers, Government and workers, all complained in the International Labor Organization of the activities of the Soviet Union. In a word, the representatives of the United States have attacked the Soviet Union on political issues. I feel strongly that the ILO should not be used for debate on matters properly belonging in the U.N. The facts are, however, that both the United States and the Soviet Union have been at fault. Is this reason for us to quit? I say "no."

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I know that the gentleman from New Jersey has been an appointed delegate of the House to the ILO.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I have been an appointed observer, as is the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) at this moment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I gather from what the gentleman has said that while he was there on one or more occasions, he had seen this building in the process of construction?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No, no. I was shown the site of it and I was informed as an observer of its potential. The chairman of the building committee of the ILO at that time was an American by the name of Stillman who just recently retired from the Department of Commerce.

This is no news to us.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me ask, did the gentleman as an official observer of the House of Representatives to one or more ILO conferences see the plans or talk to the architect and did he not see the site?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Did the gentleman ever report to the Committee on Appropriations or to the House of Representatives that a \$25 million building was to be built?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No, the gentleman did not. The gentleman did not see the plans and did not consult with the architect but was simply told of the prospectus and he was shown the prospective site.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. But the gentleman from New Jersey knew the building was to be built?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes, I did know. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

I thought we were voting at 3 o'clock. The CHAIRMAN. This is a preferential motion.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call to the attention of the Committee of the Whole the following information with regard to the building mentioned in the colloquy that has just taken place. The printed hearings held on March 10, 1971, pages 689-690 contain the following colloquy with Assistant Secretary of State De Palma:

Mr. ROONEY. When were funds requested of the Congress for the construction of that building?

Mr. DE PALMA. They will appear in the calendar 1974 ILO budget.

Mr. ROONEY. Let me repeat that question. When were funds requested of the U.S. Congress for the construction of that building?

Mr. DE PALMA. In fiscal 1974, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Evidently you think I asked "will be" instead of "were." When were funds requested of the Congress for the construction of that building?

Mr. DE PALMA. They were not as far as I know, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course not. This organization just goes ahead and decides on a building at a cost of how much, \$25 million?

Mr. DE PALMA. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY. And the United States Congress has no voice in whether we will pay how much of that \$25 million?

Mr. DE PALMA. We don't know yet, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Give us an approximation.

Mr. DE PALMA. About \$5.25 million I would say.

Mr. ROONEY. So this organization can go ahead and start a construction in 1969 of a \$25 million building to which we are required to pay approximately \$5.25 million and do this without any notice to the U.S. Congress or to the taxpayer or any request of him at all. Is that right?

Mr. DE PALMA. Sir, notice was not given as far as I have been able to discover.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, for 6 years I have had the opportunity of appointing or recommending for appointment individuals who would

be observer appointees on the part of the House to the ILO. These House Members who have gone, I think, owe an obligation to come back and report to the House of Representatives what they observed.

Let me ask the distinguished gentleman from New York—have any of these appointees ever reported to the House Committee on Appropriations that there was a prospective obligation of \$5 million plus for the building of a building by the ILO in Geneva, Switzerland?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. For over a quarter of a century, I cannot recall one such instance.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. There is an apparent confusion, I might say to the minority leader. My distinguished friend must have been terribly busy because in the last 6 years Members who have represented us as observers, including myself—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Please do not take my 5 minutes. I yielded only for a question.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. My question is, "Have not you heard of this before?"

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Have I heard of what? You?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No, the building. You saw it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I was amazed when I saw the construction going on in January just past in Geneva. I could not believe it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Have any of the observers appointed by the House ever come back and reported to the House officially that the \$25 million building was in prospect?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Never.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. To cost \$6 million of American money?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Never. I think they go over there to smell chestnuts.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We went over there to have it named after you.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, let me read what Mr. Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, said before the subcommittee on July 31, 1970:

Mr. MEANY. What has happened since the Soviets came into the ILO is that the ILO has become a sounding board more and more each year for political discussions. Those of us who have attended ILO meetings in the last few years have been subjected to the indignity of listening to speaker after speaker on the resolutions committee denouncing the United States of America. This has become a forum for Russian political propaganda, and there is no effort made by the Office of the ILO to stop this.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I urge that the pending motion be defeated.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. YATES to provide funds to pay the U.S. dues and arrearage to the International Labor Organization.

I strongly favor the U.S. continuation as a viable member in good standing of this organization. It is my view that any further weakening of our delegation to the ILO is a disservice to U.S. interests and in very real terms strengthens the hands of the Soviets who receive an added bonus with no additional cost.

While I do not support the previous action of the Congress in cutting off dues payments, I submit that any advantage which may have been given to us by making the Organization aware of the Congress displeasure has been served.

There is no wisdom in attempting to bring this agency to heel. Our international responsibility is to strengthen the ties of national trade unions and assist them in the establishment of fair labor standards to improve and protect the living standards of peoples everywhere.

I do not know of a single trade union which believes that its interest or ours is improved by withholding these funds. Mr. Meany himself, in comments reported by the press from Atlanta, Ga., on Tuesday, May 11, of this year, said:

As far as the appropriations are concerned, our position is quite simple. We owe the money and we should pay it.

Mr. Chairman, as President Truman used to say—the issue is a red herring. No Member of this body who truly believes in the U.S. responsibility to continue its important role in the international labor movement will want us to be deterred merely because a gentleman from the U.S.S.R. was appointed to a third-level position within the ILO.

For these reasons I urge the passage of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 9, noes 80.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES) there were—ayes 51, noes 70.

#### TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers

Messrs. ROONEY of New York, Bow, YATES, and ANDERSON of Illinois. The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 147, noes 227, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]  
[Recorded Teller Vote]  
AYES—147

Abourezk	Gaydos	O'Hara
Abzug	Gibbons	Pepper
Adams	Gonzalez	Perkins
Anderson, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Pike
Anderson, Ill.	Green, Pa.	Fodell
Ashley	Griffiths	Preyer, N.C.
Aspin	Hamilton	Price, Ill.
Badillo	Hanley	Pucinski
Barrett	Hanna	Quie
Begich	Hansen, Idaho	Rallsback
Bell	Harrington	Rees
Bergland	Harvey	Reid, N.Y.
Bingham	Hathaway	Reuss
Blatnik	Hawkins	Riegle
Boland	Hechler, W. Va.	Rodino
Bolling	Helstoski	Roncalio
Brademas	Hicks, Wash.	Rosenthal
Broomfield	Hungate	Rostenkowski
Burke, Mass.	Jacobs	Roush
Burton	Karth	Roybal
Carey, N.Y.	Kastenmeier	Ryan
Carney	Keith	St Germain
Celler	Kluczynski	Sarbanes
Chisholm	Koch	Saylor
Collins, Ill.	Kyros	Scheuer
Conte	Leggett	Schwengel
Conyers	Link	Selberling
Corman	McClory	Smith, N.Y.
Daniels, N.J.	McCloskey	Stanton,
Danielson	McCormack	James V.
Dellenback	McFall	Steele
Dellums	McKay	Steiger, Wis.
Diggs	Mailliard	Stokes
Dingell	Matsunaga	Sullivan
Dow	Mayne	Symington
Drinan	Meeds	Thompson, N.J.
Dwyer	Melcher	Udall
Eckhardt	Metcalfe	Ullman
Erlenborn	Mikva	Van Deerlin
Esch	Miller, Calif.	Vanik
Evans, Colo.	Minish	Vigorito
Findley	Mink	Waldie
Foley	Mitchell	Whalen
Forsythe	Monagan	Widnall
Fraser	Moorhead	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Morgan	Wright
Fulton, Tenn.	Morse	Yates
Gallagher	Moss	Yatron
Garmatz	Murphy, Ill.	Zablocki
	Obeys	

McCollister	Pryor, Ark.	Stanton,
McDade	Quillen	J. William
McDonald,	Randall	Steed
Mich.	Rarick	Steiger, Ariz.
McEwen	Reid, Ill.	Stephens
McKinney	Roberts	Stratton
McMillan	Robinson, Va.	Stubblefield
Mahon	Robison, N.Y.	Stuckey
Mann	Roe	Talcott
Mathias, Calif.	Rogers	Teague, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.	Rooney, N.Y.	Terry
Mazzoli	Rooney, Pa.	Thompson, Ga.
Michel	Rousselot	Thomson, Wis.
Miller, Ohio	Roy	Thone
Mills, Ark.	Ruppe	Vander Jagt
Mills, Md.	Ruth	Veysey
Minshall	Sandman	Waggonner
Mizell	Satterfield	Wampler
Montgomery	Scherle	Ware
Mosher	Schmitz	Whalley
Myers	Scott	White
Natcher	Sebellus	Whitehurst
Nelsen	ShIPLEY	Whitten
Nichols	Shoup	Wiggins
Nix	Shriver	Williams
O'Konski	Sikes	Wilson,
Passman	Sisk	Charles H.
Patten	Skubitz	Winn
Pelly	Slack	Wyatt
Pettis	Smith, Calif.	Wydler
Peysers	Smith, Iowa	Wyllie
Pirnie	Snyder	Wyman
Poage	Spence	Young, Tex.
Poff	Springer	Zion
Powell	Stafford	Zwach
Price, Tex.	Staggers	

NOT VOTING—59

Anderson,	Flowers	Martin
Tenn.	Ford,	Mollohan
Ashbrook	William D.	Murphy, N.Y.
Baker	Goldwater	Nedzi
Blaggi	Gray	O'Neill
Blanton	Griffin	Patman
Bray	Gubser	Pickle
Cabell	Halpern	Purcell
Clark	Hansen, Wash.	Rangel
Clawson, Del	Hastings	Rhodes
Clay	Hays	Runnels
Conable	Hicks, Mass.	Schneebell
Culver	Hogan	Taylor
Davis, Wis.	Howard	Teague, Tex.
Denholm	Landrum	Tiernan
Dent	Lennon	Watts
Devine	Long, La.	Wilson, Bob
Donohue	McCulloch	Young, Fla.
Dulski	McKevitt	
Edwards, Calif.	Macdonald,	
Edwards, La.	Mass.	
Fascell	Madden	

So the amendment was rejected. Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change my vote from "aye" to "no."

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

There was no objection. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSIONS  
For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the United States to meet its obligations in connection with participation in international fisheries commissions pursuant to treaties or conventions, and implementing Acts of Congress, \$2,900,000: *Provided*, That the United States share of such expenses may be advanced to the respective commissions.

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

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the International Fisheries I think the Members of this body would be shocked if they knew that our State Department deliberately was failing to carry out the will of the Congress in these various laws which have been designed to protect our fishermen.

Historically, Chile, Ecuador, and Peru entered into an agreement among themselves in the mid-1950's under which they claimed a 200-mile territorial sea

off their coasts. This was an unprecedented move, but not one which caused great trouble initially.

However, in the ensuing years, especially early in 1971, more and more seizures of American fishing vessels have taken place, sometimes involving shooting incidents in which American citizens have been wounded.

Our American fishermen pioneered this fishery back in the late 1920's and early 1930's, yet when we enter these waters now, we are made out to be pirates by the Central and South American press, by Radio Havana and lately by Radio Peking which called us "gangsters." We are labeled "an imperialistic aggressor."

At the center of this issue is the fact that Ecuador and Peru have refused to sincerely meet to resolve the issue. They have refused to go to the International Court of Justice to reach a determination on the legality of their claim of 200-mile jurisdiction off their coasts.

I have authored, along with others in this House, and this Congress has passed, numerous bills designed to get our countries into serious negotiations, but these efforts have been circumvented by our own State Department which has refused to enforce, for one thing, the Pelly amendment to the Fishermen's Protective Act which requires that the amount of illegal fines be deducted from foreign aid. The act provides that in any case when a vessel of the United States is seized by a foreign country on the basis of rights or claims in territorial waters or the high seas which are not recognized by the United States, the Secretary of State shall as soon as practicable take such action as he deems appropriate to attend to the welfare of such vessel and its crew and to secure the release of such vessel and crew. Where a fine must be paid, the owners of the vessel shall be reimbursed and the Secretary of State shall take such action as he may deem appropriate to make and collect any claims against the foreign country for amounts expended to obtain release of vessel. Then the law provides that if such country fails or refuses to reimburse the United States an amount of the unpaid claim shall be withheld from foreign assistance funds programs for that country.

Mr. Chairman, since that law was enacted our State Department has never made any claims to a foreign country, thus they avoid deducting such sums from foreign aid allocations.

With other laws, the policy is similar. For example, in the Foreign Assistance Act there is a provision saying that in determining whether or not to furnish assistance, consideration shall be given to excluding any country which seizes or imposes any penalty against any U.S. fishing vessel on account of its fishing activities in international waters.

Has the Department of State followed this law? The answer seems obvious.

There are the Hickenlooper and the Kuchel amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act and the Belcher amendment to the Sugar Act, all designed to resolve this dispute over fishing rights; yet, the State Department has steadfastly refused to carry out the intent of the Congress because the laws were written with per-

Abbitt	Clancy	Grasso
Abernethy	Clausen,	Gross
Addabbo	Don H.	Grover
Alexander	Cleveland	Gude
Andrews, Ala.	Collier	Hagan
Andrews, N. Dak.	Collins, Tex.	Haley
Annunzio	Colmer	Hall
Archer	Cotter	Hammer-
Arends	Coughlin	schmidt
Aspinall	Crane	Harsha
Baring	Daniel, Va.	Hébert
Belcher	Davis, Ga.	Heckler, Mass.
Bennett	Davis, S.C.	Henderson
Betts	de la Garza	Hillis
Bevill	Delaney	Hollifield
Bieber	Dennis	Horton
Blackburn	Derwinski	Hosmer
Boggs	Dickinson	Hull
Bow	Dorn	Hunt
Brasco	Dowdy	Hutchinson
Brinkley	Downing	Ichord
Brooks	Duncan	Jarman
Brotzman	du Pont	Johnson, Calif.
Brown, Mich.	Edmondson	Johnson, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Edwards, Ala.	Jonas
Broyhill, N.C.	Ellberg	Jones, Ala.
Broyhill, Va.	Eshleman	Jones, N.C.
Buchanan	Evins, Tenn.	Jones, Tenn.
Burke, Fla.	Fish	Kazen
Burleson, Tex.	Fisher	Keating
Burlison, Mo.	Flood	Kee
Byrne, Pa.	Flynt	Kemp
Byrnes, Wis.	Ford, Gerald R.	King
Byron	Fountain	Kuykendall
Caffery	Frenzel	Kyl
Camp	Frey	Landgrebe
Carter	Fulton, Pa.	Latta
Casey, Tex.	Fuqua	Lent
Cederberg	Gallfanakis	Lloyd
Chamberlain	Gettys	Long, Md.
Chappell	Gialmo	Lujan
	Gooding	McClure

missive language making enforcement discretionary.

Mr. Chairman, we even have treaties with Ecuador, Chile, and Peru which lay the groundwork for establishing an international commission to settle disputes, but the State Department has rejected this avenue of settlement to this problem.

Mr. Chairman, the 200-mile sovereignty is a serious matter. Yet, our State Department has done nothing with the legislative tools we have given it to resolve the differences between our country and these Latin Americans.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I bring this matter to the floor as a point of information. To me, the State Department's attitude toward the American fishermen is disgraceful. Only the other day a Soviet fishing trawler did severe damage, and deliberately so, to the lobster pots of a Boston company. When the American company libeled a Soviet vessel in an American port, the Department of State interceded on behalf of the Russians.

The reason I am speaking today is to enlist the support of my colleagues because I am hopeful when the opportunity arises, I can offer amendments to these various laws making the provisions to protect our fishing industry mandatory.

Mr. Chairman, later on when the Foreign Assistance Act comes before this House I hope that the Members will support provisions making the will of the Congress mandatory, and not allowing the State Department discretion under which they have definitely shown that they do not intend to do anything that is for the good of our fishing industry.

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

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

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his aggressive leadership in this battle to protect our fisheries that have had such difficult times here over the past few years.

Mr. Chairman, I would associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and I certainly support his efforts.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman. Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I also want to express the appreciation of fishermen everywhere for the gentleman's leadership in this direction.

I, too, wish to applaud the leadership the gentleman from Washington has provided toward obtaining justice for American fishermen in all waters.

By its own testimony before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on which the gentleman serves, the State Department has shown the dimension of our problem. It is that whenever the wording of a law leaves any discretion in the matter, the Department has no intention of moving against the repeated illegal seizure of American fishing boats off South America.

Section 620(o) of the Foreign Assistance Act states that "consideration should be given" to cutting off aid to nations which "impose any penalty or sanction against any U.S. fishing boat

on account of its activities in international waters."

The provision has been on the books since 1965—yet it has never been implemented.

A number of other possible avenues exist for redress of these abuses, but the repeatedly stated will of Congress has always been ignored or thwarted. It is clear from dreary evidence over the years that State Department officials will do nothing in the matter unless specifically mandated by law.

It is time to stop using the money of American taxpayers to subsidize piracy. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 105. It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against section 105, lines 20 through 22, as being legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this provision has been in this bill for many, many years. It goes back to the time that the late Senator from Nevada, Pat McCarran, was chairman of Senate appropriations for this bill.

However, I am constrained to have to concede that the point of order has merit.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ABERNETHY). The gentleman from New York concedes the point of order.

The point of order is sustained.

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

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Community Relations Service established by title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000g-2000g-2), \$5,250,000.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GONZALEZ

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GONZALEZ: Page 16, line 5, change the figure "\$5,250,000" to "\$1,000,000."

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the figure that the committee has recommended which is \$5,250,000 to an even \$1 million which represents the figure more or less that the Congress appropriated from the beginning of this service until about 1968.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I offer this amendment is because the experience of this service shows that this Congress and this committee has approved a needless expenditure of thousands of dollars.

In the hearings, as printed, on page 1,300 you will see a table there of some of the expenditures that the administrator of this division admits to having spent.

It lists expenditures, for example, made to one individual, Ernest Bernal,

San Antonio, Tex., who got paid a fairly substantial amount of money for some study, so it says.

There is also another one, Jesse Rios. My contention is that this money has been used politically. The money spent on this one particular individual, who happens to be an instructor in one of the local colleges in San Antonio, is a complete misspending of money. In other words, there is nothing that the U.S. Government, the Community Relations Service, or the carrying out of the intention of the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 hoped to bring about.

On May 20, in connection with another activity, I wrote to the chairman of this committee, the Honorable GEORGE MAHON. I said:

MAY 20, 1971.

HON. GEORGE MAHON,  
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,  
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The San Antonio Housing Authority has just informed me of a situation that is absolutely incredible, and it is a matter I believe you will be interested in.

I understand that the Community Relations Service has agreed, or at least is considering, paying for the traveling expenses and other incidentals for rent strike organizers to hold a meeting in San Antonio, evidently for the purpose of trying to set up a rent strike in public housing in San Antonio.

I do not believe that any agency of our government has any business in financing the organizers of an attempt to bankrupt another agency. Your Committee has heard complaints from me about the Community Relations Service attempting to build fires in San Antonio. Our city has enough troubles without this kind of Federal "help".

At this point I include in the RECORD a copy of a Wall Street Journal article of March 1970, in which, in a front page scare article, bylined by Richard A. Shaffer, who never visited Texas, much less San Antonio, until he was led there by agents of the service, was predicting that there would be a revolution in San Antonio, that it was imminent. What he calls "the Mexicans" were going on and killing all the "gringos." He scared the wits out of businessmen in the north and east who have insurance policies on public buildings in that area. So they gave a hard time and a bad name to the business leadership of my community. The article is as follows:

THE ANGRY CHICANOS: DEEPENING FRUSTRATION OF MEXICAN-AMERICANS STIRS FEARS OF VIOLENCE—SAN ANTONIO DEEMED LIKELY TO HAVE TROUBLE; POVERTY, BAD HOUSING CAUSE UNREST—"IT'S TOO LATE FOR THE GRINGO"

(By Richard A. Shaffer)

SAN ANTONIO.—Every Texan remembers the Alamo, and Beto Martinez is no exception. But the man he admires is Santa Anna, the Mexican commander who massacred 187 defenders of the old mission here.

"He had the right idea of what to do with white men," says Martinez, who predicts: "The day will come again when any gringo in this part of the country will be shot on sight."

Martinez, 32, is an unemployed high school dropout who wears a goatee and shabby clothes, and rarely takes off his sunglasses even in the darkest bars. He is minister of war for the Mexican-American Nationalist Organization (MANO), a clandestine group

that insists all "whites" are racist enemies who should be driven out of the Southwest, by force if necessary. Martinez, who has served time in Texas prisons for possession of marijuana and for sodomy, says most members of MANO are ex-convicts like himself and that others are Vietnam veterans with experience in demolition techniques and guerrilla warfare.

#### "WE'LL BE READY"

"Right now, we're strictly for self-defense. We're just waiting," he calmly tells an interviewer while rolling his own cigaret. "But when something starts, we'll be ready."

It's hard to say just how much of a threat MANO really poses to law and order in San Antonio. Martinez claims his group has 300 members. But police in this seemingly tranquil city, where historical monuments draw a constant stream of tourists, say MANO is "nothing to be afraid of—just Beto and a few crazy kids."

Whatever MANO's numerical strength, many knowledgeable observers say the belligerence displayed by Martinez is all too typical of a deepening undercurrent of anger and frustration among the nation's Mexican-Americans. To some, it seems inevitable that violence will result, and they believe it may well come this summer.

One Federal official responsible for gauging the mood of minority groups puts it this way: "There's an awful lot of ferment among the Mexican-Americans, a rising level of militancy among the young, with more demonstrations and more challenging of authority—the all the preliminary stages of outright violence."

#### UNUSUALLY LARGE PROPORTION

If trouble comes, many experts believe, it could well occur here in South Texas. Many areas of the Southwest have large concentrations of Mexican-Americans, but the proportion is unusually large here. San Antonio counts 300,000 Mexican-Americans in its total population of 650,000, making it second only to Los Angeles in the number of Mexican-Americans.

Many Mexican-Americans, to be sure, have little cause for unhappiness. Throughout the Southwest, Mexican-Americans are prominent in business and various professions, including politics, and the number of well-educated Mexican-Americans moving into middle-class society is growing.

But vast numbers remain mired in seemingly hopeless poverty. Cut off from the society at large by language and cultural barriers, poorly educated, lacking job skills, often discriminated against on an ethnic basis, these people cluster in the Mexican-American slums—or barrios—found in practically every Southwestern city.

In San Antonio the Barrio is a sprawling collection of dilapidated wooden houses on the wrong side of town. Many of the barrio's streets remain unpaved, and many of the houses are jammed with big families—or sometimes several families. The yards are tiny, often surrounded by fences and decorated with birdbaths and plaster religious statues.

#### MANY MIGRANT WORKERS

Many of those who live in the San Antonio barrio and in other areas of South Texas are migrant farm workers, usually spending months in the Midwest during the growing and harvest seasons and returning here for the winter.

Those who fear violence here this summer say it could well be triggered by the impact of growing mechanization on the jobs of such migrant workers. In the Midwest alone, one Federal report estimates, 40,000 migrant farm laborers will be displaced this year—and a large percentage of these will be Texans. Luis Le Leon, who works in the Laredo, Tex., office of an eight-state migrant-assistance group known as the Colorado Mi-

grant Council, predicts: "There's going to be a lot of frustration and anger."

Jose Angel Gutierrez, a youthful activist who works with migrants and holds a master's degree in political science, says he is convinced that "after this summer, a farm laborer won't even have enough money to get drunk on. Things may not explode completely this summer. But that's when it's going to begin."

When he wrote his master's thesis two years ago, Mr. Gutierrez concluded that "the empirical conditions for revolution" exist in South Texas. Today, he says, "the chances for violence are better than ever."

There have, of course, been a number of manifestations of Mexican-American unrest already in various parts of the nation. The campaign led by Cesar Chavez to unionize the grape-field workers in Delano, Calif., has largely been a "chicano"—or Mexican-American—movement, and confrontations of various sorts have occurred with less publicity in Lansing, Mich., Kansas City, Denver, Chicago, and other places where the Spanish-speaking have settled after fleeing the poverty along the Mexican border.

But much of the agitation has remained beneath the surface. Most Mexican-American groups in San Antonio, for example, publicly deplore even nonviolent demonstrations. During two boycotts of public schools by Chicano students and a strike by city garbage collectors (nearly all Mexican-Americans) there was not a single arrest. As a result, city leaders are confident things will remain calm.

"This has always been a liberal town," says Walter W. McAllister, the 81-year-old mayor, who has an autographed picture of Herbert Hoover in his office. "I don't expect trouble. Americans of Mexican descent here have made real progress in recent years."

But a Federal observer here warns, "There are 'brown power' militants who are as full of hate and violence as anything the black power movement ever saw. It wouldn't surprise me to see things really come to a head in San Antonio. Maybe here before anywhere else."

One reason for the peaceful facade, as MANO's Beto Martinez sees it, is that the radicals have learned a lesson from those who have gone before. For example, when a supposedly nonviolent group headed by Mr. Gutierrez and known as the Mexican-American Youth Organization (MAYO) began making such public statements as "We must eliminate the gringo. . . . We have to be revolutionary in our demands," it was widely accused of racism.

U.S. Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez of San Antonio, a Mexican-American with a consistently liberal voting record in Congress, blasted MAYO as drawing "fire from the deepest wellsprings of hate." The Ford Foundation refused to renew a grant to MAYO, and Mr. Gutierrez was fired from another Ford Foundation-sponsored project.

"We're not so stupid," says Martinez. "We went underground right after the cops murdered all those Black Panthers." Now, he says, no more than four or five members of MANO meet at one time. Membership lists have been destroyed.

Martinez tells his recruits: "Get guns wherever you can, preferably from addicts who steal them. Don't buy them if you can help it. And don't carry them. Stay off dope. Don't use the telephone. Don't make public speeches. Get a job, if you can, and try to look harmless. This is how the Minutemen have survived. We will, too." (The Minutemen is a secret paramilitary group on the extreme right.)

#### NO RAMPAGES EXPECTED

On the basis of detailed reports on MANO and the mood of the Mexican-American populace here, Federal observers don't expect a riot like those that occurred in the Watts

section of Los Angeles and in some other cities, with rampages of looting and burning.

Instead, they fear a shootout between militants and police, a replay of the Cleveland battle between blacks and police that took 11 lives in the summer of 1968. In maintaining that the chances for such violence are high here, sources cite the conclusion by Cleveland Mayor Carl B. Stokes and a county grand jury that the outbreak there was not the result of a revolutionary plot or conspiracy but rather represented "spontaneous action taken by a group who were armed and emotionally prepared to do violence."

If there is such "emotional preparation" in Texas, it is not hard to trace its roots. Sen. Joseph M. Montoya (D., N.M.) told a Senate subcommittee last summer that Mexican-American poverty is worse in Texas than in any other area for which statistics are available.

In Texas 46.5% of the Mexican-Americans live in housing regarded as overcrowded or dilapidated, while only 9.4% of the "white" population lives in such conditions. The median annual family income for Mexican-Americans is \$2,914, compared with \$4,884 for whites. The average educational level is 6.2 years for Mexican-Americans but 11.4 years for whites. Of the total population in Texas, 3.4% has no schooling at all. This compares with 5.3% among Negroes in Texas and 16% among Mexican-Americans.

The Mexican-American also suffers more severely at the hands of official justice in South Texas than in any other area in five Southeastern states, according to studies made by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in 1968.

The commission said it found that Mexican-American citizens are subject to unduly harsh treatment by law enforcement officers, that they are often arrested on insufficient grounds, receive physical and verbal abuse and penalties which are disproportionately severe. We have found them to be deprived of proper use of bail and of adequate representation by counsel. They are substantially underrepresented on grand and petit juries and excluded from full participation in law enforcement agencies, especially in supervisory positions."

Government efforts to improve the plight of Mexican-Americans have caused some disillusionment. "People are beginning to realize that these programs have promised more than they can deliver," says Richard Avena, field director for the Civil Rights Commission here.

#### HIGH JOBLESS RATE

Unemployment remains high—nearly 30% on the Mexican-American West Side of San Antonio—despite a Labor Department "concentrated employment program" that has been underway for three years, and the city Urban Renewal Authority is prevented by state law from using its land for badly needed public housing. The only two projects the authority has completed in 13 years were devoted to commercial interests and headquarters for local government.

There's some hope political successes will offset the forces for strife in the streets.

Mexican-Americans in some nearby rural communities have been fashioning their own political machine, the Raza Unida (United People) Party, which has either sponsored or supported more than a dozen candidates and not lost an election. Even in San Antonio, where city government has been controlled since the mid-1950s by the conservative Good Government League and where the Spanish-speaking vote is largely restricted to a single county commissioner district, candidates with militant support have won in at least five elections.

Even so, Mr. Gutierrez, chief strategist of the Raza Unida victories, says, "It's too late for the gringo to make amends. Violence has got to come."

In concluding my letter to the chairman of the committee, I said—

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that you will endeavor to prevent any Federal agency from undertaking this kind of frivolous, even dangerous kind of activity. We should not be in the business of subsidizing irresponsible people—and believe me, I know whereof I speak in this case.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,  
Member of Congress.

I take this means of bringing to the attention of the House what I consider to be a very serious diversion, distortion, and miscarriage of the intentions that the Congress had in setting up this provision in the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. 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 Texas?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GONZALEZ was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this evidence, and because of the salaries paid beyond the needs of this service to agents in the pay of the Government, who, in order to justify their job, which is supposed to be to prevent community disturbances, but who are actually fostering, stimulating and inciting distrust and unrest in communities, I think the committee has a serious responsibility to correct this, and I think it is tragic that this amount of money, which has multiplied 500 percent in a matter of 3 years, should be spent so indiscriminately while we pass this as a matter of procedure, pro forma, without any questions. I make that statement in view of the serious instances I have cited on a grassroot level, incidents which are steering us as Representatives who are asked to vote on these appropriations.

I ask for a favorable vote on my motion to restore the amount of the appropriation to its original pristine amount.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I take it you are against the Community Relations Commission as it is operating in your area?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I do not know what the gentleman heard.

Mr. CONYERS. I have been listening to what you said.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Then I think the gentleman is intelligent enough to form his own conclusion about what I said.

Mr. CONYERS. I just want to get it on the record.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am speaking for the RECORD.

Mr. CONYERS. Because there are a number of people who have been supporting the Community Relations Commission. It has done a good job in other communities in this country. I just

wanted to understand the gentleman's point that he has been making in the Well.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I appreciate the concern of the gentleman. I have spoken specifically. I have given specific instances. I offer for the gentleman's reading tomorrow's copy of the printed RECORD, with specific letters, specific incidents, and specific articles.

I say, whatever the experience may be elsewhere, I am charged with the responsibility of reporting my experience.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am delighted to yield further.

Mr. CONYERS. The Community Relations Commission works throughout the United States of America.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am well aware of that.

Mr. CONYERS. Does the gentleman have any information on its operations anywhere else?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I have information—of course, I do not have time to check it as I have with respect to my own district, about its role in other communities—as far away as California.

Mr. CONYERS. What information is that?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I do not know if my time will permit, but I will have to bring that out in documented form later on. What I report today is documented. It is specific. It is disturbing to me because it is happening in my own backyard.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Even I, Mr. Chairman, suspected the distinguished gentleman from Texas was against this Community Relations Service. All he wants to do is reduce the appropriation from \$5,250,000 to an even million dollars. He just wants to put them out of business.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us be fair about this. There have been some unfounded statements made with regard to this service.

As I pointed out during general debate, this agency was created long before 1968, because in 1965 in the supplemental appropriation bill there was an appropriation for it, and in 1966, as well as in 1967. So we have here an agency which does provide assistance to communities in resolving disputes, disagreements, and difficulties. They send people into these communities where trouble might rise who seek under the powers of the Department of Justice to do what they can to alleviate conditions which might become dangerous and cause riots and substantial property damage and loss of life.

As far as this appropriation itself is concerned, the committee saw fit to very substantially reduce it. I did not agree to that; that is to say, that was not my judgment. I thought we should have allowed the full amount.

The fact is that they asked for \$5,850,000, and the majority of the subcommittee—I have to respect the majority of the subcommittee, and I represent them here on this floor today—al-

lowed \$5,250,000, which is a cut of \$600,000.

I do not believe there is merit to the pending amendment, and it should be defeated.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I wonder how we got along for 175 years in this country without a Community Relations bureaucrat?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, we got along with "Chick sales" and we got along without telephones.

Also, we got along without television. Times change. We did not have riots such as we have had in recent years in major cities of the country. We did not have property damage and arson such as we had here in the District of Columbia a few years back. I am sure the gentleman would be the first to want to do something to alleviate these sorts of situations.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Surely, I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Which comes first, the chicken or the egg?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, the gentleman from Iowa is more acquainted with that situation by virtue of the part of the country from whence he comes. I know he has been further back under the barn hunting eggs than I have ever been. That is a cinch.

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

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Since the distinguished chairman made allusion to those who made charges that are not founded—and I do not know whether he made that allusion or not—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No. I certainly did not mean to use that word with regard to the distinguished gentleman from Texas at all. I should have used the word "mistaken."

Mr. GONZALEZ. Then, it is incumbent on the chairman to be specific about those specific points that I presented to the committee by letter dated May 20, in which I stated that we were confronted in San Antonio with the possible destruction of the peace and order, all brought about by moneys possibly coming from this agency without any kind of accountability from the Congress, and here we are appropriating more money to them.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I did not ask that of the distinguished gentleman. It was the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) who stood here and inquired with regard to that. I have always found the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) to be highly trustworthy, a gentleman, and a commendable Member of this body.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may have an opportunity to expand and to revise on that statement.

Mr. Chairman, I have just one other question.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I was not here to hear all of the remarks of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), but apparently the gentleman from Texas has offered an amendment to delete the funds for the Community Relations Service. I must object most strongly to that.

The Civil Rights Oversight Committee, which is Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary, has had quite a lot to do in its short lifetime with this particular service of the Department of Justice. It was authorized and begun in 1964. As far as the Omnibus Civil Rights Act is concerned, that great bill did more to help race relations in this country than any other piece of legislation we have ever enacted. If the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), my distinguished friend of many years, has had problems with the operation of this part of the Department of Justice, this division, then it would really have been very nice if Mr. GONZALEZ had come to us as the oversight committee, and we would have made a prompt investigation of it. However, I can assure my colleagues that this is a good operation. It is done quietly. These people live in the community. They work very hard on such difficult problems as the community-police relationships. They have probably stopped more riots and more internal disturbances—

Mr. GONZALEZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Yes. Of course.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Will you specify where they have prevented one riot? One riot.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. If the gentleman will come to my office, I will go into great detail, but generally speaking the work is done quietly and with no publicity. I assure the gentleman from Texas that it is very valuable work.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I want to share the comments made by the gentleman from California—and I am sorry that at this point we had to get into this kind of discussion as to where riots have been stopped by a commission. I think it is rather difficult, I would say to my friend from Texas, to show where a riot would have occurred in the United States if a commission had not acted.

I asked him earlier if had any intelligence about the Commission and its activities and functions across the United States of America, and he did not have any.

I think we should make clear now the fact that the gentleman objects to this Commission because of the activities going on in San Antonio, Tex., but that he more properly should come before Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary, because that subcommittee chairman and its members would be

delighted to hear of any misconduct that is going on and that should be corrected by that committee. I, as a member of that subcommittee, would encourage my friend not only to send such complaints directly to the chairman of the Finance Subcommittee but also to the Judiciary Committee where these matters are more properly investigated.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. If the gentleman from Texas is an adherent to civil rights and has some problem to discuss with reference to the Community Relations Commission, I would suggest that the gentleman bring them to Subcommittee No. 4 in order that they will receive prompt attention.

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

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

Mr. MITCHELL. As the former director of the Maryland Human Relations Commission, under Governor Tawes, and as one who worked in frequent contact with the former Governor of the State of Maryland, Mr. AGNEW, I can attest personally to the effective use of the Community Relations Commission in the State of Maryland from June 1963 to 1965.

In my official capacity as a director of a State agency, I called upon the Community Relations Commission time and time again to render its effective services to the State of Maryland. As the director of the Baltimore Community Action Agency from 1965 until 1968, during that period of time operating first under Mayor McKeldin and second under the present Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro III, I personally had the opportunity to witness the effective work of the Community Relations Commission and the services which it has rendered. I have had firsthand opportunities to evaluate the effectiveness of the contributions of this particular service to my city and to my State.

Admitting that the service may not be equally good in all cities and States across the Nation, I think it would be absolutely nonsensical to throw the baby out the window with the bath water. I urge the defeat of the Gonzalez amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the gentleman from Texas had an opportunity to respond to the question. I would like to yield to him now for that purpose.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I very deeply appreciate the consideration of the gentleman from Iowa and I do want to take advantage of this opportunity, although I may not have to use the full 5 minutes.

First, let us keep first things first. I happen to have been a Member of this body when we debated and considered the 1964 Civil Rights Act for 10 consecutive days. I supported it and the RECORD shows it and I am glad I did. So, let us not distort the RECORD in that respect.

Second, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL) talks about the Human Relations Commission of Maryland and of Baltimore. I am not talking about

the human relations commission in the city of Baltimore. I am not talking about the human relations commission in the city of San Antonio in the State of Texas or Maryland. I am talking about the Federal Community Relations Services and with particular reference to the region now located in Dallas, out of which emissaries have gone into San Antonio and have been assigned to San Antonio.

When I asked specifically as to what records and what rights have been violated, I asked that with the intention of showing that insofar as we can tell in the Dallas region which covers several States, rather than preventing, they have been fomenting and have been crystallizing community sentiment along racial lines, along social lines, through articles which have appeared on the front pages of the paper and which fact has been admitted by the writers that it has not been happenstance. The journalists told us that the Federal representatives were the source of this information.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I beg the pardon of the gentleman. I am really a guest here on the time of the gentleman from Iowa.

I want to make two points. First, I think the record will show that as far as my position in particular is concerned, that I have supported civil rights efforts, I am for equality, I am for fair and impartial treatment, and my record is unassailable in that respect, and was unassailable long before I came to the Congress. But I am also for fair play. I am also for having a man earn the money that he is to receive when he is hired for a job. I am also for carrying out the intentions that Congress had when it enacted this section of the Civil Rights Act. And my contention is that I did the correct thing through my correspondence and through my contacting of these people, and that I secured no results. And if I have to go before the substantive committees on authorization, then that is something else also.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman from Texas would agree with me, I believe, that when it comes to the question of preventing riots and preventing the fomenting of riots, that that is one thing that we cannot prove as to what riots were prevented any more than we could prove that the State Safety Patrol has prevented accidents—name one.

Mr. GONZALEZ. If the gentleman will yield further, I can personally testify to one that we prevented in my hometown 2 years ago, not because of the service, but in spite of it, and because I happened to bring them to the public view.

The gentleman talks about how quietly they work, and that is an unfortunate thing, that is the thing I am talking about, they are working so quietly that the jobs have multiplied in this division so fast, and the salaries have grown so greatly that they just sit around trying to figure out what to think of in order to justify those jobs.

That is what I am saying. And we cannot wash our hands on this, and say how well they are working because they are working so quietly. We have a direct responsibility in this matter. I know in my

case, regardless of the position it puts me in, regardless of the political impact, I have the responsibility of bringing this to the attention of this committee, and if the committee does not listen to me then the Congress, as I am, on the specifics, and I have the documentation on it.

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely grateful to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL) for yielding me this additional time, because I did feel that these points should be made.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I suggest that this is probably one of the best times and one of the best opportunities the House will ever have to strike a blow for the Alamo.

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

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from California yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is far too kind to me in yielding, because I suspect that the gentleman may take a position opposite to the position that I take. But I do want to point out, in requesting the Members to vote down the pending amendment reducing a \$5 million appropriation to \$1 million, that the committee recommendation would merely add 13 positions, making a total of 250 employees in this office.

I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

And please do not strike a blow for the Alamo with this item.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat in a dilemma as to what to do with regard to the amendment pending before us. On one hand, I must say that I understand the position the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) has taken. I understand it because I know that he speaks the truth.

I also look at the other side of the coin, and see the good work that has been done in other sections of the country. I do not believe that striking out or reducing an appropriation is the proper way of registering a grievance against a particular group.

In this instance I believe that the gentleman from Texas is correct in saying that something has to be done to change the attitude of individuals who run this agency here in Washington. Those who go out into a Congressman's district—to actually incite people to riot, must be stopped. On the other hand, I compliment most segments of the organization. Those who work in various communities throughout the United States. Those who work in Los Angeles, Calif., and in other sections of the country, where the local committees on Human Relations are actually doing a tremendous job, because they have within those organizations men and women who are active in the community in which they live, and as citizens of that area are participating through the Committee on Human Relations in the affairs of their community.

I do not know at this moment just exactly what to do about the inequities that I see. I do know one thing however and that is that most agencies that are recipients of money from this appropriation of \$5,250,000 are doing a good job in various sections of the country. I believe that this debate should serve as notice not only to those individuals who operate this service, but also to the staff of the Civil Rights Commission that we are dissatisfied with their attitude, dissatisfied also with some of the things that they are not doing for some minorities and that it is high time that they realize that there are many minorities in the United States not just one and that these minorities must be served on an equal basis. If they are not served on an equal basis, then the funding should not be made to groups who operate in an unequal way perpetuating discrimination under the guise of promoting equal opportunity for all.

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

Mr. ROYBAL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman now extends his warning, I take it, to the Civil Rights Commission, which has not been named previously; is that correct?

Mr. ROYBAL. Yes. I did mention the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. CONYERS. What has the Civil Rights Commission done that offends the gentleman from California?

Mr. ROYBAL. If the gentleman would really be interested I can make that explanation when that subject matter is before us. I had decided not to say anything about the Civil Rights Commission. Even though I am dissatisfied with the attitude of some of those who run it. I still believe that to reduce an appropriation is not the way to correct the situation. I think this will serve as sufficient warning to those individuals involved that they have to reexamine their operation once again and that they have to readjust their position and steer a better course.

I use this time to notify them that we expect a lot better performance from them in the coming year. As I said before I am not in favor of this reduction. I will even vote in favor of increasing the appropriation for the Civil Rights Commission but they should also know that they have to correct their ways.

Mr. CONYERS. I agree with the gentleman's last thinking on this subject. I suppose the gentleman had to talk his way into that decision.

But what are the names of the members of the Community Relations Commission who sit in soft plush chairs in Washington and incite riots in Members' districts?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GONZALEZ) there were—ayes 68, noes 64.

## TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; the Chairman appointed as tellers, Messrs. ROONEY of New York, Bow, GONZALEZ, and KYL.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 127, noes 233, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—127

Abbitt	Frey	O'Konski
Abernethy	Fuqua	Passman
Andrews, Ala.	Gettys	Pelly
Archer	Gibbons	Pettis
Arends	Gonzalez	Poage
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Poff
Bennett	Gross	Powell
Betts	Hagan	Price, Tex.
Bevill	Haley	Rarick
Blackburn	Hall	Reid, Ill.
Bow	Hammer-	Roberts
Brinkley	schmidt	Rogers
Broyhill, N.C.	Hastings	Roussellot
Broyhill, Va.	Hull	Sandman
Buchanan	Hunt	Satterfield
Burke, Fla.	Jarman	Scherle
Burleson, Tex.	Jones, N.C.	Schmitz
Caffery	Kazen	Scott
Camp	Keating	Sebelius
Carter	Kee	Sikes
Casey, Tex.	King	Skubitz
Chappell	Kuykendall	Smith, Calif.
Clancy	Kyl	Snyder
Clausen,	Landgrebe	Spence
Don H.	Latta	Springer
Collins, Tex.	Lloyd	Steiger, Ariz.
Colmer	Long, Md.	Stubblefield
Crane	McClary	Stuckey
Daniel, Va.	McClure	Talcott
Davis, Ga.	McCollister	Teague, Calif.
de la Garza	McMillan	Terry
Dickinson	Mann	Thompson, Ga.
Dorn	Mathias, Calif.	Thomson, Wis.
Dowdy	Mathis, Ga.	Veysey
Downing	Miller, Calif.	Waggonner
Duncan	Miller, Ohio	Wampler
Dwyer	Mills, Md.	Whitehurst
Edwards, Ala.	Minshall	Whitten
Eshleman	Mizell	Wiggins
Evins, Tenn.	Monagan	Williams
Fisher	Montgomery	Winn
Flynt	Myers	Wright
Fountain	Nichols	Zion

NOES—233

Abouzeck	Conyers	Griffiths
Abzug	Corman	Grover
Adams	Cotter	Gude
Addabbo	Coughlin	Hamilton
Anderson,	Daniels, N.J.	Hanley
Calif.	Danielson	Hanna
Andrews,	Davis, S.C.	Hansen, Idaho
N. Dak.	Delaney	Hansen, Wash.
Annunzio	Dellenback	Harrington
Ashley	Dellums	Harsha
Aspin	Denholm	Harvey
Aspinall	Dennis	Hathaway
Badillo	Derwinski	Hawkins
Barrett	Diggs	Hechler, W. Va.
Begich	Dingell	Heckler, Mass.
Bell	Dow	Helstoski
Bergland	Drinan	Henderson
Blester	du Pont	Hicks, Wash.
Bingham	Eckhardt	Hillis
Boggs	Edmondson	Hosmer
Boland	Edwards, Calif.	Hungate
Brademas	Ellberg	Hutchinson
Brasco	Erlenborn	Jacobs
Brooks	Esch	Johnson, Calif.
Broomfield	Evans, Colo.	Johnson, Pa.
Brown, Mich.	Findley	Jonas
Brown, Ohio	Fish	Jones, Ala.
Burke, Mass.	Flood	Jones, Tenn.
Burlison, Mo.	Foley	Karh
Burton	Ford, Gerald R.	Kastenmeier
Byrne, Pa.	Forsythe	Keith
Byrnes, Wis.	Fraser	Kemp
Byron	Frelinghuysen	Kluczynski
Carey, N.Y.	Frenzel	Koch
Carney	Fulton, Pa.	Kyros
Cederberg	Gallifanakis	Leggett
Celler	Gallagher	Lent
Chamberlain	Garmatz	Link
Chisholm	Gaydos	Lujan
Cleveland	Gialmo	McCloskey
Collier	Grasso	McDade
Collins, Ill.	Gray	McDonald,
Conte	Green, Pa.	Mich.

McEwen	Preyer, N.C.	Smith, Iowa
McFall	Price, Ill.	Smith, N.Y.
McKay	Pryor, Ark.	Stafford
Macdonald,	Pucinski	Staggers
Mass.	Quile	Stanton,
Mahon	Quillen	J. William
Mailliard	Rallsback	Stanton,
Matsunaga	Randall	James V.
Mayne	Rees	Steed
Mazzoli	Reid, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.
Meeds	Reuss	Stephens
Melcher	Riegle	Stokes
Metcalfe	Robinson, Va.	Stratton
Mikva	Robison, N.Y.	Sullivan
Minish	Rodino	Symington
Mink	Roe	Thompson, N.J.
Mitchell	Roncallo	Thone
Moorhead	Rooney, N.Y.	Udall
Morgan	Rooney, Pa.	Van Deerlin
Morse	Rosenthal	Vander Jagt
Mosher	Rostenkowski	Vanik
Moss	Roush	Vigorito
Murphy, III.	Roy	Waldie
Murphy, N.Y.	Roybal	Whalen
Natcher	Ruppe	Whalley
Nelsen	Ryan	White
Nix	St Germain	Widnall
O'Obey	Sarbanes	Wilson,
O'Hara	Saylor	Charles H.
O'Neill	Scheuer	Wolf
Patten	Schwengel	Wyatt
Pepper	Seiberling	Wylder
Perkins	Shipley	Wyman
Pickle	Shoup	Yates
Pike	Shriver	Yatron
Pirnie	Sisk	Zablocki
Podell	Slack	Zwach

NOT VOTING—73

Alexander	Fascell	Madden
Anderson, III.	Flowers	Martin
Anderson,	Ford,	Michel
Tenn.	William D.	Mills, Ark.
Ashbrook	Fulton, Tenn.	Mollohan
Baker	Goldwater	Nedzi
Belcher	Goodling	Fatman
Biaggi	Griffin	Peyser
Blanton	Gubser	Purcell
Blatnik	Halpern	Rangel
Bolling	Hays	Rhodes
Bray	Hébert	Runnels
Brotzman	Hicks, Mass.	Ruth
Cabell	Hogan	Schneebell
Clark	Hollifield	Steele
Clawson, Del	Horton	Taylor
Clay	Howard	Teague, Tex.
Conable	Ichord	Tiernan
Culver	Landrum	Ullman
Davis, Wis.	Lennon	Ware
Dent	Long, La.	Watts
Devine	McCormack	Wilson, Bob
Donohue	McCulloch	Wylie
Dulski	McKevitt	Young, Fla.
Edwards, La.	McKinney	Young, Tex.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change my vote from "no" to "aye."

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

There was no objection.

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

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

For expenses necessary for the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, including supervision of United States prisoners in non-Federal institutions; purchase of (not to exceed twenty-six for replacement only), and hire of passenger motor vehicles; compilation of statistics relating to prisoners in Federal penal and correctional institutions; assistance to State and local governments to improve their correctional systems; firearms and ammunition; medals and other awards; payment of rewards; purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock; construction of buildings at prison camps; and acquisition of land as authorized by section 4010 of title 18, United States Code, \$103,500,000: *Provided*, That there may be transferred to the Health Services and Mental Health Administration such amounts as may be

necessary, in the discretion of the Attorney General, for direct expenditure by that Administration for medical relief for inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MIKVA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MIKVA: Page 19, line 15, after the word "Code" strike out "103,500,000" and insert "\$105,225,000."

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have a series of three amendments which seek to restore the cuts that were made by the Appropriations Committee in the budget sought for the Bureau of Prisons.

Now, the Bureau of Prisons has received one of the largest increases in its history, and some have asked me not to raise these points at this time; because even with the cuts, they are still getting a substantial increase over the last fiscal year.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, crime has been increasing also. If any of you have been reading your mail you will find that the one single issue that bothers the people the most is the problem of crime. Certainly, we are not doing what we ought to do with reference to the crime problem.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware of a professor who drowned in a river that averaged 6 inches in depth. I suggest that these cuts which "average" less than 10 percent will affect some very substantial and important programs—programs which seek to do something about the rising crime problem and the problem of recidivism—that is the number of prisoners who go to prison but who come back upon release to a life of crime.

The chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee said during the hearings, according to the transcript, that the Federal Bureau of Prisons runs the finest system in the country.

I think he is correct. But it will not continue to be the finest and it is not adequate to meet the task given it. Based upon the kind of statistics that show what is happening to the prisoners that are turned loose, the system is not making it.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee recommended a total cut of some \$19 million. Of that some \$16.3 million is for building and facilities; \$1,725,000 is for salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Prisons; and there is another \$1,250,000 to support prisoners.

Mr. Chairman, these cuts are going to hurt. These are not cuts that have to do with the building of new institutions as such. It is true that some of the building facilities will be affected because a piece of the cut is in that category, but the bulk of the cut has to do with custodial programs and innovative programs—programs seeking to try to turn the corner and determine why people come out worse than when they go in.

Mr. Chairman, we are spending a lot of money on law and order in this country. It seems to me that we are being pennywise and pound foolish to deny to the Bureau of Prisons the money that is

sought, the money which has been approved by the administration, the money which has been approved by the Office of Management and Budget. We need a better situation in our prisons than we have had heretofore to be able to return to society criminals who have been rehabilitated rather than to return criminals who are likely to continue their life of crime.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the fact that the Appropriations Committee is supposed to be the watchdog for the people. But I suspect in this instance that the watchdog has jumped up and bitten the people, letting the burglar go free.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 9272 offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

It is a deep disappointment to me to see that the committee wants to cut nearly \$20 million from the President's budget request for the Federal prison system. A cut in prison funds at this time is false economy. The cut indicates a distorted sense of priorities at a time when the crime rate is rising rapidly.

Yet, of all the activities within the criminal justice system, the correctional system has perhaps the greatest potential for reducing crime committed by repeating offenders. And 80 percent of the serious crimes of this Nation are committed by repeaters.

We have been talking about law and order, and we did so during the last campaign dialog on domestic issues was law and order, and how to fight crime.

When you analyze that 80 percent of the serious crimes of this Nation are committed by repeaters, I submit that the best way to fight crime is to improve our correctional systems instead of having them be just a school of crime, and make them really true rehabilitative centers.

We are not talking about pampering criminals or making country clubs out of the penal institutions; we are talking about investing in the improvement of a correctional system which is the most severely neglected part of our woefully inadequate criminal justice system.

As the crime rate continues to catapult upward, we have an ever more critical need for planning new facilities in our Federal system.

Crime has been estimated to cost this Nation between \$50 and \$100 billion every year. Yet in the name of economy we are asked to cut the President's modest request by \$20 million.

Recently I have been telling the public, as well as prison officials and inmates, that Congressmen are taking a new direction concerning the way to attack the crime problem.

In the past, we had a wealth of excellent suggestions for making our correctional institutions true instruments of rehabilitation to help stop the rising crime rate. But our priorities were twisted in the wrong direction in favor of simplistic but ineffective solutions.

During this session of Congress, however, it appeared to me that my colleagues were at last ready to move on to

more complex and more effective methods, such as modernized corrections, speedy trials, and narcotics treatment.

A vote today in favor of the amendment proposed by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) will be a first step toward indicating to the public that we are sincere about attacking the crime problem through the best and most effective method, the improvement of our correctional institutions. This has the greatest potential for crime reduction.

As I have seen through a series of tours of penal institutions, the Federal system at least offers a ray of hope in an otherwise bleak and horrible correctional setup.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to indicate a real commitment to attacking crime through prison improvement by supporting the amendment before us today.

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

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) for his excellent statement, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

We in the Congress should pay attention to what the gentleman from California has just said because it points the way to progress in this particular area, an area which most critically needs attention now.

I mentioned that police and courts had been given much attention, but rehabilitation was the critical need—just a general statement.

The President and the Chief Justice of the United States have both spoken out strongly for correctional reform. It is up to us in the Congress to provide the means to make the Federal correctional system a model for the States. We have a long way to go at every level of government.

I have visited the Federal Women's Detention Center at Alderson, W. Va.; and recently spent the better part of a day touring the Lorton correctional complex operated by the District of Columbia. One of the major problems at these facilities is the enforced idleness of most of the inmates. More educational and vocational training programs are essential, not only to occupy the time of those in prison, but also to prepare these individuals for their return to the community. At Lorton, I visited a class in library science conducted by an instructor from Federal City College. Many of the men enroll at the college or at the Washington Technical Institute when they leave prison. The vocational programs at Lorton can accommodate only about 400 of the 2,000 inmates at the reformatory. Many of the jobs, such as the manufacture of clothing and furniture do not easily lead to outside jobs, at least not in the Washington area to which the men return.

A first-class court system and first-class police are vital to effective law enforcement. But if arrest, conviction, and sentence are not followed by rehabilita-

tion of offenders, the cycle of crime will begin again. Both the individual and the community are the losers so long as we in Congress give short shrift to reform of our correctional system.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amount recommended by the committee, \$103,500,000, is \$12,655,000 over the appropriation for this item the current fiscal year. This cut is only in the amount \$1,725,000 and the gentleman's amendment seeks to restore that \$1,725,000.

I should point out that this cut is not even being appealed to the other body—and as you know under the appropriation procedure, the other body generally only listens to appeals of items in which the administration or the executive agency disagrees with the House appropriation action.

In this case, the Department of Justice is not even appealing it.

In the money allowed by the subcommittee, how many new positions do you think are being allowed? I almost hate to tell you, but the situation requires it—there are over 600 new positions provided under the committee figure. I submit, gentlemen, that this cut is not going to hurt the Federal prison system in the slightest and I ask that the pending amendment be voted down.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I visited my first prison as a Member of Congress in January 1970, to see what was taking place within those institutions. I had been inside prisons before when I practiced law and represented clients, but it is not quite the same when you are making an inspection. I have since visited six correctional facilities, some were Federal and four were city institutions.

What I have found is that our prisons are turning out hardened convicts who perhaps could have been rehabilitated had some attention been given to them when they were in jail and time was hanging heavy on their hands and when their minds were open to change. But, we do not rehabilitate, and in the case of the narcotic addict we do not provide any drug therapy. We simply detoxify the addict—most often through cold turkey—and at the end of his sentence we throw him out on the street and he again becomes addicted and again assaults you, your wife, and your children in the streets.

In reviewing this part of the budget an effort has been made to save money—to cut down on expenditures. And where is the easiest place to do that? It is with the prisoners because there is no constituency involved here. You are not going to get a letter from some prisoner saying that he is going to vote against you because you cut money from the budget. But, more important you are losing the opportunity to treat and rehabilitate the man who will eventually be put back out on the streets to be either a good citizen or a thief.

You do not have to be a do-gooder to be in favor of increasing this bill—not at

all. You only have to be interested in society. I think you ought to be interested in the individual and in rehabilitating him. But, just as important here is the need of society and you are turning your back on society when you cut this budget.

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

Mr. KOCH. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I would repeat that it is not a question of do-gooders and liberals against conservatives. This is a question, as the gentleman has well stated, of what must be done to really help solve a problem which so acutely affects all our citizens—how best we can deal with prisoners who are going to return to the free world.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) said that there will be 600 positions added to the number of personnel. Unfortunately, the prison or jail population in the federal system is projected to increase by some 10 percent—or some 2,000. So at least we are standing still, as the gentleman from New York pointed out—and I say that is the wrong way to stand.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I recommend to everyone here, if they cannot make a visit to a prison, to go and see "Fortune and Men's Eyes" which is playing right here in Washington and it gives you a picture of what is taking place in prisons across the country.

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

Mr. KOCH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) indicated that there was an increase over the last year. That is true. However, it is \$19 million below what the President requested.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is not a fact at all. The cut by the committee with regard to this item comes to merely \$1,725,000. The gentleman is talking about a figure which refers to three items.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, may I give you one salient fact: 400 drug addicts who have been released from prison in the city of New York live in a hotel in my district. It is estimated that they steal \$35 million a year to support their habit, which costs each of them \$50 a day.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOCH. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Does not the gentleman realize that this matter does not have very much to do with the city of New York? The gentleman is talking of mere whimsy in respect to the situation in the city of New York. Do you not know that the Federal prisons are the finest in the world?

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, the problems of the city of New York apply to the whole country. Prisons throughout the country have drug addicts in their cells and are releasing men and women who immediately return to their drug habits. We are not treating these people while they are committed to our pris-

ons—and while we cut the budget today, we ask society to pay a tremendous price for our inaction.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BOW. This amendment is addressed to the question of the Bureau of Prisons, salaries and expenses. It is a cut of \$1,725,000. But may I point out that what the committee is recommending in this bill is \$103,500,000. As the gentleman from New York has said, this is an increase of 600 and some-odd positions. This is not any meat-ax cut. This was done very carefully. We have discussed it with the Bureau of Prisons. I can say to my colleagues here that when we are now appropriating \$103,500,000, I think that is all they can use this year, and it is not going to affect crime on the streets. If we would give them \$200 million, and we still had the kind of enforcement and things going on that we have, we would not change the population of the prisons.

It has been said here, "Go look at the prisons, how bad off these people are."

Our committee not long ago arranged for a swimming pool in one of these correctional institutions. In the last couple of years new gymnasiums have been built for regulation basketball courts.

There was a recommendation a year ago in respect to food. The prisoners were objecting to canned orange juice. The budget was increased to bring in fresh orange juice.

We go on down. Let us talk about the increase in the budget last year, so that every inmate would have an amount of fresh meat equal to the average in the United States. I asked the question then how many law-abiding citizens, how many people who have never come in contact with the law or prisons were getting the average of the country. Of course, they could not tell us.

We have been very liberal in the prison system. I think the gentleman from New York has made investigations. He has gone out and studied the prison system. I believe this recommendation is fair and the committee is in full accord with it.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. DENNIS. I object.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request with a 10-minute limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has asked unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I was on my feet when the Chair recognized the gentleman in the well, and I want 5 minutes on this amendment. If I am not going to get it, I will object.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY OF NEW YORK

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not use the full 5 minutes, because I do not want to hog this very brief time that is available, but I wish to call attention to the plight of the man who sits in judgment of one who has been convicted of crime. I have some friends in the Federal District Court in Los Angeles. They are competent concerned public servants who are frequently criticized because they sometimes give what appear to be too lenient sentences to young offenders who have committed serious crimes. But they are faced with this very difficult problem. Everyone in the system understands that when a young man is sent to a Federal prison for a long period of time, his life is sacrificed. There is little hope he will ever return to society as a responsible, contributing member. I cannot really believe that the Appropriations Committee is satisfied with the capacity of our penal system to rehabilitate these young people.

I understand that the three amendments together amount to the \$14 million. That is a significant amount of money.

I do not believe it is time to decide whether or not we are hurting the prison system. It seems to me we must give to the Federal judges, who sit in judgment over criminals, some alternative other than turning them back on the streets, where they may again offend society, or sending them to prison, knowing they will be morally destroyed.

I hope we can support the amendment.

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

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

Mr. MIKVA. While this is a single amendment, dealing with \$1.5 million, I have tried to discuss the three together. I do not propose to take additional time on the other two.

The three together all seek to do the same thing, to restore the figures to the amounts requested by the Bureau of Prisons, and approved by the administration through the Office of Management and Budget before being submitted to the Appropriations Committee.

In other instances the Appropriations Committee gave various other agencies the full amount sought by them. In this instance they saw fit to cut.

In consideration of the seriousness of crime problems and the problems of

recidivism we ought not to be cutting this amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Members standing at the time of the limitation of debate will be recognized for approximately three-quarters of a minute each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

(By unanimous consent, Messrs. ROONEY of New York, HUNGATE and JACOBS yielded their time to Mr. DENNIS.)

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues, particularly the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and also the other gentlemen.

I have no desire to address the House for any extended period. The reason I got to my feet is that I feel that this type of amendment is too often considered as one between conservatives and liberals, between "bleeding hearts" and "hard noses," and that sort of thing.

I should like to look at it, for just a minute, from another point of view. I do not believe I am known in the House as a liberal or as a big spender, but I do not have to come to the Congress to find out what the inside of a penitentiary looked like, because I have practiced criminal law in my time, and I sometimes had clients who were put in the penitentiary, although I tried to keep them out.

Penitentiaries are not very pleasant places, either Federal or State. The Federal prison is usually a little better of the two. Their products are less pleasant than the places. Most of the people in them have been there before, and a good many of them learned much of what got them there as a result of their first trip.

I commenced my public life as a prosecuting attorney and, if I do say so, I was a fairly vigorous one. Later on I preferred to defend clients. One of the reasons was that I came to realize that I really was not doing anything much very constructive for society when I sent people to jail, so I thought that if I could keep them out it might be a little more constructive for society as a whole.

For these reasons it seems to me to keep the budget at what the people who made up the budget asked for, for the purpose of starting to reform the penal system, is not being a bleeding heart at all, but is just being realistic and doing a little overdue justice.

Therefore, I support the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY yielded his time to Mr. SYMINGTON.)

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a tremendous respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY). In fact, when I was in the Justice Department working as Executive Director of the President's Juvenile Delinquency Committee, the first appearance I had before the Congress was to try to defend our budget before the chairman. He was very fair and asked tough questions. All I can say is that getting to know Jim Bennett, as many of you did,

and Myrl Alexander, who were the Bureau of Prisons directors, was a great experience for me.

I was told by them that less than 5 percent of the Federal judges had seen the inside of the prisons to which they send these fellows. I myself saw only the juvenile institutions in this country, and talked to the social workers who were trying to get something done with these people when they got out, and also talked with the teachers and saw the conditions under which these people live. I realized then that it would take a tremendous and massive effort by this country of ours to pull our prison system up to the point where we could really expect it to do the job that it was intended to do. We want these prisoners back, too, Mr. Chairman, back home, not back in prison.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL).

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, the total amount for prisons under this bill is \$19,286,000 under the President's request.

I have also spent considerable time visiting prisons, and I can tell you they are not adequate and not correct. They do not improve but, rather, they bring the prisoners, the inmates, out into society in a condition where they are worse than they were when they went in.

I would like to repeat what I said earlier. We talk about law and order here and the idea behind winning the election was to obtain better law and order. If we want to put our money where our mouth is, then let us put the money here. Let us correct these institutions in which they breed crime and let us try to improve this terrible situation, because 80 percent of the people who commit crimes are recidivists.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MIKVA) there were—ayes 58, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION CONTROL COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of Executive Order 11523 of April 9, 1970, establishing the National Industrial Pollution Control Council, \$310,000.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments at the Clerk's desk which I ask unanimous consent be read and considered en bloc, notwithstanding the fact that the second amendment appears at page 57 of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, we do not have a copy of these amendments and therefore must object to the unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: Page 27, strike out line 15 and all that follows down through line 18.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the function of this amendment is very simple. It is to save \$310,000.

As everyone knows the Federal Government is proliferated with advisory bodies in many instances composed of those who are supposed to be regulated under the law in advising the Federal Government and its agencies on the law as it should be enforced insofar as it affects them.

Mr. Chairman, a classic example of this appeared in the Washington Post wherein it was stated that we were sending the goats to guard the cabbage patch. Such is the National Industrial Pollution Control Council which appears at page 27 of the bill and to which this amendment is directed.

The chairman is one who is well qualified to advise the agencies of the Federal Government on industrial pollution control but instead to advise how the polluter's interest should be protected. He is the chairman of a large corporation which produces a product which is loaded with such heavy quantities of highly toxic acid wastes that they corroded the steel lids of the manhole covers so as to cause them to collapse into the system. One of its members has complained consistently about the environmentalists and conservationists and the amount of money he was being compelled to spend for his corporation on pollution abatement and things of that kind, yet we find that his firm spent 50 times as much on advertising as it spent on research and on pollution abatement.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of reasons why the National Industrial Pollution Control Council should be abolished. First of all, it is not needed. It is a broadly based body which is set up by statute and not by Executive order, charged with carrying out this responsibility.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I would love to yield to the gentleman from New York but I do not have the time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I only want the name of the chairman to whom you are referring.

Mr. DINGELL. The name of the chairman is Cross. He is the chairman of the 3-M Co. He is one of the big polluters of the country, too, I might add.

There are a number of reasons why this organization should not be funded. First of all, it is composed solely and exclusively of major industrial polluters, not technical people, but the heads of corporations. Indeed, its roster reads like the roster of outstanding polluters and of those against whom the Federal Government has initiated water pollution abatement suits.

Second, it has withheld the availability of its minutes to the public. It has denied repeatedly public participation in and public appearances at meetings which it has held. Indeed, it is fair to say that its published documents appear to be and purport to be public documents,

when they are in fact not so. Indeed, these documents are utilized principally to justify and sanctify the position of polluters instead of setting out the Government's position of concern of the people of the Nation on the environment.

Indeed, not long back one of the agents of one of the polluters, one of the members of the NIPCC was circulating Government agencies and the public at large with copies of one of the documents which this agency had put together, and calling it a government document, and it spoke on behalf of something known as NTA, which happens, among other things, to be a cancer producer which has been abolished as a substitute for phosphates.

As I mentioned, it conducts its work in secret, it has no representatives in schools, educational institutions, colleges, universities, or conservation groups. At least, it has no representatives that are identifiable as representatives of small business.

As I mentioned, its meetings are carefully held in secret, and the public is absolutely and persistently excluded from its deliberations.

And, last, also it is the kind of Commission that the Federal Government does not need.

One of the things this Nation has strived for has been to be a working democracy of the elected representatives of the people. This constitutes a third and very dangerous layer of the Government whose purpose is to interfere with governmental decisionmaking which will be exempt from the elective process, and from the accountability to which we as elected representatives of the people are subjected, who serve the Government and are truly responsible and are accountable to the people at large.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I know how hard the distinguished gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Michigan, (Mr. DINGELL) has worked on this entire field, and how important his contributions have been. I think the gentleman should be heard further, and I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding to me. I had been prepared to yield to the gentleman, but my time had expired.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that this kind of an institution is something which is very dangerous to the fundamental fabric of this Nation. I am indeed troubled, and I would have my colleagues to know that if this institution is to be composed entirely of polluters, who deal in darkness and in secrecy, which does not make its deliberations available to the public, then I think the only way this Congress, this body can bring a halt to these kinds of polluters, is by striking the appropriation of that institution. I believe that this would be taking a step which will lead us toward a more responsive kind of advisory panel. I would have no objection to a panel such as this, if it is run the right way, if it permitted public participation, or if its delibera-

tions were open to the public, or indeed if its minutes were published in full and were in correct and true form, and were available to the people of the United States.

I believe that its documents ought not to be identified as quasi-public documents. I do not believe that its documents should be used for the purpose of influencing governmental action, and as documents of a governmental agency. I believe that this is extremely bad.

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment, a modest savings of \$310,000 of the taxpayers' money, will be adopted, and will carry with it the broad and clear disapproval of this body toward the actions of that kind of an agency.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee of the Whole, this is a comparatively small item of 300 and some thousand dollars.

The testimony in regard thereto is to be found in the testimony of Secretary of Commerce Stans at page 11 of the printed hearings:

Secretary STANS. \* \* \* The purpose of it is to bring industry together in industry groups, top executives to discuss the problems of pollution and what they are doing about them and to induce them to take on voluntarily increased programs to eliminate the extent of pollution, and clean up the environment.

It has been a very successful enterprise, Mr. Chairman. If the Government got as much for its money—

Mr. ROONEY. What if anything has it accomplished up to now? All I read is about firms being indicted in connection with pollution. Is this coordinated with the Department of Justice?

Secretary STANS. It is coordinated with the Department of Justice, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Council on Environmental Quality. They rely upon the Council to bring industry knowledge and views to bear on these various problems. There have been approximately 20 reports issued by the sub-councils dealing with the various aspects of pollution caused by paper mills, detergents, utilities, and so on. The members of the Council have produced several hundred actions which have been taken voluntarily and have made several hundred more commitments as to how they are going to deal with these problems, very largely at their own expense, in order to clear up environmental difficulties.

Mr. Chairman, beginning at page 906 of these printed hearings there is a list of the council and subcouncil members. It is a lengthy list. Included therein we find such Detroit people as the Automotive Subcouncil.

Chairman: Edward N. Cole, General Motors Corporation.

Vice Chairman: L. (Lee) Iacocca, Ford Motor Company.

Members: V. E. Boyd, Chrysler Corporation; William E. Callahan, International Harvester Company; W. H. Franklin, Caterpillar Tractor Company; William V. Lunsburg, American Motors Corporation; W. D. MacDonnell, Kelsey-Hayes Company; Henry J. Nave, White Motor Corporation; Gerald H. Trautman, Greyhound Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, I read these names because these are the type of people who have been enlisted to try to do something about the various serious pollution problems. I think it would be pennywise and pound foolish to cut this small appropriation out of this bill. The committee went into it in some detail and obtained all the information it could and it became convinced that the request merited consideration by this body as well as by the other body.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DINGELL), there were—ayes 24, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

#### MARITIME ADMINISTRATION SHIP CONSTRUCTION

For construction-differential subsidy and cost of national-defense features incident to construction of ships for operation in foreign commerce (46 U.S.C. 1152, 1154); for construction-differential subsidy and cost of national-defense features incident to the reconstruction and reconditioning of ships under title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1154); and for acquisition of used ships pursuant to section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1160); to remain available until expended, \$229,687,000.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HALL. I make the point of order to that portion of the bill which starts at line 4 on page 32 through line 25 on page 33; line 1 through line 25 on page 34, and lines 1 through 22 on page 35. The point of order lies on the entire section concerning the Maritime Administration. It is predicated on the fact that there is no authorization for this portion of the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read only through line 14, page 32. It would appear to the Chair that the gentleman should limit his point of order to that portion of the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that portion of the bill between line 5 and line 14 on page 32 on the basis that the conference report has not even been submitted, and there is no authorization on this portion of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I have to say what I am going to say. I have to admit that the point of order is well taken, because the authorizing legislation, once again, has not reached the President and been signed. In fact, I believe the bill has been pending over in the other body in the Commerce Com-

mittee for some time. The figures contained in this bill include the amounts that were approved in the House, but under the circumstances, I am constrained to concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ABERNETHY). The point of order is conceded and sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

For the payment of obligations incurred for operating-differential subsidies granted on or after January 1, 1947, as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and in appropriations heretofore made to the United States Maritime Commission, \$239,145,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no contracts shall be executed during the current fiscal year by the Secretary of Commerce which will obligate the Government to pay operating-differential subsidy on more than one thousand seven hundred voyages in any one calendar year, including voyages covered by contracts in effect at the beginning of the current fiscal year.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order against this portion of the bill on exactly the same basis. The gentleman from New York is exactly correct. The bill was held up in the other body for 58 days. It is not only a question of the President not signing the bill into law, but we have not even had the final conference with this body concerning this subject, and I repeat my point of order.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I must make the same statement with regard to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ABERNETHY). The point of order is conceded and is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses necessary for research, development, fabrication, and test operation of experimental facilities and equipment; collection and dissemination of maritime technical and engineering information; studies to improve water transportation systems; \$23,750,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That transfers may be made from this appropriation to the "Vessel operations revolving fund" for losses resulting from expenses of experimental ship operations.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make exactly the same point of order to this portion of the appropriation bill, that it is an appropriation without an authorization. I shall not repeat the details. It is exactly the same situation.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I must reluctantly take the same position.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ABERNETHY). The point of order is conceded and sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for carrying into effect the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other laws administered by the Maritime Administration, including not to exceed \$1,125 for entertainment of officials of other coun-

tries when specifically authorized by the Maritime Administrator; not to exceed \$1,250 for representation allowances; \$22,210,000.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I repeat the same point of order against that portion of the bill on page 33 between lines 13 and 20.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the same statement.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ABERNETHY). The point of order is conceded and sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### MARITIME TRAINING

For training cadets as officers of the Merchant Marine at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York; not to exceed \$2,500 for contingencies for the Superintendent, United States Merchant Marine Academy, to be expended in his discretion; and uniform and textbook allowances for cadet midshipmen, at an average yearly cost of not to exceed \$475 per cadet; \$7,513,000: *Provided*, That except as herein provided for uniform and textbook allowances, this appropriation shall not be used for compensation or allowances for cadets: *Provided further*, That reimbursement may be made to this appropriation for expenses in support of activities financed from the appropriations for "Research and development", "Ship construction", and "Salaries and expenses".

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order to that portion of the bill under the section entitled "Maritime Training", between lines 21 on page 33 and line 10 on page 34.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I make the same reluctant admission.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ABERNETHY). The point of order is conceded and is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

For financial assistance to State marine schools and the students thereof as authorized by the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 622-624), \$2,200,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$801,000 is for maintenance and repair of vessels loaned by the United States for use in connection with such State marine schools, and \$1,399,000, is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority granted by said Act, to enter into contracts to make payments for expenses incurred in the maintenance and support of marine schools, and to pay allowances for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence of cadets at State marine schools.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order to the language of the bill on page 34, between lines 11 and 22.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is what happens when committees such as in this instance—this started in the House—get into this business of authorizing. We did not need this for all the years, and we had a good merchant marine, but we are in bad shape today.

Mr. Chairman, I must make the same concession with regard to the validity of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ABERNETHY). The point of order is conceded and sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SALARIES OF SUPPORTING PERSONNEL

For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal Judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, \$68,654,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, except that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the General Schedule grades (GS) 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10, as the appointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk shall conform with that of the General Schedule grades (GS) 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12, as the appointing judge shall determine, subject to review by the Judicial Conference of the United States if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge otherwise to be final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of step increases corresponding with those provided for by chapter 53 of title 5 of the United States Code, and of compensation paid for temporary assistance needed because of an emergency) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed by each of the circuit and district judges shall not exceed \$39,172 and \$30,089 per annum, respectively, except in the case of the chief judge of each circuit and the chief judge of each district court having five or more district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed \$50,689 and \$38,671 per annum, respectively.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language to be found beginning on line 21 of page 39 and extending through line 23 of page 40 as legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if the distinguished gentleman from Iowa would withhold his point of order until I make an explanation as to why we did what we did.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa reserves a point of order.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This is a pure and simple limitation. Without this there is no limitation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We will agree to that, but it is legislation on an appropriation bill intended to do something in good sense and to save money for the taxpayers. That is all it is.

Will the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. GROSS. No. I insist on the point of order because I do not believe the Appropriations Committee ought to be in the business of writing legislation.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am sure the gentleman knows what he is doing.

Mr. GROSS. Legislative committees are for that purpose.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. When these courts get together and decide to do what they please it is going to cost the taxpayers a lot of money. And it might take quite some time to get this straightened out before it is put back in the bill by the other body.

Mr. GROSS. We do have legislative committees to which matters of this kind ought to be referred.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman

from New York wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER).

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CELLER. Do I correctly understand that the point of order is made on the ground that the appropriation was not authorized?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No. The appropriations are authorized. This is a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman wishes to be heard on the point of order he should address himself to the Chair.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman believe that this is legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes, I am constrained to admit that. It has been in there for 20 or more years, to my knowledge, but there is nothing I can do about it as I stand here. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa does not mean to do what is called for here.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ABERNETHY). The point of order is conceded and sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the commission on Civil Rights, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$3,500,000.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning on line 1, page 45, Commission on Civil Rights, extending through line 5 on page 45, in that this is an appropriation without authorization.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I must concede the point of order. I have no alternative, because the authority presently in the law for appropriations for the U.S. Civil Rights Commission comes to only \$3.4 million. Therefore I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ABERNETHY). The point of order is conceded and sustained.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY OF NEW YORK

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.  
The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY of New York: Page 45, line 1, insert:

#### "COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the Commission on Civil Rights, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$3,400,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote. This would merely reinstate the amount authorized for the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of restoration of funds to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

The Appropriations Committee has reported out an appropriation that is \$460,000 less than the request of the administration. It is \$57,000 less than the amount needed to keep the Commission at its present operating level.

The Commission on Civil Rights under the leadership of Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame, has compiled an outstanding record of accomplishment. This year spokesmen for the administration have credited the Commission's study of the Federal civil rights enforcement effort as being responsible for many constructive steps recently taken by departments and agencies to put their civil rights programs in order. Over the years the Commission has seen better than 60 percent of its recommendations carried out—no mean achievement. One which cannot be disregarded.

What is being asked for the Commission on Civil Rights is not an inflated request; it has been carefully reviewed by my own Judiciary Committee when we reported favorably H.R. 7271 to increase the authorization for the Commission to \$4 million. As you know, H.R. 7271 was passed by this body on May 17, 1971, by a vote of 262 to 67.

The additional \$460,000 being requested would enable the Commission to expand its program to cover American Indian rights, a study of administration of justice in prisons and expansion of on-going programs dealing with problems of Spanish-speaking citizens, as well as other useful activities and studies.

Only yesterday, Father Hesburgh testified that four Presidents personally have told him that civil rights is the Nation's No. 1 domestic priority. Yet the money spent on the one agency of Government charged with the responsibility of pointing out the problems and appraising the national effort has been funded at a miniscule rate.

The Commission deserves the support of Congress and I urge the restoration of funds to the Commission in the amount of \$3,960,000. We should not be penny-wise and pound foolish. We dare not be stingy. Remember the stingy are always poor. We dare not be poor in foresight for the Nation's well-being.

If we are ever to achieve integration, it is through the Commission on Civil Rights. It is the gadfly that develops public opinion against discrimination and thus compels appropriate action. It is also the sparkplug of reform in civil rights. Without it, the evils of segregation remain uncovered. The Commission removes scabs over festering sores. Excesses would exist and persist. We would be thrown back into the abysmal depths of the past. Most of our Nation wish to respect civil rights, but there are segments of our population, North and South, which still are purblind and sometimes seek to feather their nests by discrimination—even the Federal, State, and municipal governments at times are guilty.

The Commission focuses the pitiless light of publicity upon the derelictions.

There is no other agency to do this. Congress, busily engaged in multifarious affairs, cannot do this essential work.

The Commission on Civil Rights has performed unique and valuable functions since its establishment in 1957. Its reports and recommendations have provided an essential basis for legislation and executive action undertaken during the past decade to assure equal rights. The House Committee on the Judiciary in particular has relied heavily on the outstanding and vigorous program of fact gathering which the Commission has performed. Its contributions in connection with the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and, most recently, the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, deserve special commendation. There is a continuing need for an independent agency objectively to appraise and report on the changing status of civil rights, to assess the progress that has been made, and to indicate the areas where the denial of equal rights persists.

We dare not hamper its work for parsimonious considerations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, is it in order at this time to seek information regarding the section starting on page 44, line 17?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman that the Clerk has passed that point in reading. However, if the gentleman would like to strike the last word and ask some questions about it, he can do that.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, accepting the sagacious suggestion, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time only for the purpose of asking the distinguished chairman whether this figure of \$9 million for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is an increase over the previous year.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will say to my distinguished friend that it is an increase. Most of the items contained in the bill, with few exceptions, have increases because of the pay raise that was granted by the Congress.

In this instance the budget request was in the amount of \$9,064,000. The committee allowed \$9 million which represents an increase of \$355,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year, but \$64,000 less than they asked for. This will carry them at about the same rate as during the past fiscal year.

Mr. COLLIER. Has there been any report to indicate whether this agency since its establishment in 1926 has accomplished anything in terms of arms control or disarmament?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes. At the present time they are engaged in the so-called SALT talks.

Mr. COLLIER. That I understand, but it seems to me in a previous bill 2 years

ago when we were considering the sale of some \$2 billion worth of arms to several foreign nations, the Arms Control Agency had no position and had not, in fact even testified on a matter so directly related to its prime function; that is the distribution of surplus arms around the world.

I just wondered if they are getting into that field after 9 years.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I cannot say to the gentleman that it is. This is to continue the Commission. We certainly do not wish to break up the SALT talks.

Mr. COLLIER. No, and I do not suggest that we do so but at least at the moment the prime function is the work on the SALT talks?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is it. Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GROSS. We have spent a good many millions of dollars on alleged disarmament and there is no disarmament. As a matter of fact we are selling more nearly \$6 billion worth of arms around the world than we are \$2 billion when you get into the every facet by which arms are being bought and sold.

Mr. COLLIER. It is indeed that situation that prompted my question.

Mr. GROSS. This is the most ludicrous operation, this disarmament agency business, at a cost of \$9 million a year.

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

Sec. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to administer any program which is funded in whole or in part from foreign currencies or credits for which a specific dollar appropriation therefore has not been made.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RONCALIO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RONCALIO: on page 57, after line 21, add:

"Sec. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for plans or studies for the construction of any public building within the District of Columbia or a 75 mile radius therefrom."

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, the history of the environmental destruction of Washington is being recorded daily in the newspapers of this city. I note for the RECORD the article in the Washington Star on May 13 which records the necessity to effect a 10-week freeze on some \$100 million of construction because of the pollution from the District's Blue Plains sewage treatment plant. In response to an existing crisis, the Department of Sanitary Engineering stopped issuing approval for builders to hook on to the city's sewer system.

On June 13, the Washington Post reported troubles at the Grosvenor Lane Nursing Home in Bethesda where the kitchen had a 3-day sewage backup.

In the same issue of the Post the Arlington County planners proposed considerable reductions in future commercial development along the county's Jefferson Davis Highway corridor, where a decade of growth—with the Federal Government playing a major part—has

brought a string of high-rise mini cities and enriched county tax coffers.

Four days later, the Capitol Hill newspaper, the Roll Call, reported on the demise of the Plaza Hotel and the plans to add yet another building to Capitol Hill, whose grassy park areas is already being crowded to make way for the James Madison Annex of the Library of Congress.

The problem is not being recognized. During the same week these items were being published, Washington Post columnist John B. Willmann decries the antiquated regulations prohibiting the construction of skyscrapers in the Capitol. Without fairly commenting on the effect of high-rise office buildings on the city's beauty, or the consequences of the added congestion, he asked, "Why not higher buildings?"

Noting the experiment of floating balloons over Washington to assess the effect of skyscrapers, he asked:

Putting balloons in the sky as indicators of the effect of taller buildings leaves something to be desired. Why not just take a quick trip to Baltimore and appraise the tall new buildings in that downtown?

I could not agree more completely. If you want to get a preview of what is happening to Washington, take a drive to Baltimore or New York and ask yourself if this is what you want happening to the Nation's Capital.

The relentless onslaught of construction will seemingly never end. Even the historic grounds of Antietam are threatened by proposed housing development. The effort is being resisted, as reported in the April 15 Washington Post story titled, "Developers Wage a War at Antietam."

The holding action in the outlying areas is even better described in the May 10 Washington Star article titled "The Day Loudoun County Said Whoa."

I think it is time for the House of Representatives to cry "Whoa" to any more Federal office construction in the Washington area.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that the gentleman from Wyoming was a member of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. RONCALIO. I am a member of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is the committee that should be handling his amendment. Why does the gentleman from Wyoming offer this amendment to this bill? The gentleman seems to be offering the same amendment to other appropriation bills. This matter has been heard and rejected, and has been rejected each time by a considerable margin. Why does the gentleman insist on offering the same amendment again? His amendment has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. RONCALIO. It has everything to do with this bill, I will say to the esteemed chairman, and if it did not then

it would have been subject to a point of order at the proper time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Not at all. Mr. RONCALIO. This is merely the same limitation that I proposed before.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I might say to the gentleman from Wyoming that I considered it a limitation, but the point is that the amendment belongs before his own Committee on Public Works.

Again I say that this same amendment was introduced only a few days ago when a bill was being handled by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY). Is that no so?

Mr. RONCALIO. My reply to the gentleman from New York is that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY), is not opposed to the amendment, to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I trust the funding amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think we all understand this. I suggest that we vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO).

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Boggs) having resumed the chair Mr. ABERNETHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9272) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

One hundred and sixty-five Members are present, not a quorum.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 337, nays 10, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—337

Abblitt	Denholm	Keating
Abernethy	Dennis	Kee
Abourezk	Derwinski	Keith
Abzug	Dickinson	King
Adams	Dingell	Kluczynski
Addabbo	Dow	Koch
Alexander	Downing	Kuykendall
Anderson, Ill.	Drinan	Kyros
Andrews, Ala.	Duncan	Landgrebe
Annunzio	du Pont	Landrum
Archer	Dwyer	Latta
Arends	Eckhardt	Leggett
Ashley	Edwards, Ala.	Lennon
Aspin	Ellberg	Lent
Aspinall	Erlenborn	Link
Badillo	Eshleman	Lloyd
Baring	Evins, Tenn.	Long, Md.
Barrett	Findley	Lujan
Begich	Fish	McClory
Belcher	Fisher	McCloskey
Bergland	Flood	McClure
Betts	Flynt	McCollister
Bevill	Foley	McDade
Biester	Ford, Gerald R.	McDonald,
Bingham	Forsythe	Mich.
Blackburn	Fountain	McEwen
Blatnik	Frelinghuysen	McFay
Boggs	Frenzel	McKay
Boland	Frey	McMillan
Bolling	Fulton, Pa.	MacDonald,
Bow	Fuqua	Mass.
Brademas	Galifanakis	Mahon
Brasco	Gallagher	Mailliard
Brinkley	Garmatz	Mann
Brooks	Gaydos	Mathias, Calif.
Broomfield	Gettys	Matsunaga
Brotzman	Glaime	Mazzoli
Brown, Mich.	Gibbons	Meeds
Brown, Ohio	Gonzalez	Meicher
Broyhill, N.C.	Grasso	Michel
Broyhill, Va.	Gray	Mikva
Buchanan	Green, Oreg.	Miller, Calif.
Burke, Fla.	Green, Pa.	Miller, Ohio
Burke, Mass.	Gude	Mills, Ark.
Burleson, Tex.	Hagan	Minish
Burlison, Mo.	Haley	Mink
Burton	Hamilton	Minshall
Byrne, Pa.	Hammer-	Mitchell
Byrnes, Wis.	schmidt	Mizell
Byron	Hanley	Monagan
Caffery	Hanna	Montgomery
Camp	Hansen, Idaho	Moorhead
Carey, N.Y.	Hansen, Wash.	Morgan
Carney	Harrington	Morse
Carter	Harsha	Mosher
Casey, Tex.	Harvey	Moss
Cederberg	Hastings	Murphy, Ill.
Celler	Hathaway	Murphy, N.Y.
Chamberlain	Hébert	Myers
Chappell	Hechler, W. Va.	Natcher
Chisholm	Heckler, Mass.	Nelsen
Clancy	Helstoski	Nichols
Clausen,	Henderson	Nix
Don H.	Hicks, Wash.	Obey
Cleveland	Hillis	O'Hara
Collier	Hoamer	O'Konski
Collins, Ill.	Hull	O'Neill
Collins, Tex.	Hungate	Passman
Colmer	Hunt	Patten
Conte	Hutchinson	Pelly
Conyers	Ichord	Pepper
Corman	Jacobs	Perkins
Cotter	Jarman	Pike
Coughlin	Johnson, Calif.	Pirnie
Daniel, Va.	Johnson, Pa.	Poage
Daniels, N.J.	Jonas	Poff
Danielson	Jones, Ala.	Powell
Davis, Ga.	Jones, N.C.	Preyer, N.C.
Davis, S.C.	Jones, Tenn.	Price, Ill.
de la Garza	Karth	Price, Tex.
Delaney	Kastenmeier	Fryor, Ark.
Dellenback	Kazen	Pucinski

Quile	Shipley	Thompson, N.J.
Quillen	Shoup	Thomson, Wis.
Rallsback	Shriver	Thone
Randall	Sikes	Udall
Rees	Sisk	Van Deerlin
Reid, Ill.	Skubitz	Vander Jagt
Reid, N.Y.	Slack	Vanik
Reuss	Smith, Calif.	Veysey
Riegle	Smith, Iowa	Vigorito
Roberts	Smith, N.Y.	Waggonner
Robinson, Va.	Snyder	Wampler
Robison, N.Y.	Spence	Whalen
Rodino	Springer	Whalley
Roe	Stafford	White
Rogers	Staggers	Whitehurst
Rooney, N.Y.	Stanton	Whitten
Rooney, Pa.	J. William	Widnall
Rosenthal	Stanton	Wiggins
Rostenkowski	James V.	Williams
Roush	Steed	Wilson
Roy	Steele	Charles H.
Roybal	Steiger, Wis.	Winn
Ruppe	Stephens	Wolf
Ryan	Stokes	Wright
St Germain	Stratton	Wyatt
Sandman	Stubblefield	Wydler
Sarbanes	Stuckey	Wyman
Satterfield	Sullivan	Yates
Scheuer	Symington	Yatron
Schwengel	Talcott	Young, Tex.
Scott	Teague, Calif.	Zablocki
Sebellius	Teague, Tex.	Zion
Seiberling	Terry	

## NAYS—10

Bennett	Kyl	Saylor
Dorn	Mathis, Ga.	Schmitz
Gross	Rarick	
Hall	Roncallo	

## NOT VOTING—84

Anderson, Calif.	Esch	Mayne
Anderson, Tenn.	Evans, Colo.	Metcalfe
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fascell	Mills, Md.
Ashbrook	Flowers	Mollohan
Baker	Ford	Nedzi
Bell	William D.	Patman
Blaggi	Fraser	Pettis
Blanton	Fulton, Tenn.	Peyser
Bray	Goldwater	Pickle
Cabell	Goodling	Podell
Clark	Griffin	Purcell
Clawson, Del.	Griffiths	Rangel
Clay	Grover	Rhodes
Conable	Gubser	Rousselot
Crane	Halpern	Runnels
Culver	Hawkins	Ruth
Davis, Wis.	Hays	Scherle
Dellums	Hicks, Mass.	Schneebell
Dent	Hogan	Steiger, Ariz.
Devine	Hollifield	Taylor
Diggs	Horton	Thompson, Ga.
Donohue	Howard	Tiernan
Dowdy	Kemp	Ullman
Dulski	Long, La.	Waldie
Edmondson	McCormack	Ware
Edwards, Calif.	McCulloch	Watts
Edwards, La.	McKevitt	Wilson, Bob
	McKinney	Wyllie
	Madden	Young, Fla.
	Martin	Zwach

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.  
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Hogan.  
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Bob Wilson.  
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Wylie.  
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Conable.  
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Ashbrook.  
 Mr. Blanton with Mr. Mayne.  
 Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Halpern.  
 Mr. Runnels with Mr. Scherle.  
 Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Baker.  
 Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Horton.  
 Mr. Ullman with Mr. Pettis.  
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Peyser.  
 Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. McKinney.  
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. McKevitt.  
 Mr. Fascell with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.  
 Mr. Taylor with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.  
 Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Kemp.  
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Bell.  
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Bray.

CXVII—1378—Part 17

Mr. Griffin with Mr. Crane.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Ware.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Young of Florida.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Pickle with Del Clawson.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Ruth.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Schneebell.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Goodling.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Mills of Maryland.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Delluns.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Metcalfe.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Hawkins.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7016, OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1972, AND PROVIDING FOR ITS CONSIDERATION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House on the bill (H.R. 7016) making appropriations for the Office of Education and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes, may have until midnight Monday next to file the conference report and that it may be in order on Wednesday next to consider the conference report in the House.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5257, CHILD NUTRITION

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5257) to extend the school breakfast and special food programs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so not for the purpose of objecting, which I shall not, but I must admit my concern over the continued use of unanimous consent to bring up conference re-

ports in violation of the rules of the House which were passed last year.

I take this particular reservation at this time, merely to state my own very real reservations about this particular type of procedure being used as a means of bypassing the ability of the House to have the 3 legislative days for the purpose of considering conference reports. I shall not object, and shall, in fact, withdraw my reservation of objection, but I want to put the House on notice that I think it does a disservice to all of us as Members of the House who are not then given as full an opportunity as the rules envision by having conference reports lay over for a period of time so that we might give them further consideration. I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 22, 1971.)

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 5257 contains in essence the text contained in H.R. 5257 as it passed the House by a vote of 331 to 0 on May 17 and the text of H.R. 9098 as it passed the House without a dissenting vote last Monday.

I say substantially the text of those two bills because I feel that the conference has sustained the major thrust of the House position on these two measures.

The conference report provides only \$35 million from section 32 funds to be used for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, as contrasted with the \$50 million provided in H.R. 5257 as it passed the House. As it passed the House these funds were to be expended only for free and reduced price meals to needy children in schools and service institutions. With respect to the use of these funds the Senate language was employed and they may be used for any purpose authorized by the National School Lunch Act.

There are varying estimates on the amount of money that will be necessary to meet the needs in the current fiscal year of school systems who have developed a shortage of funds in meeting school lunch program costs. The direct communication that we have had with school systems indicates that the shortage in 12 States amounts to approximately \$22 million. It was the collective judgment of the conference that the \$35

million would meet the most pressing needs at this time.

And I should say at this time that the conference report we bring back is a unanimous one.

The \$100 million provided for fiscal year 1972 in H.R. 5257 from section 32 funds was retained in the conference report as well as the major purpose for which such funds may be expended—that is to carry out those provisions of the National School Lunch Act specifically relating to the service of free and reduced price meals to needy children in schools and service institutions.

The conference report retains the provisions of the House bill which authorized the carryover of the funds into succeeding fiscal years.

It will be recalled that the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 5257 extended section 13 providing for special food service programs for 2 years. Section 13 was due to expire on June 30 of this year. The conference report retains the 2-year extension.

It will be recalled that the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 5257 extended permanently the authorization for the school breakfast program contained in the Child Nutrition Act. That program was also scheduled to expire on June 30 of this year. The conference report eliminates the permanent authorization but extends the breakfast program for 2 years. Thus, its authorization will coincide with section 13 of the National School Lunch Act and will be authorized until June 30, 1973.

The authorization in the House amendment to the Senate amendment for the breakfast program was \$25 million for each fiscal year and the authorization for the special food service program under section 13 of the National School Lunch Act was \$32 million for each year. These authorization ceilings have been retained in the conference report.

The school breakfast program was first authorized in the Child Nutrition Act in 1966. The Congress extended it in 1968. Mr. Speaker, this program was conceived and developed in the face of growing evidence that millions of children were attending school hungry—hungry because families lacked the income to furnish children a breakfast.

The evidence disclosed to the Congress at that time clearly illustrated that malnutrition and the undernourishment of children impeded their educational progress. Hunger was just another of the several impediments to the disadvantaged child's being able to successfully enter into a learning situation in the classroom. The success of the breakfast program has been demonstrated time and time again in testimony provided the committee in hearings conducted by it when the program was extended in 1968 and in hearings conducted currently by the General Subcommittee on Education.

With respect to the breakfast program the Senate amendment provided in effect that the Secretary of Agriculture could authorize financial assistance up to 100 percent of the operating costs of a program—instead of the 80 percent now specified in the law.

Contrasted with this the House amendment to the Senate amendment repealed existing provisions for the special treatment in circumstances of severe need as well as the provision that funds would be used to reimburse schools for the cost of obtaining foods and provided instead for advanced payments at such rates per meal as the Secretary shall prescribe based on the type and cost of the meals provided including the cost of labor used in preparation of the meals.

The conference report adopts the Senate provision but modifies it in line with the House language providing for prepayment to schools in lieu of reimbursements.

I want to stress at this point that the conferees unanimously felt that the Secretary of Agriculture has been unduly restrictive in using his authority to pay up to 80 percent of the operating costs. It is the intent of the conference that the Secretary will be more liberal in recognizing circumstances of need and fully utilizing his authority to pay all of the operating costs in such cases.

In stressing this point our objective is to eliminate those cases of millions of needy children not being reached because of the lack of any lunch facilities or lunch program in the schools.

The conferees adopted a provision in the Senate amendment not contained in the House amendment to the Senate amendment prescribing the same eligibility requirements for free and reduced price meals in the breakfast program as in the school lunch program. The conference report also adopts a Senate provision authorizing the Secretary to use up to \$20 million of section 32 funds for a supplemental feeding program in fiscal year 1972.

In the House amendment to the Senate amendment a third criterion was added to provisions of the school breakfast program to be used in the selection of schools for participation. This criterion would bring in those schools in which there is a special need for improving the nutrition and dietary practices of the children attending. While the Senate accepted this additional criterion it limited the application of the criterion to those children of working mothers and children from low-income families having such special needs.

The House amendment to the Senate amendment which amended section 13 of the National School Lunch Act providing the local matching requirements for the special feeding program could be made up in "cash or kind fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services" was modified by deleting the word plant but otherwise is carried in the conference report.

In essence these are the differences between the Senate amendments to H.R. 5257 and the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

In summary I would urge my colleagues to approve the conference report so that the school breakfast program due to expire on June 30 may be continued; so that urgently needed funds for the National School Lunch Act for the current fiscal year may be provided; and so that the expiring special food service

program due also to expire on June 30 may be extended.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the report of the conference committee on the bill to amend the National School Lunch Act. I would particularly commend the members of the conference from both houses for recognizing the urgent need to provide funds for this year's summer lunch program. The report authorizes the expenditure by the Secretary of Agriculture of 35 million dollars of section 32 funds in fiscal 1971. This provision will, thus, make available, immediately, adequate funds to support the summer lunch program which is to begin next week. The report is most gratifying in light of the shocking decision by the Department of Agriculture to virtually eliminate these programs by refusing to provide sufficient funds. In my city of Chicago, which plans to feed more than 50,000 children per day, the Department announced a cut of 90 percent. About \$26 million is necessary to provide nutritious lunches for hundreds of thousands of needy youngsters and this bill will now authorize such an expenditure. The need is immediate. Many cities have planned complete summer youth activities while continually being assured that the money for lunches would be available. The citizens of these communities depend on this program to provide sorely needed nutrition for children who would otherwise be deprived.

America cannot, in good conscience, deny any of its people, especially its children, the right to such a basic need as good nutrition.

I therefore, urge speedy approval of the conference report so that there will be no further delay in assuring the full operation of the summer lunch program. I trust the Department of Agriculture will then see fit to restore the necessary funds to maintain this important program.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to give my strongest support to passage of H.R. 5257, which provides funds and authority to extend the school breakfast and special food programs for needy children throughout this country.

Many feeding programs are well established and await only these funds to continue the work of feeding the hungry children in our Nation. For example, New York State has applied for \$4 million, \$3.5 million of which would go directly into New York City programs. In human terms, this \$3.5 million means that 100,000 children will be fed through day care centers, special recreation programs, and settlement houses. It also means jobs for the 150 people employed to run these programs. We cannot afford to let these people down.

I am greatly disturbed by the fact that there has been some suggestion that the Secretary of Agriculture is willing to spend only \$32 million of the \$35 million that the Congress is willing to appropriate. For that \$3 million of available funds, enough to feed almost all of New York City's hungry children, should go unspent seems to me unconscionable. I deplore this insensitivity on

the part of the Department of Agriculture and urge that all the available money be used to assist our hungry children.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CORRECTING ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 5257, NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 346) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 346

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 5257) to extend the school breakfast and special food programs, the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to make the following correction, namely, after the enacting clause insert the following: "That the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1752) is amended by adding at the end of the Act the following new section:"

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6444) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, to provide a 10-percent increase in annuities, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 2, strike out "section (a)" and insert "section 5(a)".

Page 4, line 14, strike out " " December 31, 1971," and insert " " June 30, 1972,".

Page 4, line 22, strike out " " December 31, 1971," and insert " " June 30, 1972,".

Page 5, line 12, strike out "1972." and insert "1973,".

Page 5, line 13, strike out "1972" and insert "1973,".

Page 5, line 14, strike out "1972," and insert "1973,".

Page 5, after line 18, insert:

"(c) Section 6 of Public Law 91-377 is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1972' each time that date appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1973'."

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman if he will explain the meaning of what the Senate amendments would do.

Mr. STAGGERS. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the House bill provided a 10 percent increase in railroad retirement benefits, expiring June 30, 1971, the same date previously set for the 15 percent increase to expire.

The House bill also extended for 6 months—until December 31, 1971—the date for filing a final report by the Commission on Railroad Retirement.

The Senate bill extends the date for filing the report to June 30, 1972, and also extends the duration of the 15 and 10 percent increases to June 30, 1973.

Mr. SPRINGER. The purpose, first, is to extend the time for the Commission to make the study. The second purpose is to increase the percentage, which we considered previously on the floor, and to come out at the same time.

Mr. STAGGERS. The gentleman is correct.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDING PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO EXTEND STUDENT LOAN AND SCHOLARSHIP PROVISIONS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7736) to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for 1 year the student loan and scholarship provisions of titles VII and VIII of such act, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, after line 6, insert:

"TRAINEESHIPS FOR ADVANCED TRAINING OF PROFESSIONAL NURSES

"SEC. 5. Section 821(a) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out 'for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971' and inserting in lieu thereof 'each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and the next' fiscal year."

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the chairman explain what the amendment will do?

Mr. STAGGERS. I shall be happy to explain.

The House bill contains a straight 1-year extension of all provisions relating to student loans and scholarships under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act and the Nurse Training Act.

The Senate adopted all features of the House bill, and added a straight 1-year extension of existing authority for traineeships for training teachers of nursing and nurse specialists.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is the only addition by the Senate amendment?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right. This is the only change in the House bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority whip for the program for next week, and any additional program for this week.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, there is no further legislative business for today. Upon conclusion of reading the program I will ask unanimous consent that the House go over until Monday.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day. There are no bills.

For consideration on Monday there is H.R. 9271, the Treasury-Postal Service appropriation bill for fiscal year 1972.

On Tuesday there is scheduled for consideration the Interior Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1972.

On Wednesday there are scheduled for consideration S. 1700, Treasury borrowing from Federal Reserve, subject to a rule being granted; and H.R. 9382, the HUD, space, science, veterans appropriation bill for fiscal year 1972.

On Thursday there are scheduled H.R. 8629, the Health Manpower Training Act, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate; and H.R. 8630, Nurses Training Act, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

The Fourth of July recess will be from the conclusion of business on Thursday, July 1, until noon on Tuesday, July 6.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the distinguished acting majority leader respond to one or two questions?

It is possible there could be some controversial matters, aside from the appropriation bill, coming to the floor on Monday; is that correct?

Mr. O'NEILL. The draft bill, as I understand it, is in the engrossment stage in the Senate. It is also my understanding that the Committee on Armed Services is going to meet tomorrow, to ask on Monday that it be sent to conference. There is a possibility, I suppose, that action could be offered with respect to the draft bill on Monday, and that is very controversial.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. One other question. I note on Thursday there are two bills from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce listed. I have been asked by some Members whether there would be any business on Thursday.

I gather from the whip notice in the program as announced by the gentleman from Massachusetts that there will be business and those will be the bills before the House on that day.

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the distinguished minority whip this question: H.R. 8629 and H.R. 8630 are very important bills. I will concede that. However, I believe that our committee brought those two bills out unanimously. I take it that there is one who did not vote for them, I hate to say, for which I apologize, but we could dispose of both of those bills, I believe, provided we did not have rollcalls on them, although we may have them. I think we could dispose of both of those bills in an hour. It is my understanding from talking to some of the Members that the original calendar had said that at the close of business on Wednesday there would be no further business until the following Tuesday. This is a change in the schedule.

Now, I am personally willing to be here on Thursday, as far as I am concerned, but a lot of people have made plans, apparently, to leave Wednesday evening. I can tell you that if you want to schedule these bills on Tuesday or Wednesday and, let us say, come in at 11 o'clock, I will guarantee to the gentleman that we can dispose of both of those bills in an hour. I am just asking the majority whip at this time if it is not possible to schedule those two bills on one or the other of those two days.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would have to question the accuracy of the statement that we originally planned to recess for the Fourth of July weekend on Wednesday next.

Mr. SPRINGER. I apologize if that is not true, but that was my understanding.

Mr. O'NEILL. The program is as announced with the provision that any further program will be announced later. In the event that we would be able to conclude our business on Wednesday night, I am sure that everybody would be happy.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the majority whip, is it not possible, if we came in at 11 o'clock on Tuesday, which would give us an extra hour, if we cannot do it on Wednesday?

Mr. O'NEILL. I am sure the leadership on both sides of the House will be happy to discuss the matter on Monday.

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

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

Mr. SCHMITZ. Is it the intention of the leadership to reschedule the health manpower bill on Tuesday or Wednesday? Because I do not want anyone to be under the illusion that there will not be a rollcall vote on that one.

Mr. O'NEILL. I have read the program for next week, and that is how it stands at the present time.

Mr. SCHMITZ. I just want everyone to be on notice that there will be a vote on that bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would anticipate that, and I am sure, in view of the gentleman's views on it, we would expect it.

Mr. O'NEILL. Let me say this. I have given the program for the week, but as it is subject to change as I announced.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I only raised this question because I think we ought to be as clear as possible on the prospect of finishing this business as it is scheduled. I am agreeable either way, but the sooner we can clarify it—and Monday would be ample time—the better. However, this schedule is fine with me. I think we ought to live by it until it is clarified.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JUNE 28, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday, June 28.

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

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that for the Independence Day holiday?

Mr. O'NEILL. No; that is for next week. I asked unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next—

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

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

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CALL OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR AND FOR MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON TUESDAY, JULY 6, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, July 6, 1971, it shall be in order to consider business under clause 4, rule XIII, the consent calendar rule, and that it shall also be in order on that date for the speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules notwithstanding the provisions of clause I, rule XXVII.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this all about?

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the call of the consent calendar and suspensions would normally fall on Monday of that week. This unanimous-consent request is only to put them over until the following day.

Mr. GROSS. Until July 5?

Mr. O'NEILL. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Consent and suspensions?

Mr. O'NEILL. Yes. To put them over from the 5th to the 6th. Tuesday is the 6th. This is to make them in order on the first Tuesday instead of the first Monday, as the rule provides. The rule provides that they be considered on the first Monday and we are asking that they be put over until Tuesday of that week.

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

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

There was no objection.

#### DEDICATION OF NEW SYNAGOGUE IN SYRACUSE, N.Y.

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, I had the great privilege of attending the dedication of a new synagogue in Syracuse, N.Y., Temple Adath Yeshurun. It was a beautiful, moving ceremony, rich in the tradition of the ancient Hebrew faith, and alive with the spirit that is American Jewry in 1971.

The temple itself is a magnificent edifice. But what it represents is more imposing than all the bricks and mortar in the world; it represents the continuity of a religious heritage.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Rabbi Irwin Hyman, delivered the dedication

message to his congregation and to the others of us assembled for the occasion. It was a simple and eloquent message, which I would like to share with my colleagues today.

**DEDICATION OF NEW TEMPLE ADATH YESHURUN**  
(By Rabbi Irwin Hyman)

It is with a feeling of great joy and exaltation that we assemble here today marking the first realization and fulfillment of our dream. It is a moment of great thanksgiving as we offer our thanks to the Almighty for having enabled us to reach this moment.

We are thankful for the legacy of freedom in this our beloved land, the United States of America, where men may worship as their conscience prompts them in contrast to the lot of our brethren in the Soviet Union where spiritual oppression is rampant. Here we build synagogues; there synagogues are being forcefully closed. We associate ourselves with our co-religionists behind the iron curtain, and affirm our solidarity with them in their yearning to leave the land of intolerance for the state of Israel, where they can live as free men and women. Every synagogue built on these shores is in ten-fold compensation for the synagogues destroyed in our generation by the totalitarian regimes in Europe.

We offer our gratitude for the good fortune of having been blessed with men and women of vision, dedication and faith who served as lay leaders and workers both in the past and in the present, and for the sensitive, energetic youth which comprise a large part of our congregation, and who are the guarantors of a creative and fruitful future.

Our large membership have demonstrated that where a sacred fire and eternal flame reside in the hearts of selfless people, determination and will, dedication and sacrifice can triumph over seemingly insurmountable obstacles, and make the impossible seem possible and fulfillment of dreams a reality.

Our House of God is a reservoir of idealism—a citadel of faith, performing the task of awakening the soul of our people in this community. It will be a tower of strength; it will be an armory of the spirit, the source of religious inspiration against the invasion of anxiety and chaos from the outside world, a schoolhouse for all ages and all persons.

Our synagogue sanctuary with its unique blending of material, design, and art, now takes a place of honor among the other houses of worship in our city, and speaks to the larger society of men of all creed and races in the affirmation of faith. We therefore welcome wholeheartedly our honored guests from all walks of life, all faiths and creeds, who grace this occasion by their presence, and with whom I have had the privilege of working shoulder to shoulder in civic and religious causes in our community. It has been the Judeo-Christian tradition and the mutual understanding and friendship that has obtained among all of us that has made this city great and a desirable place for ourselves and our children. On behalf of the temple, I pledge continued cooperation among us in the years and decades ahead.

We have taken a parcel of earth and made it hallowed ground; we have used common space and transformed it into a sanctuary. This affirms that man's role is to sanctify every corner of life. I recall the biblical strip of barren earth where our ancestor Jacob slept one night with a rock for a pillow. Alone, facing an unknown future, he dreamed of a ladder which linked heaven and earth. And in his dreams the Lord promised him: Behold I am with you and will protect you wherever you go. This dream and this promise added a new dimension to Jacob's life. Awakening, he said: Surely the Lord is in this place. This is none other than the House of God.

In the spirit of Jacob's dream of a link between heaven and earth, on another strip

of ground and in another land, we too have built this our sanctuary, a House of God for all people. Through our lives, as individuals or as a corporate group, may we pledge to make this site sacred soil, so that all who pass may say: Surely the Lord is in this place; this is a House of God.

The dedication today is of singular importance because it presents us with the experience of a heightened spiritual consciousness. It will remind us of a divine dimension of ourselves, of a feeling to strive continually to become something more than we are. It will confer upon us new impetus of becoming a blessing and a light unto all people.

Our new facilities afford our members and their families the opportunity for educational, religious, and social enrichment, a strengthened commitment to our hallowed religious heritage, so that it may continue to be a guiding influence for us, for our children, and for all generations yet to be enriched as we have been.

May God grant us all good health that we may use our new temple for satisfying personal fulfillment and for the greater glory of His holy name. Thus we can proudly proclaim as did the psalmist: This is the day the Lord has made; let us rejoice and be glad in it!

**ADMINISTRATION HOLDS UP PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM AS UNEMPLOYMENT RATE RISES**

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

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. Speaker, to millions of families throughout the United States, the most important news today is very personal. Their breadwinner is out of work.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that last month unemployment rate was 6.2 percent—the highest it has been in 9 years. Translated from percentages, the figure means that 5,217,000 would-be workers are without jobs in this country.

The statistics do not begin to tell the story of the personal impact and hardship imposed on these men and women and their families. The statistics give only a broad hint of the great damage and harm inflicted upon our economy, upon our entire society, and on each and every American citizen as an individual.

And yet, much of this individual and national suffering from the plague of unemployment is totally unnecessary.

Hundreds of thousands of new jobs—possibly millions—would be created in a chain reaction if our national administration would only listen to the voice of the American people, speaking through their representatives in Congress.

Congress has authorized the expenditure of \$12.8 billion for various Public Works throughout the country. President Richard Nixon, for some mysterious reason, has seen fit to freeze these funds.

While these funds remain frozen, the life savings of the unemployed are melting away. Jobless skilled craftsmen without work find themselves unable to meet their mortgage payments or buy shoes for their children. Young people grow bitter against our American system be-

cause they cannot find jobs. Merchants complain about falling sales because millions of people have no money to spend even for necessities.

The Cleveland AFL-CIO Federation of Labor, which speaks for 150,000 members and their families, has adopted a resolution accusing our national administration of political chicanery in the freezing of the \$12.8 billion. The organization charges that the administration is scheming to release these funds somewhat closer to the 1972 election, so that an atmosphere of prosperity would prevail as the November election date approaches.

I hope this labor organization is mistaken. I hope that our national administration is too dedicated to the best interests of the American people to even think of playing politics with such a serious matter as employment, unemployment, the health and vigor of our economy, and the well-being of our people.

I sincerely hope that the White House, within the next few days, will begin releasing these frozen funds so that millions of Americans go to work, building projects which will increase our real national wealth.

I also hope that President Nixon will decide to sign the \$2 billion accelerated public works bill passed by both Houses of Congress. The bill was adopted in response to popular demand that immediate action be taken to end the costly blight of unemployment.

The American people expect, and have a right to expect, that they can depend on their Government to do what is necessary to maintain a strong national economy.

The 5,217,000 unemployed—including 42,000 in my own Cleveland area—would rather have jobs than welfare payments.

**THE ECONOMY**

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

Mr. MYERS, Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the gentleman from Ohio made reference to the fact that unemployment is very high in this country, and we all acknowledge that it is. But he assessed the blame on the President of the United States for contributing to it, which I think is very unfair. No administration, regardless of which political party, condones or wants to see a high unemployment.

There are some facts which have gone ignored here. I include in the RECORD at this point an article that appeared in the Indianapolis Star sometime ago:

**JOBLESS MEN OFFERED \$120-A-WEEK WORK—THEY TURN IT DOWN**

(By Thomas R. Keating)

One morning last week, a dozen men were offered jobs while they stood in line to draw unemployment compensation checks from the state unemployment office—and all refused the work.

The job they were offered—as a concrete worker—promised to be a hard one, much harder than doing nothing. But then the pay was approximately triple what one can make doing nothing these days.

The concrete job would have paid \$3 an hour—\$120 for a 40-hour week.

The maximum for state unemployment checks is only \$40 a week, with \$3 extra for every dependent up to four.

Yet, no one wanted the job.

Why?

The reasons varied, but basically most of the men admitted the work was just plain too hard and they weren't that hungry yet.

No one seemed too excited about the fact they were out of work and no one saw any particular logic in accepting a job, even at triple the unemployment money, when they could get by doing nothing.

Many of the men offered jobs said they were "only temporarily laid off." To many, who were skilled laborers or white collar workers, the prospect of a concrete job obviously was distasteful.

Some of the men explained their reluctance to take the concrete job by saying that they had "nesteggs" or supplemental income from unions or employers.

A husky 28-year-old father of three, who was laid off recently at Detroit Diesel, Division of General Motors, said his family could "get along real well for a while."

He said he expected to be back at work long before the unemployment checks ran out. The checks can be drawn for a maximum of 26 weeks.

"This is kind of like a vacation for me" he said with a sad smile. "My wife has all kinds of plans for me to get some work done around the house that I've put off for a long time."

Another man in his late 40s said he didn't really feel up to the heavy work involved in the concrete job.

"What if I had a hernia or a heart attack," he asked. "Then what? I'd be out of work even longer."

"You gotta be kidding, man. That concrete work is for the grunts," said a young man who measured about 6-feet, 3-inches to the top of his be-bop cap.

"I done that stuff in the summers when I was a kid. Not again. Come home all dirty at nights and too tired for my women. No thanks, man, no thanks."

Another man, in his middle 30s, said he had always been an office worker and that concrete work would be too much of a comedown.

"I don't mean that I look down on men who have that kind of job," he added hurriedly. "But it's just not for me, even on a temporary basis."

"I have more training than to do something like that. I mean, I guess it sounds like I'm afraid to get my hands dirty," he said holding up clean hands. "But, that's not it entirely. Maybe that's part of it, but pouring concrete is tough work and I feel like I deserve better."

A gaunt man, who admitted only to being "over 40," said he had tried hard to find work for five weeks before filing for unemployment compensation.

"I suppose there is still some stigma attached to taking money for not working," he said. "But it's not easy for a man my age to pick up a good job. I can't do that concrete work. I wouldn't last a day."

"I don't think times are all that bad, even though I have been laid off," said a well dressed man, about 30 years old.

"I'm just going to take it easy for a while and play some golf and watch a lot of football games. I'm pretty sure to get my job back when things pick up, so I'm not worrying. Life's too short."

"Times have been pretty good and I've got some money in the bank and no big bills or wife to worry about."

"So what the hell, why sweat it?"

The article refers to men, standing in the unemployment line to receive unem-

ployment checks, who turned down an opportunity to work for three times the amount that they would receive through the unemployment process. They were able, capable men who did not want to work and who would rather receive unemployment. Inland Steel Co., in the Calumet region of Indiana, has advised me they would like to employ 1,000 men today. They will pay them their transportation from any place in the United States to Gary, Ind., for employment, and there would be good jobs that do not require any special skills or experiences. But they cannot hire the 1,000 people they would like to employ. Other steel mills have similar situations. I realize that there are some in the Nation that will work, but cannot find a job of their choosing. At the same time, there are many unfilled job opportunities available to those that would rather work than live from unemployment checks.

Massive public works programs, at this time, are not the solution. That is only temporary relief similar to giving aspirin for a headache. It leaves the real basic problem unsolved.

Blaming the President or anyone for not wasting large public works programs does nothing toward solving the unemployment situation in our country.

#### THE SHARPSTOWN FOLLIES—ACT V

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have told the House about the incredible handling of the case of Frank W. Sharp by the Department of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, I accuse the Justice Department of deliberate, conscious and gross mishandling of this entire case.

I shall show this afternoon that while the Assistant Attorney General, Will Wilson, may be a personally honest man, his superiors at the Department of Justice handled the Sharp case in a manner deliberately calculated to assure that Sharp never came to a genuine trial, for fear that this would embarrass Mr. Wilson, who had known Frank Sharp well, and who had a very substantial interest in a company he arranged for Sharp to acquire.

I shall show how the U.S. attorney for the Houston district inexplicably brought the case of Mr. Sharp before a judge who also had known and worked for Mr. Sharp, and who inexplicably failed to disqualify himself from passing sentence on the case. The U.S. attorney knew, and it is incredible to think that he did not know, or that Deputy Attorney General Kleindeinst did not know, that the judge hearing the Sharp case had, in fact once been an attorney representing Sharp, just as Will Wilson had once been an attorney representing Sharp.

The U.S. attorney accuses me of having no knowledge of the case, and says I have no right to speak. Well, the Justice Department seems to be telling everybody in the country what to say or not to say these days. If anybody is ignorant, it is Mr. Farris, the prosecuting attorney.

I accuse him, and I accuse the Justice Department, of incompetence, deliberate deception, and outright fraud. Mr. Sharp has been exposed, and now I propose to expose to the House the machinations, the falsehoods, the conscious malfeasance, and the calculated mishandling of this entire matter.

I know that my colleagues are aware that bungling is not new to this particular Justice Department administration. Mediocrity and stupidity are explainable and understandable. Fraud is not either explainable or pardonable. And I accuse the Justice Department of just that—plain, outright, deliberate fraud.

#### U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL IGNORES NARCOTICS VIOLATIONS

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, reports that I am receiving from the dope festival at McCrea, La., indicate a showing of 25,000 to 30,000 vehicles and a crowd of possibly 70,000, with even more expected over this weekend.

It is common knowledge to all that every caliber of dope and narcotics is being sold, distributed, and used openly. Yet, the Federal narcotics officers and law enforcement people on the spot are doing nothing to enforce the narcotics laws of our Nation. Perhaps they intend to sit back and let the situation get worse so they can scream for more tax money and additional personnel.

The Southern States are literally crawling with lawyers and race experts from the Attorney General's office. We in the South are constantly harassed and investigated for every kind of two-bit civil rights charge, but we cannot find one Federal official who will take the bull by the horns and enforce the narcotics laws of our Nation to put a stop to the McCrea narcotics traffic.

I use this forum to demand that Attorney General Mitchell immediately issue orders to enforce the narcotics laws of our Nation. If he needs any factual data, all he needs to do is to look at the detailed reporting in the Baton Rouge States Times, the Morning Advocate of Baton Rouge, the New Orleans Times-Picayune, or even the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

How many more young people must be destroyed before Federal action is taken against narcotics by using the laws on the books and men on the taxpayers' payroll?

I include a copy of my letter to Attorney General Mitchell and Mr. Ingersoll of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs following my remarks at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1971.  
Re "Celebration of Life" Rock Festival, McCrea, La., Pointe Coupee Parish.  
HON. JOHN N. MITCHELL,  
Attorney General,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The reports I have received from Louisiana on this so-called "rock and roll festival" indicate that a crowd of over seventy thousand have al-

ready congregated and the "big" festivities are not scheduled until this weekend.

My reason for writing is to advise you that narcotics of every description are reportedly being sold, distributed, and used by these young people. To date, I am advised that there has been no action by any federal law enforcement authorities to enforce the narcotics laws of the United States. If you are wanting on facts and details, you need only read the detailed accounts in this morning's New Orleans Times-Picayune or the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

I am not persuaded by excuses that you do not have the funds and manpower to enforce narcotics laws. This area is literally crawling with federal men who claim to be with the Justice Department, but are doing nothing because they profess to be racial experts and not interested in narcotics violations. If the Administration is concerned about the racial proportion of students in Southern schools, they certainly should be interested in protecting our young people from the threat of drugs.

I urge use of the laws on the books and the men now in your service before more young people are infected and contaminated by this threat to their generation.

I demand that you as the Attorney General immediately order a shut down of all narcotics traffic and sales at the McCrea, Louisiana shindig.

I am not interested in explanations as to why your office hasn't acted. I only ask that your office take action . . . and now.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. BARICK,  
Member of Congress.

#### THE SHARPSTOWN FOLLIES—ACT V

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, if the great Sharpstown scandal were merely a State or local problem, I would not dwell upon it at such great length. If it were a simple matter, I would not report to you on it in any great detail. But Sharpstown is a scandal that reaches far beyond anything I had ever imagined. This case grows curiouser and curiouser, and I feel compelled to report all I know about it.

On the surface, Sharpstown is just an ordinary scandal, though of magnificent proportions. But it is far more than that.

I will not go into all the ramifications, because it would take any arm of accountants and lawyers to unravel all the great scheme, and its component parts. In its essentials, however, it will help you understand the case if I provide you some background.

Frank Sharp made a fortune in real estate development in the rapidly growing city of Houston; he eventually built a subdivision big enough to be called a town, and in typical Texas style he called it Sharpstown.

Sharp also set up a bank in Sharpstown, appropriately enough called the Sharpstown State Bank.

Later on Sharp acquired other companies, most notably National Bankers Life Insurance Co. In the meanwhile he gained a considerable reputation for philanthropy, and even was made an honorary member of the Jesuit order; this was extraordinary for the Jesuits, and even more extraordinary that the

high tribute was made to Sharp, a Protestant.

But all this magnificence vanished during the past winter.

Frank Sharp, it was said, had caused loans to be made to State officials, who used the loans to buy stock in Sharp's insurance company, National Bankers Life.

Allegedly, the high State officials who received the loans and who bought the stock later pushed through a piece of legislation that would have exempted Sharp's banks from the prying eyes of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which had been unhappy with many of the practices they found at Sharp's bank.

It was said, too, that the quick stock profits earned by many of the State officials involved, came about because of some fantastic manipulations by Sharp and others, which had caused the value of the stock to appreciate in value very rapidly.

As the financial web became exposed, depositors lost confidence in Sharp's bank, and it was forced to close; it was probably the biggest bank collapse in Texas in recent years, and the FDIC had to send \$50 million to Texas to cover the losses. No one knows yet just how much money FDIC will ultimately lose, or how much might be lost by depositors who had more money in the bank than FDIC covered.

Thus far, it seems to be only a typical scandal, though of gargantuan proportions. But then new events have unfolded, events which make this case a matter of immense importance.

In the first place, the Justice Department has arranged matters so that Sharp will never go to trial; he has entered a guilty plea to certain violations, and has gained immunity from all other criminal liability. This seems incredible; at first I considered that this was only the sort of bungling that we have come to expect from this administration's Justice Department. But then certain facts came to mind, and as I exposed those facts, more came forward, so that the whole tangled—and yes, incredible—tale becomes even more tangled and incredible.

A few days ago a Federal judge in Houston fined Sharp \$5,000 and assessed a 3-year suspended sentence. Then Sharp was granted immunity from all other charges, a decision that had the full approval of none other than the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Kleindienst.

I charge that the Justice Department has deliberately mishandled this case for political reasons. They have declined to prosecute Sharp vigorously because to do so would expose the very close relationship that existed between Sharp and the Assistant Attorney General, Will Wilson, for many years. If that were to happen it would embarrass an already red-faced Department of Justice. In order to cover their tracks, the Department then aimed to enter into a series of prosecutions of high State officials in Texas. This will pay the administration rich political dividends, and at the same time cover up their deliberate shelving of the Sharp

case, and their potentially embarrassing problems in the Assistant Attorney General's office.

I charge that the Department of Justice not only assured that they would never try Sharp through plea bargaining, but that they deliberately took his case before the court of a judge who was biased, and who could be expected to view Sharp through anything but neutral eyes—a judge who in fact has once been in the employ of Frank Sharp, just as Will Wilson had been.

It is incredible to think that the Justice Department was unaware of what it was doing.

Why would it have been embarrassing to the Department to have the relationship between Wilson and Sharp discussed? For one thing, Wilson was under consideration for a higher level job. It would have been ruinous to have it brought out in court that he had been so intimate an associate of Sharp's. This would not only have embarrassed Wilson, but also his boss, Mr. Kleindienst, who wants to become Attorney General himself when the present incumbent of that office resumes full-time politicking.

I do not presently believe that Wilson himself is a dishonest man; he might not have even known about the way the Sharp case was being handled. But regardless of his personal role it is plain that both his boss, Kleindienst, and the local U.S. attorney in Houston, Mr. Faris, knew of Wilson's relationship with Sharp, and how embarrassing it might be if in the course of prosecuting Sharp all this were to come out. Accordingly, it was arranged to let Sharp plead guilty to a few charges, and take him before a friendly judge. That way Sharp would be gotten neatly out of the way, Wilson would never be embarrassed, and politically productive prosecutions of high Texas officials would cover up the whole thing.

What was Wilson's relationship with Frank Sharp?

Well, as a member of the Texas State Banking Commission in 1960, Wilson had voted to approve the formation of the Sharpstown State Bank. Wilson says that he favored the application on the merits, and I have no way to dispute his word on this point.

Later on, Wilson left politics and entered law practice. He was employed by Sharp, and I believe that Sharp was one of the best clients Wilson had.

When Sharp decided to enter the insurance business, Wilson handled the negotiations that brought Sharp 518,000 shares of the National Bankers Life Insurance Co. Although Wilson told me that he had advised Sharp against this move, he did buy 7,500 shares of the stock for himself.

Wilson was in a position to know a great deal about Frank Sharp; he had seen Sharp's business dealings both from the point of view of lawyer and regulatory commissioner, he had been Sharp's adviser and negotiator. There may have been an even closer relationship than that. Whatever the case may be, and even if Wilson's relationship with Sharp were wholly innocent, it is clear that Kleindienst thought that it should be

hidden—and hence he arranged the plea bargaining that kept Sharp from ever coming to trial.

The local U.S. attorney, on arranging the plea bargaining, took Sharp's case before the local judge in Houston—a normal enough thing on the surface. But incredibly, the judge in question had once been in the employ of Sharp, just as Wilson had been. And even more incredibly, the judge did not disqualify himself. And so in one of the most celebrated cases in all of Texas history there was no trial. On accepting the pleas of guilty, the judge assessed a 3-year suspended sentence and a \$5,000 fine. Sharp could have gotten 10 years.

It is not that the judge has any excess of heart. Indeed he has been known for his hard-bitten attitude. Witness the recent case of a sailor who came to the judge pressing a claim for injury against a shipping company. The judge said, "You mean all we're concerned with is how much money you'll get?" the judge asked. The sailor said that this was the case. The judge then asked, "How much did they offer you to settle?"

The sailor replied \$5,000 was the offer and the judge ruled instantly that the case would be settled for that amount. He refused to hear objections, saying to the attorney, "When you're hot you're hot. When you're not, you're not." Case closed. I think that you will have to agree with me that this is not a judge with excessive heart. No, indeed he is not. And I doubt that the local U.S. attorney chose his forum carelessly. I think that he chose carefully and deliberately the court to bury Mr. Sharp's case, and with it the possibility of embarrassing his boss, Assistant Attorney General Wilson.

Mr. Farris, the local attorney, knew his judge well, if he was any kind of attorney at all. It is inconceivable that he did not know the relationship that existed between the defendant Sharp and the judge who would sentence him. It is inconceivable that the judge failed to disqualify himself—but then I have just told a story that reveals the kind of judge he is.

We cannot tolerate this kind of scandal in silence.

We cannot stand by while this kind of thing goes on, and fail to protest.

I am protesting.

I do not want any man guilty of a crime to escape, and I do not want any man accused of a crime not to have his fair day in court. But as each day goes by it becomes more clear that the Sharp case is being handled as a political case through and through, and that the strategy is being directed by the Deputy Attorney General himself.

It may not be a scandal that Will Wilson knew Frank Sharp and was such a close associate of his. Mr. Wilson says he is an honest man, and I do not say otherwise, at least based on what I know now. But I am saying that the Justice Department deliberately attempted to shelve the Sharp case in the darkest of corners, because prosecution would have probably embarrassed Wilson. I am saying that they hoped to cover this up by prosecuting the public officials Sharp is said to have tried to influence or corrupt.

And I am saying that they deliberately tried to insure that Sharp would get special treatment by taking him before a judge who was as much a former employee of Sharp as Will Wilson himself, and who for reasons that no man can fathom did not disqualify himself. The Justice Department picked its judge well.

The local U.S. attorney in Houston says I know nothing of this case, and have no right to speak of it. Well, he is the one who is ignorant. He is the one who does not know whereof he speaks. For if he did not know the history of the judge, he is hopelessly incompetent, and there is nothing I can do to rescue him from that.

Do I have a right to speak? I have a responsibility. All of us do.

We have not heard the last of the Sharpstown follies yet. I expect to have more, and I believe that the case will become even more shocking as time goes on. It is a shame to have to recite all this to the House. I regret it. But I have a duty, and I will fulfill it.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my gratitude to the Speaker for allowing me to address the House at this time. I do so because of the fact that the matter I wish to speak on is of importance that is far beyond any particular individual issue that I could find a personal involvement in because it involves, not only my native State of Texas, but it involves the prestige of the name of impartial law enforcement on the part of the Federal agency charged with that responsibility, the Federal Department of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken out four other specific times here within a period of less than 2 weeks, and I have specifically charged that in the handling of the immunity granted Frank W. Sharp of Houston—a man who had caused the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to pay out \$50 million worth of money, who has mulcted thousands of innocent depositors, who has perpetrated one of the most scandalous frauds in the history of Texas, or our Nation—by virtue of this immunity he is permitted to go literally scot free with a \$5,000 fine and a so-called probation period of 3 years.

Now, the charges to which he pled guilty, quite surreptitiously and secretly, as far as I know, because no member of the public and no member of the press knew that Frank Sharp had been accused and charged on an indictment of two felony counts, although he is susceptible to a plethora of charges ranging from conspiracy to swindling, to giving false testimony, to fraud, et cetera, et cetera.

Now, it is no mere happenstance that a certain combination of events evolved so that the Chief Prosecutor in the Federal Department of Justice happens to be a former attorney general of the State of Texas, and who is now the assistant attorney general in charge of the criminal division. But he, who himself has been heavily involved, by his own admission to me in a telephonic conversation yesterday, to the extent of in excess of at least \$75,000 in the very company that formed the basis of the fraud, of the swindle, and the scandal, the National Bankers Life Insurance Co.

That in itself does not necessarily

mean, nor do I charge now or imply, that the former attorney general, the present chief prosecutor, the assistant attorney general in charge of criminal division, is personally guilty of being associated in the fraudulent transactions by virtue of which Frank Sharp has pled guilty, and who is further and additionally charged, and it is imputed to Frank Sharp that he has corrupted some of the chief highest officeholders in the State of Texas from the Governor to the speaker of the Texas House, to the chairman of the State Democratic executive committee, and to a variety of other members of the State legislature, some former and some present official officeholders of agencies and subdivisions of the State of Texas.

In light of that, what American and, for that matter, what Texan can remain silent if he then is notified and factually informed that there are more happenstances and coincidences?

As of today I have brought out and I now charge in effect that not only was the plea of immunity granted upon the recommendation of the Department of Justice and honored by the trial judge, who entertained the kookie plea of guilty under semisecret circumstances, but that the judge himself is a former attorney for Frank Sharp himself and has been a beneficiary of Sharp's largesse in the past. By all the basic canons of judicial ethics, he should have disqualified himself from handling the case much less pass judgment—and such a lenient one on Frank Sharp.

So I charge soberly and regretfully but affirmatively, positively and unequivocally that it is a shoddy deal, which has led the highest office of the Attorney General to go into a shoddy handling of the case and granting immunity only, that they can get at some other public officials in the State of Texas.

It was not necessary.

Every one of the individuals involved in this malodorous transaction could and should be prosecuted whether he is a Governor or not or a Speaker or not or a Congressman or not. Let us have even-handed justice. Let us not let the big fish go. This, in effect, is what the Department of Justice has done. Why? Why would the district attorney of the entity who has shown great zeal by traveling to that far, remote, sparsely populated community in southwest Texas in order to indict only two persons some minor officials, say so abjectly I cannot do anything about Frank Sharp because in order to get some other information, we have to make, this is the best we could do with these charges.

The whole transaction smells from beginning to end, and there is no question in my mind when this whole thing was routed to the Deputy Attorney General himself, Mr. Kleindienst, that the motivating reason of why he was willing to grant people immunity and to recommend it was in order to protect his Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Will Wilson, and not because Will Wilson was necessarily a part of the fraudulent transaction, but because of the implications that would arise by the publicity that would be attached to a very high official of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Kleindienst certainly cannot profess ignorance to that because he knew Wilson had disqualified himself from any handling of the case because of his prior association with Sharp.

But until yesterday's telephone conversation with me, not one time had an explanation ever been given that it was more than just a casual attorney-client relationship in the past. It was more. It was substantial ownership of the very company in question.

Then the plot thickens when the very judge himself in passing judgment—the Assistant Attorney General tells me that the Department of Justice had nothing to do with the case, because the Houston jurisdiction happens to be one of those areas where the Federal practices and procedures do not permit the Department of Justice in that area to offer a recommendation to the judge. The judge did not request a recommendation. So of his own volition, he imposed a lighter sentence. He could have sentenced the man because there were two felony counts, to jail for as long as 10 years. But instead there was only a \$5,000 fine which to a man like Frank Sharp is like a nickel or a dime to you or to me—and what is called a 3-year probation.

But exchange for that, he entered upon this time the recommendation of the Department of Justice a plea of immunity or a grant or order of immunity. So we will never really be able to find in the due process in a court of law the exact relationships that have existed between Sharp and Assistant Attorney General Short and the very judge who sat in judgment on him.

So I have charged that with malice of aforethought and premeditation and to all intents and purposes, Frank Sharp has been given a slap on the wrist only because of two factors—first, a zeal to protect a highly placed Justice official and, second, a zeal to get at these other highly placed officials in Texas for, I guess and assume, purely political motivations.

On all of these counts the matter speaks. It is bad, it is abominable to the name of the Federal Justice Department of the United States of America.

Everyone of us sitting and standing here has a responsibility. We all partake in the faith or lack of faith, in the trust or lack of trust, and in these critical times in which Governors, leaders, Presidents, past and present, are said to have credibility gaps, and we have confessions by some of our colleagues here during the disputations and debates saying, "Oh, I used to believe, but now I do not"—we heard one Congressman say the other day quite pathetically, "I do not believe anything a President would say." I do not agree with that, and I am not in that circumstance. I still have pride and honor in America.

I am still eternally and will be eternally grateful for the chance to have been an American. But at the same time we have a serious and solemn responsibility to stand up and shout and point the accusing finger when we see so much shoddy business as a Frank Sharp immunity grant order that has been given

on the recommendation and express indications of the highest officials of the Justice Department and with the connivance of a judge. And I defy that judge to have the basic judicial ethic to come out and reveal his full and intimate associations in the past and the present with Frank W. Sharp. How can we ever stand up here in this forum or, for that matter, in any executive branch of the government, and say, "We want law and order, we want respect for law and order, we want the dignity of even-handed, fair and impartial justice," as long as we persist in this thing, and say it is all right to have the Frank Sharp deals?

Yesterday, I expressed my gratitude to the Assistant Attorney General. I had made serious charges, and I am repeating them. I am making them today. These charges are serious. I would consider them serious. I would say that if such a thing were implied or imputed, I would be living in a living hell. And if the charge were unjust, I would be stoutly defending. So I appreciate the fact that the Assistant Attorney General called and said:

My involvement was innocent. Yes, I am an attorney for Frank Sharp, and I am grateful to him, because he gave me good legal business in the past. But I dispossessed myself and I divested myself of all these shares of stock before I came to assume the office. As to the amount of stock, I bought, first, 5,000 shares at rates varying from 8 and 8½, to 10, to 11½ dollars a share. Then subsequent to that original acquisition in 1968, a vice president of the insurance company put up for sale through a bank 2,500 additional shares, which I bought at \$10 a share.

That is a substantial involvement. I am not saying that because he did that, that he was part and parcel of the fraud Frank Sharp perpetrated by and through this insurance company. What I am saying is that Kleindienst, in recommending that a plea of immunity be granted, was doing it because he knew the only man who could ever bring out the full scale on the transactions—because some questions are still unanswered—was Frank Sharp, and that since he has immunity, he will have no chance to be asked those questions in a forum of proper jurisdiction.

I am assured that at this time the grand jury which was convened in Houston, and which nobody knew about until I started to talk about it last week—and I charged last week that exactly a week ago, it was the hope, expectation, and desire of the district attorney to bring indictments against the Governor, the speaker of the Texas House, the chairman of the Democratic State Executive Committee, and two or more other individuals. Nobody had known them. Nobody apparently had set it. When the district attorney in Houston was confronted with the fact, he said:

Oh, no, the indictment will not be brought today. It will take about three weeks.

But up to then there had been no mention of this intention. But the reason why it was expected these indictments would be returned last week was because Mr. Frank Sharp had just entered his plea, had gotten his order of immunity, and was ready to testify in order to make a

case. My contention is that there is a lot here that demands the most scrupulous redress on the part of these high officials. If, indeed, the judge in Houston is, as I live, a former recipient of benefits of Frank Sharp, he had no right to sit in judgment and give him this lenient treatment.

This judge has a reputation for being hard, if not harsh. Why suddenly all this leniency?

These are questions I am raising. I intend to persist in raising these questions because this is a matter of public concern. I believe it transcends any kind of partisan politics. I believe it transcends any kind of State allegiance. It is a national question. It involves the good name, the role, and the confidence we should have and pride ourselves in having in the Federal Department of Justice.

#### BATTERY PARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the Statue of Liberty has long symbolized the freedom which the heart of man has desired since time began. American fighting men returning from foreign wars have waited for hours with longing eyes to get a glimpse of this lovely lady with the torch of liberty held high. People from all over the world have traveled thousands of miles to see this monument which towers over the entrance into the greatest civilization in history.

People are still coming by the thousands today to see the Statue of Liberty, but there is now a shocking and inexcusable difference—on the way they must pass through the valley of a garbage dump. Now I am aware that the mayor of New York City has been plagued with garbage problems during most of his reign and I am sure that he is sick of the whole mess. However, Mr. Speaker, it is a national disgrace for people to have to pass through the garbage dump in Battery Park to board a ship to go out to the Statue of Liberty. A few weeks ago I took my young daughter on this trip and I must say that she was shocked by the sight of the mess in Battery Park, and I was embarrassed to let her see that our country does not think any more of our national shrines.

What about the impression it gives the foreign visitor about the way we do things in this country? The day we made our visit most of the people waiting to visit the statue were from foreign lands. I suggest that this is not only poor public relations but it is disrespectful to our guests and gives the impression of a total lack of pride in our heritage.

Mr. Speaker, something must be done about this shameful mess. Therefore, I am today writing a letter to Mr. George Hartzog, Director of the National Park Service, urging him to make the necessary contacts with Mayor Lindsay and/or Governor Rockefeller to get this garbage removed from the entrance into this national shrine. It would seem to me that the mayor is the proper person to clean up this mess but since I am aware

of the political situation in New York and remember that the mayor and the Governor were involved in a jurisdictional dispute over New York City's garbage in time past, I will leave it up to Mr. Hartzog to determine the proper person to contact. All I want is the garbage removed and the place cleaned up.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a copy of my letter to Mr. Hartzog into the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1971.

Mr. GEORGE B. HARTZOG,  
Director, National Park Service,  
Department of the Interior,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: It came to my attention in a most forceful way on a recent visit to Battery Park in New York City that this park, for all practical purposes, is being used as a garbage dump. The fact that I had taken my young daughter along with me to see the Statue of Liberty caused me considerable embarrassment since I did not want her to have the impression that we have so little concern about preserving symbolic elements of our heritage.

As you know, thousands of visitors—most of them foreigners—come every day to see this monument that symbolizes the freedom that we all enjoy in this country. It is my opinion that it is a national disgrace for these people to be forced to walk through these heaps of garbage to get aboard the boat. What kind of impression does this sight leave with a foreign visitor about our hospitality and our national pride?

Therefore, I suggest that you contact the proper officials in New York and urge them to get this situation cleaned up without further delay. I say "proper officials" because I am aware of the political situation that exists between the offices of the Mayor of New York City and the Governor of New York state. I am also aware that Mayor Lindsay and Governor Rockefeller were involved in a jurisdictional dispute over New York City's garbage a few years ago. Rest assured that I do not want to open up old political wounds between the mayor and the governor, but I do want the garbage cleaned up.

Let me thank you in advance for what you can do to clean up this bad situation.

Sincerely,

RICHARD H. ICHORD,  
Member of Congress.

#### CONGRESS AND THE INDOCHINA WAR

The SPEAKER, pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a sense of Congress resolution on the Indochina war. My resolution declares that it is the national policy to withdraw American military forces from Vietnam on an irreversible basis and to complete such withdrawal at the earliest practicable date. It further states as a matter of national policy our willingness to accelerate and complete that withdrawal by a date certain provided there is a negotiated agreement to release all American prisoners of war in Indochina by a date 60 days prior to that date certain.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that a sense of Congress resolution of this nature is the proper manner for the Congress to express itself on this issue and

not through misleading funds limitation riders billed as "end of war" amendments, or by actually cutting off funds. I commend the majority leader of the other body for recognizing that a national policy declaration of this sort is the proper approach to the problem, even though I differ with some of the specific provisions of the Mansfield amendment adopted on Tuesday of this week. My own resolution does not specify a date certain, leaving this a matter to be negotiated concurrently with the POW question. Obviously, though, this would have to be within a reasonable time frame to have any appeal at the bargaining table. My resolution also differs from the Mansfield amendment in that it does not specify that the release of prisoners should be phased or geared to our withdrawal rate.

Again, this should be a question left to our negotiating team. My resolution simply says that all our prisoners should be released at least 60 days prior to the withdrawal of our final troop. I think it is important that the Congress does give the President some policy guidance at this time, while at the same time reserving for our negotiators a maximum amount of flexibility with which to work out a final settlement. The significant similarities between my resolution and the Mansfield amendment are that we make a national policy declaration and that it emphasizes linking the POW question and our final withdrawal in a negotiated agreement. My resolution differs from the Mansfield amendment in that it allows more latitude so far as the specific terms of that agreement are concerned. I think we owe this much in confidence and flexibility to our negotiators and the President, as appealing from a popular and political standpoint setting a specific date or time frame might be.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the full text of my testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs today, along with a copy of my resolutions:

#### CONGRESS AND THE INDOCHINA WAR

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am most grateful for this opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the issue of the Indochina War, and more specifically, American policy and the role of the Congress. I want to commend you on calling these most valuable hearings, not only to hear testimony on the many resolutions and bills pending before you, but to further educate the American public, and hopefully, to give this Congress the guidance it needs to redefine and reassert its legitimate role in the foreign policy process. At the outset, let me say that the views I present here today are my own, and not those of the Republican Conference of which I am chairman nor of the Administration.

Last week the House of Representatives rejected what had been billed by some as an "end the war amendment." I cast my vote against that amendment because I felt it would only serve to mislead the American people and raise false hopes. For while the authors of that amendment took pains to point out that their amendment would not in fact do what it said it would do—that is, cut off funds for the further deployment of American forces in or over Indochina after December 31st of this year—the fact remains that to a large segment of the American public this was an end the war amendment that was supposed to do just that. My

mail reflected that perception as I'm sure much of yours did.

I think we all have to be especially mindful at this time of what Max Weber has called the "ethic of responsibility" which has to do with the consequences of our moral actions; for it is every bit as important as the other ethic mentioned by Weber—the "ethic of ultimate values and ends." I do not see how I as a legislator could discharge my ethic of responsibility by voting for an amendment wrapped only symbolically in the ethic of ultimate values and ends. It seems to me it would only be compounding the tragedy to mislead the American public on our disengagement from Vietnam after our experience of being misled into that tragic war in the first place.

And without becoming embroiled in a discussion of the historical roots of our involvement, I think brief mention should be made here of how we were misled into South Vietnam. I do not do so for the purpose of pointing the finger, but rather for the purpose of pointing the way—the way out, and the way to conduct ourselves in the future with respect to our foreign commitments.

As I mentioned during the debate on Nedzi-Whalen last week, I think part of the tragedy of Vietnam was the manner in which, by calculated deception and deliberate withholding of information in a prior administration, Congress was not even in possession of the operative facts so that it could share in an intelligent way in the responsibility of our involvement in Southeast Asia. This process of gradual attrition to the point of emasculation of legislative influence in matters of foreign policy began long ago, and I believe it is neither Constitutionally warranted nor wise.

I think there is widespread consensus among hawks and doves alike in the Congress that the legislative branch must play a larger role in decisions of war and peace, in accordance with the powers delegated to us by the Constitution. Last summer I was privileged to testify before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments on the war powers of the President and Congress. And without specifically endorsing any of the pending war powers bills, I made several suggestions for strengthening the hand of Congress in this area. While I realize that this subcommittee does not have jurisdiction in this area, your full committee does, and I think it does have at least an indirect bearing on the subject you are considering today—the Indochina War.

First, there should be prior consultation between the Congress and the Executive in all situations involving the deployment or possible deployment of American military forces. By this I do not necessarily mean the entire Congress would have to be consulted in all situations. Obviously, for the purposes of secrecy and expedition in a crisis, this may have to be confined to the key Congressional leaders. And by consultation, I mean to imply more than just presenting these leaders with a *fait accompli*; there should be some opportunity for prior Congressional input in the decision itself, as limited as this might be in a crisis or emergency situation.

Secondly, once the President has committed American forces on an emergency basis, it should be required that he deliver a full and formal report to the Congress conveying all the essential facts and rationale for his actions. This report should be submitted within a specified period of time. I cannot overemphasize the need for Congress to be fully informed in such situations so that it can proceed to make intelligent and responsible judgments and decisions based on all the facts. Recent evidence which has come to light seems to indicate that we have not been so apprised in the past, and this has certainly impaired our ability to act in an informed and prudent manner.

Third, if the Executive deployment of forces in a crisis situation threatens to balloon into a major national commitment, the Congress must have the decisive role in making the extended commitment. I have suggested as a working rule of thumb that if, 30 days after the deployment of these forces they have not been withdrawn, then it should be assumed that a major commitment is in the making, and the Congress should then step in to make a clear determination of the policy course to be pursued—that is, whether to extend or terminate that commitment.

Finally, if the Congress does decide to extend that commitment by joint resolution or other means, its authorization should be very precise and circumspect, and not of the open-ended, blank check Tonkin Gulf variety.

To quote from my concluding statement to the subcommittee last year:

"Our primary concern . . . must be to insure that Congress plays a decisive role in any future decision to undertake major commitments of American armed forces abroad; in the process, however, we must be careful not to circumscribe the President's capacity to respond in crisis situations."

I think it is especially important that the President have a wide range of options and flexibility with which to respond in a crisis situation. Our new posture of relative nuclear parity coupled with the Nixon Doctrine of low profile and regional self-sufficiency is bound to be tested by the two major Communist powers to determine whether these new doctrines will give them an additional margin for expansionist activities. It would therefore be a grave mistake, in my opinion, to limit the options of the Commander-in-Chief during this delicate transition period when our initial response to provocative probes is of critical importance. I think we can retain this necessary element of flexibility for the Executive while at the same time insuring a larger role for the Congress through prior consultation, full information, and final determination with regard to sustained commitments.

So let me say in concluding this portion of my testimony that it is my hope that the House Foreign Affairs Committee will report out a responsible war powers resolution which incorporates guidelines and requirements similar to those I have suggested.

I want to move on now to a matter of more immediate and direct concern to this subcommittee, and that is the subject of the Indochina War at this point in time, our current policy with respect to that war, and what initiatives this Congress might take to influence that policy. I know this subcommittee has a large number of bills and resolutions pending before it on this subject, and I have today introduced my own concurrent resolution for your consideration. I strongly feel that what is needed at this time is a clear Congressional declaration of national policy on Indochina to fill the vacuum left by the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. And the proper vehicle for this, it seems to me, is a sense of Congress resolution, as opposed to a meaningless funds limitation rider like Nedzi-Whalen or an actual funds cut-off amendment that would tie the hands of the Commander-in-Chief.

When I suggested such a sense of Congress resolution during the debate on Nedzi-Whalen last week, one of my good friends and colleagues got up on the House floor and mildly rebuked me by saying, and I quote:

"I have had one of those 'sense of Congress' resolutions about ending the war, one which I introduced last year and another which I introduced this year. And all they have been good for so far is to gather dust on the shelves of the Committee on Foreign Affairs."

I think his point is well-taken. Such resolutions are meaningless so long as they go

nowhere. So it is my earnest hope that this subcommittee will not only provide a valuable forum for discussing our policy and the various resolutions, but that it will report out a meaningful measure and give the full House an opportunity to officially offer its policy guidance on Indochina.

I know there are some who will still say that even if a sense of Congress resolution is reported and passed by both Houses, it will be virtually meaningless. I cannot agree with that view. Granted, such a resolution would not have the force of law or in any way bind the President. But at the same time, it must be conceded that a forceful and substantive Congressional declaration of policy would have a profound influence on the Executive, to be ignored at its own peril.

I would now like to discuss the specific provisions of the resolution which I introduced today, a copy of which is appended to this testimony. The "resolved" sections are prefaced by three "whereas" clauses which recognize the President's policy to bring to an end the war through the withdrawal of our troops, through a reduction in the level of hostilities, and through negotiations. It further recognizes that he has already withdrawn over half our troops since taking office and will have withdrawn over two-thirds by this December 1st. And it finally recognizes that the President has stated our goal to be "a total American withdrawal from Vietnam."

At the heart of my resolution are three Congressional declarations of national policy on Indochina. First, "that it is the national policy to continue the safe and orderly withdrawal of American Armed Forces from South Vietnam on an irreversible basis, with the objective of the total withdrawal of all such troops at the earliest practicable date." Secondly, that it is the national policy "to accelerate and complete such withdrawal by a date certain," provided there is a negotiated agreement to release and repatriate all American prisoners of war being held in Indochina 60 days prior to that date certain, and to guarantee the safe and orderly withdrawal of our remaining forces from South Vietnam.

And third, that it is the national policy "to provide assistance to the nations of Indochina, in amounts approved by the Congress, consistent with the objectives of the Guam Doctrine of July, 1969, and to 'arrange asylum or other means of protection for South Vietnamese, Cambodians and Laotians who might be physically endangered by the withdrawal of American Armed Forces.'"

I want to make several points about this resolution and how it relates to our present policy, and then I will be happy to answer any questions you might have. First, I think it is important that this Congress affirm that our primary goal in Vietnam should be to get out of Vietnam as soon as practicable, and to bring our prisoners of war home with us. I do not think this represents any radical departure from the goals enunciated by the President on numerous occasions. In his press conference of March 4, 1971, the President said, and I quote:

"As far as our goal is concerned, our goal is to get all Americans out of Vietnam as soon as we can by negotiation if possible and through our withdrawal program and Vietnamization program if necessary."

Again, in his Vietnam report of April 7, 1971, the President said:

"Our goal is a total American withdrawal from Vietnam. We can and we will reach that goal through our program of Vietnamization if necessary. But we would infinitely prefer to reach it even sooner—through negotiations."

Now, in the past, our negotiating position has centered on the possibility of an all-Indochina settlement. In his report of October 7, 1970, the President outlined a

five-point peace initiative to include an Indochina cease-fire, an all-Indochina peace conference, a mutual withdrawal of all outside forces from South Vietnam on a 12-month timetable, a release of all prisoners of war being held in Indochina, and a political settlement in South Vietnam.

While we have not completely abandoned hope, I think it has become increasingly apparent that the chance for such a comprehensive settlement has grown more remote with the passage of time. In his press conference of February 17, 1971, the President expressed disappointment that no progress had been made at the Paris peace table, but added, and I quote:

"We will continue to pursue the diplomacy for a primary reason, the primary reason being to negotiate some settlement of the POW issue. As we have to realize as far as a negotiation affecting a political settlement for South Vietnam is concerned, time is running out for the North Vietnamese if they expect to negotiate with the United States. Because as our forces come out of South Vietnam, it means that the responsibility for the negotiation, increasingly, then becomes that of South Vietnam."

Again, in his question-answer session with the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16, 1971, the President said:

"We haven't given up on the Paris talks. I would suggest that the moment of truth is arriving with regard to the Paris talks because time will soon run out. As the number of our forces goes down, our stroke at the negotiating table recedes and the South Vietnamese' greatly increases. So, if they want to negotiate with the United States, the time for negotiation, except for the prisoner of war issue, of course, is rapidly drawing to a close."

In his press conference of April 29, 1971, the President rejected setting a deadline or date certain for the total withdrawal of our forces, saying the North Vietnamese have only promised to "discuss" the POW question if we did so. In his words:

"We need action on their part and a commitment on their part with regard to the prisoners. Consequently, as far as any action on our part of ending American involvement is concerned—and that means a total withdrawal—that will have to be delayed until we get not just the promise to discuss the release of our prisoners, but a commitment to release our prisoners, because a discussion promise means nothing where the North Vietnamese are concerned."

And finally, in his press conference of June 1, 1971, the President was asked the question: "What is there to lose by setting a date contingent upon release of all prisoners?" The President responded:

"According to Ambassador Bruce, the position taken by the North Vietnamese has been, 'If we end our involvement in Vietnam and set a date, they will agree to discuss prisoners, not release them . . .' Now, as far as we're concerned, we at this time are not going to make any kind of agreement with regard to prisoners that is not going to be followed by action or concurrent action; and from the standpoint of the North Vietnamese, we have yet no indication whatever that they would be willing to release prisoners in the event we took certain steps."

I have drawn upon these Presidential statements because I think they do point to an evolving American policy vis-a-vis the negotiations and conditions for the total withdrawal of American forces. As our force levels decrease, our bargaining 'stroke' at Paris is reduced so far as an Indochina settlement is concerned, and eventually, the only point to be negotiated between us and the North Vietnamese will be the prisoner of war issue and the date of our final withdrawal. I do not mean to imply here that the President has taken the position that the only condition for our final withdrawal is the

release of our prisoners, though there are indications from the statements I have quoted that we are moving in that direction. The fact is that the President has stated another condition for the final withdrawal of American forces, and that is "the ability of the South Vietnamese to develop the capacity to defend themselves against a Communist takeover." In other words, the completion of the Vietnamization program.

My resolution, on the other hand, goes back to the President's statement on April 7th of this year to the effect that our goal is a total withdrawal through the Vietnamization program if necessary, "but we would infinitely prefer to reach it even sooner—through negotiations"; and the President's statement on April 26th of this year to the effect that as our force levels diminish, the only point left to be negotiated between us and Hanoi is the prisoner of war question. Under the policy suggested by my resolution, we would express to the North Vietnamese our willingness to accelerate our withdrawals and complete them by a date certain if they in turn agree to release all American prisoners being held in Indochina 60 days prior to that date, and guarantee the safe and orderly withdrawal of our remaining forces.

My resolution does not specify a date, leaving this a matter to be negotiated concurrently with the prisoner of war question. But obviously, it would have to be within a reasonable time frame to have any appeal at the bargaining table. It seems to me that the value of this approach is that rather than having each side waiting for the other to make a move on either the matter of setting a date or the matter of releasing prisoners, both would have to agree to discuss these issues simultaneously, and the resolution of one would be contingent upon the other.

While suggesting a specific date in such a resolution is appealing from a political standpoint, or from the standpoint of reassuring the American public, I think from a practical negotiating standpoint this is something best left to be worked out in the secret sessions at Paris and not publicly announced until an agreement has been reached.

To get back to the question of what effect an accelerated withdrawal and date certain for its completion would have on the Vietnamization program, let me say that while an earlier withdrawal date would reduce the amount of final preparation we could give the South Vietnamese to defend themselves, it would not be fair to suggest that we haven't already given them a reasonable capability for survival. You will recall that on April 7th of this year, shortly after the Laotian operations, the President announced that, "Vietnamization has succeeded."

A report released by the Department of Defense last week points out that ground combat responsibility will be completely turned over to the South Vietnamese by this summer, thus completing phase one of the Vietnamization program; and phase two—developing South Vietnamese air, naval, artillery, logistics and other support capabilities—has been proceeding concurrently with phase one, though it will take a little longer.

Over the last year, according to the DOD report, American air sorties have decreased 46% while South Vietnamese attack sorties have increased 65%. The pacification program has likewise been proceeding with marked success. Regional Forces have increased 48% since June of 1968 and have thus relieved the ARVN for combat duties, while Popular Forces have increased 51% since June of 1969, and over 95% of the Popular Force platoons are now fully trained and equipped with modern radios and armed with M-16 rifles.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I hardly think an accelerated withdrawal, contingent upon the prior release of our prisoners, could in any way be considered precipitous in terms of

the Vietnamization program since the South Vietnamese have developed an impressive capacity to shoulder the burden themselves, all the way down to the hamlet level.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly address myself to Section 3 of my resolution which states as a further matter of national policy our intention to provide continued military and economic assistance to the nations of Indochina, in amounts approved by Congress, and consistent with the objectives of the Guam Doctrine; and to arrange asylum for those who might be endangered by our withdrawal.

As the members of this subcommittee are well aware, the United States cannot legally or morally turn its back on Southeast Asia after the last troop has been withdrawn from South Vietnam. We will continue to be a Pacific power and we will continue to have certain obligations and responsibilities to the people of that part of the world. In July of 1969, the President issued the Guam Doctrine which said in effect that the United States will honor its treaty commitments, extend its shield to any nation allied with us which is threatened by a nuclear power, and, in cases involving other types of aggression, we will furnish military and economic assistance but look to the nation directly threatened to assume the primary responsibility of providing manpower for its defense. I think the Congress should officially endorse this policy of encouraging self-sufficiency on the part of our allies, and at the same time help formulate specific programs for its implementation.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I am interested in seeing that the Congress reassumes its Constitutional role in matters of war and peace. I think we can and should play a role in extricating the United States from Vietnam and in preventing future Vietnam-type involvements. If this is to happen it must begin right here in this committee. I commend this committee on its war powers hearings and its Indochina hearings, and I urge you to follow through in such a way that the full House will have an opportunity to express itself on these issues of crucial importance to our country and our Constitutional form of government.

#### H. CON. RES. 347

Whereas, the President of the United States is pursuing a policy designed to bring an honorable end to the war in Vietnam through the withdrawal of American Armed Forces from that country, through a reduction in the level of hostilities, and through negotiations; and

Whereas, the President has withdrawn over half of the American Armed Forces from Vietnam since taking office, and has further announced that two-thirds of all such forces will have been withdrawn by December 1, 1971; and

Whereas, the President has announced that, "Our goal is a total American withdrawal from Vietnam"; Now, therefore be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby declares that it is the national policy to continue the safe and orderly withdrawal of American Armed Forces from South Vietnam on an irreversible basis, with the objective of the total withdrawal of all such forces at the earliest practicable date.*

SEC. 2. It is the national policy to accelerate and complete such withdrawal by a date certain provided that there is a negotiated agreement to: (a) release and repatriate all American prisoners of war being held in Indochina by a date 60 days prior to such date certain, under the supervision of the International Red Cross or other such organization; and (b) guarantee the safe and orderly withdrawal of all remaining American Armed Forces from South Vietnam by such date certain.

SEC. 3. It is the national policy to: (a) provide assistance to the nations of Indochina, in amounts approved by the Congress, consistent with the objectives of the Guam Doctrine of July, 1969; and (b) arrange asylum or other means of protection for South Vietnamese, Cambodians, and Laotians who might be physically endangered by the withdrawal of American Armed Forces.

#### AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, 1971, a bill, H.R. 9330, was introduced in the House by Mr. REID of New York to provide for creation of an American Council for Private International Communications, Inc. The primary purpose of the council would be to receive congressional appropriations and make grants to Radio Liberty for broadcasts to the Soviet Union and to Radio Free Europe for broadcasts to Eastern Europe.

Because of my own interest in Soviet affairs, I wish to speak today about Radio Liberty. It appears that unless Congress acts on H.R. 9330, Radio Liberty will have no other source of support and will have to end its broadcasts to the Soviet Union. Indeed, I am informed that Radio Liberty's present funding does not extend beyond the end of this month, and that unless an interim arrangement can be made pending passage of H.R. 9330, the station will have to go off the air very shortly.

I urge the Congress to take action to prevent this emergency, which would seriously damage the foreign-policy interests of the American people and the cause of international understanding.

In more than 18 years of continuous broadcasting, Radio Liberty has built up a specialized following of concerned Soviet citizens. Unlike other radios beamed to the Soviet Union from outside, Radio Liberty speaks as the voice of former Soviet citizens and focuses primarily on the country's internal political, economic, and social life. The station has approached Soviet problems constructively, in terms of moderate and nonviolent solutions. It issues no appeals to action, but concentrates on dissemination of news and diverse opinions.

Ever since 1960, when I visited the Soviet Union with one of the first groups of American students to go there, I have been keenly aware of the role of information in the development of Soviet society. It is ironic that today, as the Soviet Union rises to the challenge of the space and nuclear age and the number of citizens with professional training at the university level is growing by leaps and bounds, the dead hand of the censor lies ever more heavily on Soviet life. This contradiction between progress and backwardness has given rise to a dissent movement which, although small in visible size, cuts deeply into the fabric of its society.

Radio Liberty's audience includes important segments of the Soviet cultural and scientific elites, those pressing hard-

est for positive change in their society. If the Soviet system yields to pressures for modernization, decentralization and liberalization, as someday it can hardly fail to do, these people will be in the forefront of the country's leadership. From our standpoint as Americans, they will be more important in our relations with their country than the aging bureaucrats at the top level with whom we now must deal.

Resistance to censorship among thinking members of Soviet society has given rise in recent years to a movement unprecedented in the Soviet period. I refer to so-called samizdat, an abbreviation of two Russian words meaning "self" and "publishing." Samizdat consists of literally hundreds of unpublished works—fiction, criticism, political essays, protest documents, appeals for human rights—now circulating throughout the Soviet Union in manuscript form. In a country where even the use of mimeograph machines is controlled by the regime, samizdat manuscripts must be painstakingly copied on typewriters, a few carbons at a time.

Samizdat has been a major source for Radio Liberty. More than one-sixth of the station's Russian-language programming in the first half of this year has consisted of broadcasts of samizdat items which have filtered out of the Soviet Union. Thus, Radio Liberty is able to provide its audience with their own uncensored medium of mass information, a unique forum for the exchange of ideas. The meaning of this to Soviet intellectuals chafing under censorship is expressed in a recent comment by one of them:

If I want to say something to the people, to the country, then the only way I can say it is through Western radio.

A major samizdat item now being readied for broadcast by Radio Liberty is the new novel "August 1914" by the Nobel Prize-winning Russian writer, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, whose work has been suppressed in his own country. A Washington Post reviewer, the newspaper's former Moscow correspondent, Anatole Shub, has written of "August 1914":

Millions of Soviet citizens, spiritually demeaned by the official mendacity and pap, would surely queue up instantly, as a breadline in a siege, to read even a few pages of a book of such shining merits.

Radio Liberty has also acquainted its audience with the iconoclastic writing of the Russian physicist Andrei Sakharov, called the "father" of his country's hydrogen bomb, who has warned:

The division of mankind faces it with destruction . . . In the face of these perils, any action increasing the division of mankind, any preaching of the incompatibility of world ideologies and nations is madness and a crime.

Especially since the post-Khrushchev leadership came to power, a relatively small but important number of Soviet citizens, prominent in various professions, have managed to seek asylum in the West. Many of these are now contributing to Radio Liberty programs: writers, journalists, social scientists, natural scientists, and others. On several occasions Svetlana Alliluyeva has gone to Radio Liberty studios to read from her

own writings on the air. Such broadcasts are virtually the only link through which such former citizens, who have given up their citizenship in order to work for reform from abroad, can communicate with the public in their homeland.

In addition to its Russian broadcasts, Radio Liberty speaks to Ukrainians, Uzbeks, and other Central Asian and Siberian Moslems, to Belorussians, and to the peoples of the Caucasus, using a total of 16 languages of Soviet non-Russian nationalities. A proposal to add Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian is now pending. The non-Russian nationalities, which the recent census shows are on their way to outnumbering the Russians themselves, remain for the most part linguistically and culturally distinct and buoyed by a soaring rate of elite formation. In thinking of the future of our relations with the Soviet Union, we Americans must consider our links with these peoples as well as with the Russians.

An important component of Radio Liberty's Russian broadcasts has been programs in behalf of Soviet Jews. This has included scores of separate appeals by individual Soviet Jews and groups of Jews protesting discriminatory practices and demanding in many cases the right to emigrate to Israel. I understand that the station also tries in other ways to keep alive for its Jewish listeners an awareness of their ethnic and cultural identity in the face of regime efforts to efface traditional values. Jewish high holidays have been celebrated in Radio Liberty broadcasts with Hebrew prayers and songs. A regular feature of Russian broadcasts has been material dealing with condemnations of anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance by revered Russian humanists of the past, and by persons abroad whose names are respected in the U.S.S.R. A recent immigrant to Israel, the physicist Boris Tsukerman who was associated with Academician Sakharov, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, and others in creating an unofficial "Committee on Human Rights" in the Soviet Union, commented after leaving the country:

Special hopes have been placed, of course, on a radio station which has paid special heed to the requirements of various categories of Soviet radio listeners and has had the mission of satisfying these requirements.

Radio Liberty's value as a world asset is recognized internationally. In the past few months, as word has reached the press of the station's difficulties, public statements of support have been issued by leading Soviet specialists at centers of learning like Oxford, Cambridge, London University, and the Sorbonne. Such influential newspapers as the London Daily Telegraph, the Paris Figaro, and the Neue Zuercher Zeitung of Switzerland have written favorable articles.

In the United States, Radio Liberty's support is bipartisan. The station has friends among liberals and conservatives, among hawks and doves. Some of its most vigorous support comes from academic specialists. I understand that in recent weeks those sending messages to Members of Congress in behalf of Radio Liberty have included such distinguished

scholars as Philip Mosely and Zbigniew Brzezinski of Columbia, Hans Morgenthau of the University of Chicago, Frederick Barghoorn of Yale, Richard Pipes of the Russian Research Center at Harvard, Robert V. Daniels of the University of Vermont, and Foy Kohler of the University of Miami, a former Ambassador to the Soviet Union. I might add that hundreds of specialists in the United States and abroad rely on Radio Liberty's research analyses of Soviet affairs.

Radio Liberty is less well known to the United States public at large. It has never conducted mass public relations or advertising campaigns, largely because it has not solicited donations from the general public.

What would be our loss if Radio Liberty ceased broadcasting?

Radio Liberty performs a function that is not feasible for official radios like the Voice of America. If its unique role were to end, the United States and its friends abroad would relinquish an important medium of international understanding. They would rebuff an audience which has been built up over the years through investment of time, money and dedication.

If once dispersed, Radio Liberty's human resources including many persons with rare linguistic skills and cultural backgrounds would be lost beyond recovery. The station's technical facilities, once dismantled, would require years to replace. Its frequencies would be yielded permanently to other broadcasters in the crowded shortwave spectrum. Above all, notice would be served on important, friendly segments of Soviet society that they have been downgraded by the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Radio Liberty is not an outmoded instrument of the "cold war." It is an institution involved in the vital work of establishing links with those in the Soviet Union working for peace and a better life. In terms of money, its total annual operating budget is little more than the price of a single F-111 jet fighter. At that cost, it must be preserved.

Today I join Mr. REID as a cosponsor of H.R. 9330.

#### 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.

The United States is the location for the largest medical center in the world. The District Medical Center in Chicago covers 478 acres and includes five hospitals, with a total of 5,600 beds and eight professional schools with more than 3,000 students.

#### NEED FOR AMERICAN-ISRAEL TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a House resolution urging the negotiation of an American-Israeli treaty of friendship as a timely move to stabilize the Middle Eastern situation and prevent further deterioration of the tenuous cease-fire. It is cosponsored by, Hon. JOSHUA EILBERG, Hon. JOHN DUNCAN, Hon. JOSEPH ADDABBO, Hon. SAM STRATTON, Hon. ROBERT McCLORY, Hon. ROBERT DRINAN, Hon. GEORGE COLLINS, Hon. JOHN DOW, Hon. GUS YATRON, Hon. JAMES SCHEUER, and Hon. BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL.

My proposal is prompted by the recent grave events in the Middle East. These events took place at a time when our attention was preoccupied by Vietnam and the disclosure of sensational information related to our involvement there. Our preoccupation with Vietnam was cynically exploited by the Soviet Union to sabotage American efforts to promote peace between Egypt and Israel.

Moscow entered into a 15-year friendship treaty with Egypt that advanced Soviet military involvement in Egypt and transformed that country into a virtual Russian satellite. The Soviet President, Nikolai V. Podgorny, expressed Moscow's belligerent new views on the Middle East on May 27 after signing the new treaty of friendship and cooperation with Egypt. He condemned "the imperialists in the United States" and denounced American efforts to mediate the conflict.

President Anwar el-Sadat of Egypt subsequently denounced the United States and said that even if Israel withdrew from all territories occupied in June 1967, the Arabs would not make peace.

Soviet-built Sukhoi jets have resumed flights over the Suez Canal to spy on Israeli positions. They have been driven off by anti-aircraft fire on a number of very recent occasions. The cease-fire is in danger.

With possible collaboration by the Soviet Union, the leftist Arab regime in Yemen permitted extremist Arab elements to use a seaport over 1,000 miles from Suez as a base for a sneak attack by sea on an oil tanker bound for an Israeli seaport. The tanker narrowly escaped destruction. Credit for the attack was claimed by the Marxist Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the group that last year hijacked and destroyed American aircraft.

My resolution envisages a 15-year American-Israeli friendship pact that would serve as an effective answer to the mounting crisis created by the new 15-year Soviet-Egyptian friendship treaty and the resulting escalation of tensions. The threat to world peace has been increased. Massive new Soviet arms shipments are arriving in Egypt. Soviet air and naval bases in that country are being expanded. Soviet officials have just visited new Russian naval units concentrating in the Mediterranean in a bid to neutralize the U.S. 6th Fleet. The Soviet Navy is now manning submarines and missile ships as well as jet bombers displaying the insignia and colors of Egypt.

It is my conviction that we have not taken the Soviet-Egyptian pact seriously enough. My resolution would serve the national security interests of the United States by providing a dramatic notice to potential aggressors. We would indicate that our country will not be moved from its commitments to Israel. We would show the futility of efforts to drive a wedge between our Nation and the State of Israel.

My resolution would give added strength to the existing understandings between the United States and Israel. It would serve notice to the Russians that they do not have an "open sesame" to the Middle East.

My resolution provides that "the President should give favorable consideration to the negotiation by the Department of State of a 15-year American-Israel Treaty of Friendship." Enactment would give added prestige and strength to the existing relations linking the two countries. It would provide, in the words of the resolution, "a formal basis for the existing close relations between the two nations relating to economic cooperation and the supply of military and defense material."

It appears to me that the United States has taken the new pact between Russia and Egypt too lightly. There is already evidence that the treaty is calculated to prevent a just peace settlement and to cover the shipment of additional arms to Egypt.

The new treaty made Egypt almost completely subservient to the Soviet Union and made the Cairo regime a virtual satellite of Moscow. The most effective American answer, serving the national security interest of the United States, is to stabilize the now unbalanced situation by a treaty formalizing American-Israel friendship.

The Soviet Union entered an arms accord with Egypt in 1955 with tacit undertakings that led to the war of 1956. Soviet-Egyptian accommodations were further expanded in 1967, leading to the outbreak of war in that year.

There have been some reports that the United States is withholding new contracts for arms to Israel although Egypt has become more bellicose following her new pact with Russia. The United States is pressured by Egypt and the Soviet Union to withhold arms required by Israel.

A new Soviet strategy has emerged to keep tensions broiling in the Middle East over Israel which is not protected by NATO. The Russian aim is to isolate the United States from its allies, to undermine the credibility of our defensive capacities, and to test our resolve. Russia is consolidating air and naval bases in Egypt to dominate the Mediterranean.

As a member of the Near East Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I recently visited Israel and Lebanon to study the developing situation. The Soviet-Egyptian pact has not been taken seriously enough by our own Government; not only did it forge a tie between Russia and Egypt as States but also links the two peoples and their only legal political parties.

The Communist bloc provided the only parallel in existence for a pact of this sort. Egypt can be considered from now on as virtually a Russian satellite in the Middle East.

The imbalance of arms between Egypt and Israel is reaching dangerous proportions as the United States defers new Phantom Jet contracts. Russia, meanwhile, ships MIG-23's and its finest ultra-modern firepower into Egypt in a shocking escalation of weapons systems. American preoccupation with peace and withdrawal from military commitments is being cynically exploited by the Russians in the Middle East.

The danger of the new pact linking Moscow with Cairo lies in the prospect of new fighting. To deter such a possibility, the United States must act now to clarify its relationship to Israel and determination to keep faith with an outpost of freedom.

The United States-Israeli treaty would not obligate the United States to automatically go to war in defense of Israel or vice versa. It would nevertheless dramatize to potential aggressors that we are willing to formalize the existing commitments and contractual arrangements, including the provision of arms, linking the United States with Israel. Our relations with all concerned governments—Israeli, Egyptian, and Russian—would be strengthened. Our policies would be made clear to friend and foe alike.

My resolution, if adopted, would serve as an insurance policy for peace.

#### STANDARDS FOR OPERATION OF NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege to appear before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to discuss the issue of State versus Federal standards for the operation of nuclear powerplants.

The committee is currently receiving testimony from sponsors of legislation which would permit States to set more stringent standards for nuclear powerplants than is currently required by the Atomic Energy Commission.

I suspect that this is a growing problem in States other than Minnesota. Hopefully other concerned Members will make their views known to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I insert my statement at this point in the Record.

#### STATEMENT BY BILL FRENZEL BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to discuss for a few minutes this morning the question of state versus federal standards for the operation of nuclear power plants.

I am sure this committee is aware that the State of Minnesota is seeking through the courts to establish its right to set more stringent standards for the operation of nuclear power plants than is currently required by the Atomic Energy Commission.

My bill, H.R. 7539, which is currently pending before this committee, seeks to establish this right by amending the Atomic Energy

Act of 1954. As presently drawn, my bill would permit the States to impose more restrictive standards only in the area of water pollution. Mr. Grant Merritt, director of Minnesota's Pollution Control Agency, has indicated he would like to see the states' prerogatives extended to include standards for air and solid waste pollution. I agree with this suggestion and would therefore favor an amendment to my bill which would make available to the states this additional authority.

I, of course, make no pretense of being an expert on the subject of nuclear power, nor am I prepared to present and defend the legal arguments which have been advanced in the support of states' rights argument. This kind of technical presentation is better left to the experts.

But, in that regard I would hope that this committee would hold additional hearings for the purpose of receiving testimony from the staff of Minnesota's Pollution Control Agency and other outside state and private interest groups. I am indebted, however, to the people at the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency for their assistance in preparing this statement.

What I would like to do this morning, is to try to convey to this committee the intensity of feeling on this subject in Minnesota and some of the steps which have been taken as an outgrowth of this concern. For some time now, the State of Minnesota, conservation groups, and many private citizens have attempted through a variety of means to obtain needed additional protection against all possible hazards from nuclear power plants.

When Northern States Power Company proposed a nuclear plant at Monticello, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency concluded that federal guidelines were not adequate for public protection. The Minnesota PCA then directed its consultant, Dr. Ernest C. Tsvoglou, to prepare standards more restrictive than those of the AEC. NSP took the State to court. NSP charged that PCA standards were unreasonable, and claimed that Congress had pre-empted the State from establishing such standards, and further, that such standards could only be set by the federal government. The Federal District Court has already ruled against the State and the State is presently appealing that decision.

Recently the power company announced the proposal to make modifications to reduce the amount of radioactive wastes released, allowing the plant to meet the gross emission standards and most of the individual isotope limits as well. These welcome activities by the company would seem to give less weight to arguments that such systems are too costly. NSP, by the way, has been most cooperative through this whole difficult process, and should be commended for its willingness to work with the MPCA.

The Pollution Control Agency informs me that the Atomic Energy Commission recently announced changes in regulations for light water reactors. The new regulations apparently set numerical guidelines one hundred times lower than present standards but the AEC will withhold action until the new lower than present standards are exceeded by 4-8 times. In addition, the new guidelines do not cover all types of nuclear facilities.

I think the pattern of developments reflected in this chain of events is instructive. Following Minnesota's moves to restrict emissions, the company responded with its own voluntarily imposed standards. Finally, AEC-initiated actions were announced which indicate a belated sensitivity to the concerns of the people at the local level. The States have looked to the AEC for leadership but feel they are not getting it.

Public concern regarding health and environmental safety regarding nuclear plants sur-

passed most recently in Minnesota in the form of a local bill calling for a moratorium on the construction of nuclear power plants in Minnesota. The bill did not pass, but this is just one more strong indication that many Minnesotans feel a safety cushion for people is far more important than an operating cushion for a nuclear facility. If we are to err, let it be in favor of health and safety.

My bill, modified as I have suggested, could have the salutary effect of creating a healthy competition between federal and state agencies to adequately protect the public health and safety. We in Minnesota do not mean to exclude the development of nuclear power facilities in our state. But we are determined to have it on our terms.

#### ECONOMIC INCENTIVES TO CURB AIR POLLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing my third bill incorporating economic incentives to attack environmental pollution. This bill places a 5 cent per pound tax on sulfur oxides and particulate matter emitting into the atmosphere from stationary sources. The Environmental Protection Agency reports in "The Economics of Clean Air," March 1971, that in 1967 over 15,850,000 tons of particulate matter, and 28,825,000 tons of sulfur oxides were dumped into the air over the United States from stationary sources. This equals 160 pounds per person of particulate matter, and 290 pounds per person of sulfur oxides every year. If we decide to do nothing, the EPA reports, we can expect these emissions to be 25 percent over the 1967 level by the year 1974.

The passage of this bill would insure a major breakthrough in curbing air pollution. It will reverse the entire incentive process, by making it more profitable not to pollute—a polar opposite from the present system where it is more profitable to contaminate the environment than not.

My bill places a charge for polluting: a tax based on the amounts of particulate matter and sulfur oxides the polluter emits. If he emits very little, he pays little or no tax; if he pollutes a lot, he pays a large tax. Simply put, the tax insures equity.

The host of legislation being passed by the city, State, and Federal Government normally has a provision forcing new industries to install pollution abatement equipment before they commence production. This, of course, puts new industry and new plant expansion at a competitive disadvantage in relation to already existing manufacturers who are either not required to install abatement equipment or have 4 to 5 years before they must do so. Thus new firms which are required to be nonpolluters may not be able to compete costwise with existing manufacturers who are allowed to continue polluting.

In addition, States and municipalities which desire to protect the environment from degradation have to compete with other municipalities which may value other factors such as new job creation,

expanded tax base, and so forth, above environmental consideration. Also, the threat of industrial relocation is a very real problem, given the present state of the economy. The threat to pull up roots and move to a more favorable environmental climate can be very persuasive when a municipality is faced with high unemployment and shrinking tax revenues.

The passage of this bill will eliminate these three bottlenecks by providing equity for all manufacturers; new and existing industry will be treated equally. It will allow new industry to move to areas most suited to profitable operation, not where they can get away with contaminating the atmosphere. Existing firms will not pull up roots heading for new places where the air pollution laws are less stringent.

Some people would say we should outlaw or tax high-sulfur fuels if we want to reduce the emission of sulfur oxides. Such legislation would restrict the abatement options available to present polluters. There are two ways to reduce sulfur oxide emissions: First, by using low-sulfur fuels, or, second, by removing the sulfur oxides as they come out of the stacks. This bill will allow either, and the polluter will choose the method least costly. That is the advantage of using economic incentives rather than prohibiting laws to attack environmental pollution: it provides the incentive to the polluter to find the least costly way of reducing his harmful emissions.

It is important to point out that the abatement programs will cost money and these additional costs will cause prices to rise somewhat. The question is how much it will cost, and how much prices will rise. I strongly suggest that my colleagues obtain a copy of "The Economics of Clean Air," the recent publication from the Environmental Protection Agency. This excellent report reveals how small the costs of abatement actually are. Cost figures for most industries are given in the report; there is sufficient data provided for one to analyze how this proposed tax will work.

A good example is fossil fuel electric powerplants. The report states that the average steam-electric powerplant emits 10,800 tons of particulates and 29,000 tons of sulfur oxides annually. If my bill is passed and if these plants decide to continue to pollute at their present level they would pay an annual tax of \$3,980,000—39,800 tons times 2,000 times \$0.05. The main point of emphasis here, though, is that it will not be profitable for them to continue to pollute at their present level.

The initial investment cost per plant averages less than \$3.5 million with a total annual cost of \$1.1 million. Even if we depreciate the initial investment at 10 percent, our annual costs, including depreciation, would be only \$1.45 million—\$1.1 million plus 10 percent of \$3.5 million. EPA reports that such conversion would only increase electric energy costs by 2 percent to the average consumer. Most people pay around \$8 for electricity. This means their electric bill would increase 16 cents per month—\$8 times

0.02—a very small price indeed to pay for cleaner air.

What about the total costs for all polluters. These costs may at first appear large in absolute amounts, but one must relate them to other costs and expenditures manufacturers annually undertake. The initial investment costs for abatement equipment is estimated at \$6.51 billion. Gross private domestic investment was over \$130 billion last year. The \$6.51 billion thus represents only 5 percent of what the private sector spends on new plant and equipment every year. The EPA estimates that the total annual costs of these controls, including depreciation, finance, and operating expenses, would amount to approximately \$2.2 billion per year. This represents only about 0.2 percent of our gross national output—surely the costs of clean air are not very high.

The EPA also reports that the installation and operation of the abatement devices will cause consumer prices to rise by only 0.14 percent per year. This is currently less than one-third of the average monthly increase. It must be remembered that this small increase in consumer prices is actually not a real increase, because the output prices presently do not place any value on the amount of damage done by environmental pollution. The reduction in damage resulting from the installation of abatement devices will offset any increase in prices.

I believe that the use of economic incentives to combat pollution, which this legislation utilizes, is a potentially effective one. I urge my colleagues to give this approach, and this bill, their careful study.

#### SENATOR HAROLD HUGHES URGES TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Senator HAROLD HUGHES, in an excellent speech last week, called attention to the glaring inequities that remain in our tax system despite the modest reforms in the 1969 Tax Reform Act. In his speech, delivered at a June 17 dinner honoring former Senator Albert Gore, Senator HUGHES paid tribute to Senator Gore's long fight for tax reform and called for a continuation of the struggle for real tax reform. I commend Senator HUGHES' remarks to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HAROLD E. HUGHES, DEMOCRATIC DINNER FOR SENATOR ALBERT GORE, MEMPHIS, TENN.—JUNE 17, 1971

If you picked up the paper tomorrow and read a headline saying: U.S. Government Gives Away 50 Billion Dollars to the Privileged, you'd be justifiably outraged. You'd probably be so angry that you would sit down and write your Congressmen and Senators demanding an explanation. And if they couldn't provide a very good one, you'd probably vote them out of office.

Ladies and gentlemen, it happens every year, and hardly a voice is raised in protest in the halls of Congress. And when Albert Gore left the Senate, the ranks of those who have stood up on their hind legs and

screamed bloody murder, lost one of its leading and most eloquent voices.

I am talking about our monstrous and distorted federal income tax system, honey-combed with inequities and special privileges for the wealthy, the vested interests, the powerful, and the giant corporation. I am talking about an unjust tax system in this country that results in 80 percent of Federal income taxes being paid by people who make less than \$15,000 a year. I am talking about a system that patently discriminates against those who earn between \$4,000 and \$20,000 a year, and in favor of those who are most able to pay.

They don't have to build a monument to Albert Gore in Washington. He built his own. It is reflected in whatever progress we have made toward tax reform over the last decade:

Increasing the personal exemption allowed for each member of the family from \$600 to \$750, so that the middle-income taxpayer can have some tax relief;

Providing the low income allowance, so that the poorest in our Nation do not have to support the richest through the tax system;

Curtailling the activities of private foundations that were utilized to collect wealth and protect it from taxation;

Getting the first cutback in the special loophole for oil and gas companies—the percentage oil depletion allowance.

Each of these measures enacted in 1969 bore the deep imprint of Albert Gore.

Let me tell you a little story about Albert Gore's role in that Tax Reform Act. As the tax reform bill emerged from the House of Representatives in August of 1969, one-third of the tax relief in that bill went to 10 percent of the American taxpayers who earn more than \$20,000. In September, the Administration recommended that the tax relief for the middle-income taxpayer be reduced even below the level of the House bill in order to allow a 2 percent cut in corporate tax rates and to lower from 70 to 50 percent the top rate payable by the rich.

Then Albert Gore stepped in. He demanded instead that the tax relief granted to the middle-income taxpayer be increased, that further benefits to the privileged be eliminated.

The forces of wealth and power allied themselves against him. Relief for the average taxpayer meant that the coddled taxpayers would have to pay more of their fair share.

In the end, the bill that Congress passed was more nearly true tax reform than before Albert Gore started on it.

But Albert would be the first to agree that the Tax Reform Act of 1969 was only a small step toward creating a truly equitable tax system, one that fairly takes from people according to their ability to pay, instead of what we have now—a reverse Robin Hood that takes from the poor and middle-income taxpayer and gives to the rich.

Now we are engaged in a national debate about the pros and cons of revenue sharing with the states and cities. Some in Congress propose that federal aid to local governments be conditioned upon reforming their antiquated property tax systems. Certainly the property tax needs a thorough overhaul. Three million households in the United States pay more than 10 percent of their income in property taxes, an insufferable burden on lower and middle income families and one that has them crying out in pain.

But can the federal government in Washington be terribly self-righteous about the inequities and unequal burdens of the property tax, while the federal income tax is such a haven for the powerful and the privileged and the vested interest? What is needed is not property tax reform, or even income tax reform in a vacuum, but compre-

hensive tax reform to design a total tax system in which everyone is paying their fair share.

Unfortunately, for every Albert Gore who blows the whistle on special privilege, there are a thousand talented and well-paid tax lawyers straining to save their wealthy clients money by finding them loopholes and umbrellas to shelter them from taxation.

And it is not the lawyers or even the wealthy clients who are at fault. They are simply taking advantage of what a poorly devised system permits them. How many of us could truly say we would not do the same?

It is the fault of Congress who wrote the Internal Revenue Code and of the millions of victimized taxpayers who have remained silent under the strain.

The American people are not afraid of sacrifice. Time and again in our history we have clearly demonstrated that we will, in President John Kennedy's words, "bear any burden," if the cause is just and if each is called upon to bear his fair share. We can do the things that must be done in this country—we can rebuild our ailing cities, we can provide efficient and adequate health care to all those who need it, we can build a decent home for every American who is without one—and we will meet whatever it costs to do those things, if . . . if the costs are shared proportionately among all Americans.

The tradition of sacrifice is deep within the American character. But so is the tradition of fair play. And when the average taxpayer sees 301 Americans with incomes of more than \$200,000, pay no income taxes at all in 1969, he resists. And despite a "minimum tax" enacted in 1969, the figures for 1970 are likely to show the same pattern.

An even more important figure than the number of taxpayers who get off scot-free is the distribution of the total tax burden of this country.

Americans have many myths. And those myths die hard. One of them is that the tax system in America is progressive, that as your income increases, the percentage of that income that you pay in taxes also increases, so that the wealthy pay a larger part of their income to support the services of government than the not-so-wealthy.

It is a myth. A study recently released by the United States Census Department reveals that a family earning \$50,000 a year pays the same percentage of its income in taxes (income tax, property tax, sales tax, excise tax, and payroll tax) as the family earning only \$2,000—about 30 percent.

How does this happen? It happens partly because taxes like the sales tax and the property tax and the excise tax are regressive taxes; they cause a poor or middle income taxpayer to pay a far larger share of his income in these taxes than the rich. But it also happens because the income tax in America, which is supposed to take more from the wealthy, also gives the wealthy enough tax loopholes so that they can reduce their burden, while the not-so-rich take up the slack. Former Senator Paul Douglas used to call them "truckholes" rather than "loopholes," because they are big enough to drive a truck through.

The list of these loopholes is distressingly long. There is the highly discriminatory special treatment for those who can afford to invest their savings in stocks and bonds. The profit that they realize from selling those stocks is taxed at half the rate that we tax the income from salaries and wages. And if the stockholder holds on to the stock until he dies and passes them to his children, none of the growth in the value of that stock is taxed. It has been estimated that the Federal Treasury loses \$3½ billion in tax revenues each year from the untaxed growth in the value of property passed on to heirs or given away in the form of lifetime gifts.

Another loophole that provides for the enrichment of the few at the expense of the

many is the oil depletion allowance. Although we succeeded in cutting it back somewhat in 1969, it still permits the oil titans to get back their costs many times over without paying taxes, while other businessmen can only recover their initial costs. This gimmick is said to cost us \$1.2 billion a year—lost revenue that the middle-income taxpayer must make up.

There are a host of other inequities: the favored treatment afforded to the stock options granted to top executives; the *encouragement* provided by the tax laws for American business to build its factories abroad and hire foreign workers at a time when our balance of payments is precarious and unemployment in this country is intolerable; the scheme that was designed for tax-exempt organizations, which has not been thoroughly re-examined in the nearly 60 years of the federal income tax.

The Tax Reform Act of 1969—which Albert Gore was so instrumental in molding—afforded tax relief for the very poorest in our nation. But powerful forces kept it from correcting the unequal burdens imposed upon the middle-income taxpayer. The man who is working, raising a family, educating his children, and perhaps paying off the mortgage on his home, has a double-barrelled problem. Inflation eats away at his paycheck each week, so that it buys him less and less, but at the end of the year, Uncle Sam comes along and slaps him with an unfair share of the tax load. You might say the dollar he earns is worth less but costing him more.

Those us who have been calling for a change in our national priorities, a redirection of American energy to the tasks we face in this country, are often asked: Where do you plan to get the money? Much of it, I am convinced, must come from the fat in our defense budget. But there is another source: Recouping some of the estimated \$50 billion a year of tax revenues now lost to special interests. It may be that some of the activities, which we now subsidize through the tax system, we shall want to continue to subsidize, because they are important to the general welfare.

But let us "search out and destroy" the special privilege that benefits only those who are especially privileged at the expense of those who, for too long, have been asked to quietly carry more than their fair share of the load.

#### GOVERNOR DOCKING WRITES THE PRESIDENT OPPOSING ATOMIC WASTE REPOSITORY NEAR LYONS, KANS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. Roy), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, many of my fellow Kansans are very concerned about the insistence of the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with development of an atomic repository near Lyons, Kans., over the objections of elected public officials and distinguished members of the Kansas scientific community.

The distinguished Governor of Kansas, Robert Docking, has fought valiantly at every level to insure that the safety of Kansas' citizens be guaranteed before the site is acquired by the AEC and development begins. The AEC apparently has chosen to ignore the Governor's clear and forceful statements. Because of this, the Governor has seen fit to write the President of the United States expressing his opposition to the AEC procedures.

I strongly endorse and support Governor Docking's position in this regard, and insert at this time Governor Docking's letter to the President of June 22, 1971, along with the Governor's cover letter to me:

STATE OF KANSAS,  
June 24, 1971.

Hon. WILLIAM ROY,  
U.S. Representative,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Kansans are most concerned about the potential danger in the Atomic Energy Commission's proposed radioactive atomic waste repository near Lyons, Kansas. The AEC does not have the scientific evidence to prove the safety of the proposed project.

As Governor, I have asked that the repository project be delayed until scientific tests are completed to determine whether the project is safe or unsafe. Despite objections from many Kansas citizens and scientists, the AEC has announced its intentions to seek funds to move ahead with the project. The AEC plans to enter into an unknown area of atomic waste disposal and attempt to solve problems as they occur. In Kansas, we ask to assure safety, studies be undertaken to solve the anticipated problems before they occur.

I have written a letter to President Nixon (which I am enclosing) asking him to intervene with AEC to restrain the AEC from pursuing the Lyons project until further scientific tests are completed and the safety of the project can be assured the people of Kansas.

I have written to the President because the AEC has treated as trivial the concern of many Kansans.

To halt the AEC's march toward establishing this repository in Kansas against the wishes of many Kansans, we need your support and the support of the entire Kansas congressional delegation.

With every good wish.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT DOCKING,  
Governor of Kansas.

STATE OF KANSAS,  
June 21, 1971.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the United States,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter is an appeal to you to intervene with a federal agency under your supervision—the Atomic Energy Commission—to restrain the AEC from pursuing its announced intentions to seek funds from Congress to purchase land near Lyons, Kansas, and proceed to design and construct an atomic waste repository—despite objections from many Kansas citizens, scientists and elected officials.

The AEC proposes to bury radioactive atomic wastes in salt beds in the vicinity of Lyons, Kansas, first for what is termed a demonstration project, and then permanently. There are many, many unanswered questions regarding the safety of this project. The questions concern shipping the wastes safely by rail to the proposed burial site, safety of the types of containers used in shipment and storage, and safety in the methods used to store the radioactive material. The AEC plans to enter into an unknown area of atomic waste disposal and attempt to solve problems after they occur. In Kansas, we ask that to assure safety, studies be undertaken to solve the anticipated problems before they occur.

It will take 250,000 to 500,000 years for the radioactive wastes to decay. It is difficult to comprehend these figures; 500,000 years for radioactive wastes to decay is 10 times longer than the history of man on earth. An important question bearing upon the health and safety of generations is whether

these radioactive wastes can be stored for even a few years—not to mention hundreds of years—without dangerous leakage into our water supply or into the atmosphere.

The concerns of some of the best scientific minds in Kansas and the nation have been documented by the Kansas Geological Survey at the University of Kansas, directed by Dr. William Hambleton.

Dr. Hambleton and his colleagues are not satisfied with many conclusions asserted by the AEC regarding the depository. Dr. Hambleton is not satisfied with the AEC analyses of heat flow from the buried wastes and its geologic effects on the salt beds and the rock structures which seal the salt above and below. The AEC cannot assure Kansans that the dangerous radiation emitted by the radioactive wastes can be kept away from man.

In the past few months, I have contacted Senator John Pastore, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and Representative Joe L. Evins, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works. I have requested that Congress defer funds for the Lyons project until adequate scientific studies are completed to determine the site's safety to the satisfaction of the people of Kansas, scientists and elected officials. I believe this to be a reasonable request, but the AEC has announced it will pursue the Lyons project despite our objections.

To date, AEC officials, for the most part, have treated concerns of Kansans in a patronizing manner. They have attempted to dismiss our concerns as trivial, offering only fatherly phrases of "have faith in us." Our experiences with the officials of the AEC in the past few months have given us ample reasons *not* to have faith in the AEC. The attitude of most AEC officials has been one of arrogance.

The AEC has treated as trivial the concerns of Kansans for a potentially dangerous project which could affect thousands of Kansans—and all Americans. They have treated our concerns as trivial when placed before members of Congress. It is for this reason I am appealing to you, Mr. President, for you to examine the facts in this matter. I ask that you intervene with the AEC to restrain the AEC from pursuing the Lyons project and that the AEC withdraw its requests for funds to purchase land and design the repository at Lyons until further scientific tests are completed and the safety of the project can be assured the people of Kansas.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT DOCKING,  
Governor of Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to Mr. SKUBITZ.

KANSAS ATOMIC WASTE DISPOSAL PROJECT  
LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to learn that the Governor of Kansas, the Honorable Robert Docking has written the President of his concern about—and opposition to—the Atomic Energy Commission's proposed atomic-waste repository in Kansas. I am pleased that my colleague Mr. Roy has called attention to it by asking that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I only hope that Governor Docking's request that the President rescind funds for land acquisition in Kansas for the waste dump will be accorded more favorable consideration than my similar letter.

I too wrote my President almost 2 months ago, calling his attention to the problem and asking for his personal intercession in a matter of such grave

importance to the people of Kansas. I must admit that some 2 weeks later a Mr. Bill Timmons of the White House staff acknowledged receipt of my letter, which at least gave me assurance that mail delivery between the Capitol and the White House was still functioning. But to this good day, I have yet to be advised by the President, by our former colleague, Mr. Clark McGregor, to whom I arranged to have a copy delivered so that he would be personally informed of my concern, by any other member of the White House staff, or by my leaders here in the House of what decision, if any, has been or will be taken on this issue.

It is quite possible, of course, in due deference to the President, that he knows nothing of this matter. After all, his staff obviously believes it their duty to shield him from these mundane affairs which he, in his days here, did not regard as inconsequential. So, in the hope and belief that the President still reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask that the text of my letter of April 29 be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

APRIL 29, 1971.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write you on a matter of the utmost concern to Kansas and of great personal importance to me as a Kansas Congressman and a Republican who, like you, believes in the rights of the states.

It relates to a recommended item in your Budget for the Atomic Energy Commission of "partial funding of \$3.5 million for initiation of design and land acquisition for a national radioactive waste repository at Lyons, Kans., for the storage of radioactive waste in an abandoned salt mine (total estimated cost \$25 million)." (page 801—The Budget of the United States Government, Appendix Fiscal Year 1972).

My request to you is that you withdraw the recommendation for this item and propose its deletion. May I cite the reasons, in brief and obviously condensed form.

1. Neither the \$3.5 million budgeted amount of the \$25 million expenditure proposed to be authorized by H.R. 5522 is now required to permit the AEC to continue the research it has been carrying on at Lyons. The AEC has been leasing the salt beds and adjacent lands for a nominal sum; such leasing can and should continue until such time as safety and health questions relating to the burial of highly lethal nuclear wastes have been satisfactorily answered by currently-carried on scientific investigations.

2. Scientific consultants to the AEC have raised a number of questions that invoke the integrity of the site for the permanent burial of "high-level" (which means highly lethal), hot (above 600 degrees), long-lived (50,000 years to half million years), atomic wastes. These questions concern corrosion of the containers; permeability of the salt; rock fractures due to heat and consequent atomic pollution of subterranean water levels involving the Arkansas river basin (in my Congressional District); escape of lethal radon gas and consequent danger to plant and animal life; lack of any planning for retrieval of wastes in case of accident or other emergency; lack of any planning for safe carriage of atomic wastes from distant points by rail, truck, or aircraft; and no planning for quick recovery of poisonous wastes in the event of train or other accident.

(a) These unresolved questions concurred in part by the AEC itself, will take at least two years of further research, according to AEC estimates. Until the issues of public safety are satisfactorily resolved, including to the satisfaction of the Kansas scientific community under the aegis of the State Geologic Survey which is a paid AEC scientific consultant, it would be a waste of public moneys for AEC to acquire the lands. Moreover, there is some reason to believe that if acquisition takes place, the AEC would move ahead promptly with the project prior to final resolution of safety factors.

3. The projected waste depository has aroused wide controversy in Kansas and considerable opposition.

(a) The Kansas Legislature has pending before it resolutions praying your deferral of the project that were sponsored by 48 Members of the House and 8 Members of the Senate.

(b) The Governor is opposed to site acquisition and even experimental burial of wastes until and when his Kansas scientific advisers (the State Geologic Survey—an AEC consultant) are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt (since peoples' lives are at stake the "reasonable doubt" rule is logical) that such highly dangerous materials may be safely buried in Kansas salt. The Governor has threatened legal action to protect Kansas citizens if it becomes necessary. The Governor, who less than a year ago expressed no opposition to the project, now accuses the AEC of being "high handed." He is quoted in press dispatches as saying: "I thought the AEC officials were nothing less than downright shabby in the way they reacted to the testimony of Kansas public officials during the recent congressional hearings. . . ." The Kansas press quotes the Governor further: "They (AEC) were insinuating in the way they questioned Kansas officials who were testifying in opposition to the project. They apparently thought they could just throw their weight around and make us all play dead for them on this thing. . . . I am not sure they are ever going to be able to provide us with sufficient certain answers as to the results of such testing to get us to be willing to accept this project."

(c) Scores of editorials have appeared in newspapers throughout the State that question the project, question its safety, or oppose it outright. Resolutions in opposition, petitions opposing and meetings opposing have been adopted by and held by the Kansas State League of Women Voters, environmental and ecological organizations led by the Sierra clubs, college students at four of the state institutions of higher learning at Lawrence, Hutchinson, Topeka, and Pittsburg. They and many newspaper editorials have uniformly questioned the responsibility and duty of Kansas to become a national nuclear waste dump for the refuse of privately owned nuclear power plants located in other States.

4. The State as a sovereign has, as I am sure you will agree, certain inalienable rights to protect itself from intrusion, even from a Federal agency. Kansas is not shunning a responsibility to the Federal Government but rather to investor-owned utility companies located and operating in other states who find it dangerous to bury their own wastes in their own backyards. State officials would have, in my judgment, strong statewide support if they found it necessary to seek injunctive relief against a Federal agency's attempt to install a facility the State regarded as dangerous to its own citizens. No useful purpose would be served if a public, legal controversy developed between Kansas and this Administration. On the contrary, substantial harm, including political harm, could flow from such a confrontation.

I would be pleased, if you deemed it useful or necessary, to deal in greater detail with these matters. It is my feeling that you could not have heretofore known any of the facts cited in this letter. I felt that I owed you the duty of personally apprising you of them before irrevocable action is taken. The deletion of the proposed appropriation and perhaps some admonition to an agency that

has become excessively arrogant would do much to alleviate currently bitter feelings in many quarters.

With expressions of highest esteem, I am,  
Respectfully,

JOE SKUBITZ,  
Member of Congress.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE TO REVIEW DECISIONS THAT LED TO WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the public's right to know—the very keystone of any democracy—has been slowly eroded over the past decades. Administration after administration has been less than frank with the people. The startling revelations of the McNamara study laid bare that attitude. Granted, Mr. Speaker, the study is not an outright indictment of the executive branch. Perhaps it is a hasty and superficial analysis of contingency plans, as the Government contends, or a thesis tainted by antiwar bias. What is plain beyond dispute, however, is that the people were denied access to total honesty on some of the major policy decisions revealed in that study—the decisions that mired us deep in Southeast Asia.

It is a sobering situation, Mr. Speaker.

Even the Justice Department—the steward of our constitutional rights—contends only high-ranking administration officials should be privy to the McNamara study. Yielding grudgingly to protests from everywhere in our society, the administration now says it will make the study available to the Congress—and, eventually, to the people themselves.

But what about the people's rights now?

What about their rights over the past 10 years?

The newspapers that have published the McNamara study—the New York Times, the Washington Post, now the Boston Globe—have been delayed in exercising their responsibility to inform. Justice Department suits demand censorship of a report that is nothing short of vital to the people's interests. Nothing published to date has threatened national security. Outlining decisions long since past, the bulk of the study has been idly gathering dust for years now. True, it might embarrass Government officials.

But the study—at least the parts revealed to date—does not compromise the security of the United States. North Vietnam itself appears to be aware of many policy decisions cited in the study.

We have had enough debate and dithering about the war.

It is time to clear the air.

This week I introduced a resolution to create a new joint House-Senate Committee—a committee charged with carrying out a thorough and searching investigation into the history of the Vietnam war. Empowered to subpoena witnesses and documents, the committee would unearth the facts and put them before the American people.

It would not be a tribunal to expose villainy, nor a forum to launch attacks against the war.

Its goal would be this alone: A sober and evenhanded evaluation of the policies that led us into Vietnam and recommendations for legislative proposals that would enable the Congress to keep abreast of changing developments of the time.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this committee would answer a need that grows more pressing day by day.

We have already paid dearly for Vietnam: 50,000 Americans killed, hundreds of thousands more lamed and mutilated, \$250 billion squandered.

It is time to get out.

Just this week the Senate passed an amendment that is a stinging rebuke to the Nixon administration's policy of withdrawal—withdrawal so slow it seems almost glacial. Calling for total withdrawal within 9 months if our POW's are freed, the amendment would hasten an end to the war. The people have already spoken. Public opinion polls—poll after poll, year after year—show that the vast majority of Americans want to quit Vietnam.

The war is a mistake—a monumental mistake.

Still, Mr. Speaker, I think we are capable of learning from our errors.

If we can identify those errors, we can prevent them from ever leading us astray again.

The committee I suggest would be vital to that goal.

I want to emphasize, as strongly as I can, that it would be a joint committee—composed of House and Senate Members alike. Largely inspired by the McNamara papers, resolutions calling for committee investigations are proliferating wildly in both Chambers of Congress. Most seek committees narrowly limited to one body alone—the Senate in many cases, the House less frequently.

If I may speak bluntly, Mr. Speaker, this is foolish.

A single Senate committee would shunt aside the legitimate interests of the House, just as a single House committee would ignore the Senate's interests.

And two separate committees—one in the House, and one in the Senate—would waste time and money in needless duplication of effort.

Here is the text of my resolution.

H. Con. Res. 342

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That (a) there is hereby created a select joint committee (hereafter in this resolution referred to as the "committee") to be composed of—

(1) the chairman and ranking minority

member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the House Appropriations Committee;

(2) the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee;

(3) two other Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate; and

(4) two other Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker.

The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members. Any vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) The members shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties vested in the committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as Congress is in session.

(c) Except as otherwise provided by law, the committee shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of a clerk and such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

(d) The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study into the reasons for, and the course of, the involvement of the United States in the war in Vietnam. The committee shall report to each House of Congress the results of its investigation and study together with recommendations for such further legislative action as it deems appropriate. Such report shall be made as soon as practicable during the present Congress, but not later than June 30, 1972. Any such report which is made when the House or the Senate is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of the Ninety-second Congress.

Sec. 3. (a) The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized—

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

(2) to require by subpoena (to be issued under the signature of the chairman) or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents;

(3) to administer such oaths; and

(4) to take such testimony;

as it deems advisable.

(b) The committee, upon approval of the chairman, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, board, bureau, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Government, information, data, and statistics for the purpose of making its investigation and study; and each such department, board, bureau, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, data, and statistics directly to the committee upon request made pursuant to this subsection.

#### THE SHAMEFUL PLIGHT OF POVERTY AMONG MILITARY FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, this

week the House approved reform legislation, the stated purpose of which is to slow the growth of, and eventually reduce, the number of people forced onto welfare rolls.

At the same time, however, too little attention is paid to the plight of the first-term servicemen, whose meager pay scale permits his family and 50,000 other service families to be eligible for food stamps and other welfare benefits.

That is why, with the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER), I assumed the principal sponsorship of legislation to alleviate this tragic situation. Our bill, H.R. 4450, in which we were joined by nearly a hundred of our colleagues, proposed an increase in the pay of an E-1 recruit from \$134 a month to \$301 a month. These raises were originally discussed in the context of creating an all-volunteer armed force. But, as the Honolulu Advertiser pointed out in an editorial recently—

[N]o matter what Congress finally decides on the volunteer Army issue, something should be done immediately to ease the bind these men are in. America should not ask young men to serve, then subject them to such financial hardship.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has approved, as a part of the draft legislation now under consideration, the full pay increases set forth in H.R. 4450; the House-passed version is less generous. I trust that the two Houses will eventually agree on legislation that will eliminate the present disgraceful situation.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of our colleagues and other readers of the RECORD, I include the full text of the Advertiser editorial, along with a series of articles from the same newspaper on poverty in the military, which describe vividly the problem with which we must deal:

#### MILITARY POVERTY

The best way to describe the treatment of low-ranking married enlisted men in the nation's armed services is to say it is deplorable, outdated, and insensitive to problems facing the military today.

Advertiser staff writer Richard Hoyt has documented this treatment in a series of articles, stressing the low pay and the callous manner in which government regulations virtually ignore the plight of a first-term enlisted man if he is a family man.

For this young man, often a draftee or someone who has enlisted to avoid the draft, life resembles the poverty cycle familiar to persons on welfare. But in Hawaii even welfare is denied because of the assumption the military takes care of its own.

And in Hawaii financial difficulties are made even worse by the unusually high cost of living and the shortage of housing.

This disgraceful situation is rooted in the belief that a young man should donate several years of his life to national defense in peacetime as well as war. This concept is being assailed by those who want well-paid volunteer military forces. In fact, better pay and benefits for such men seem essential to that concept.

But no matter what Congress finally decides on the volunteer Army issue, something should be done immediately to ease the bind these men are in.

America should not ask young men to serve, then subject them to such financial hardship.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, May 27, 1971]  
**BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL—MILITARY IGNORES  
 WIVES OF FIRST-TERMERS**  
 (By Richard Hoyt)

If the military services wanted a first-term serviceman to have a wife they would presumably issue him one with neatly stenciled letters on her forehead: Spouse, Female, One Each.

The serviceman would carry on from there. In basic training he would be herded onto a bleacher with 50 others in his plight for a one hour block of instruction, by a bachelor NCO, on wife maintenance.

But Federal regulations do not authorize wives for first-term servicemen. The results for these "non-command sponsored" families, as they are called, are not only very unfunny, they are tragic.

Roughly 33,000 American servicemen on their first tour of duty, 23 per cent of all active duty soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines are married.

Probably most of these men were either drafted or forced by the draft to enlist in a system that does not acknowledge the need to support the families of the four lowest enlisted ranks.

The result has been described by Rep. William R. Steiger, Republican of Wisconsin, as a virtual "poverty cycle" for low ranking enlisted men.

"The draft survives as a last vestige of the ancient custom whereby the rich and powerful forced the poor and weak to provide services at subsistence wages," Steiger concluded after a recent tour of Mainland military bases.

"Conscription has been justified by the Supreme Court as a valid power of the state in times of 'grave emergency or national peril.' But the recent legislative history of military pay makes it plain that the primary function of conscription has been to depress military compensation to a point where a disenfranchised minority of the citizenry has been compelled to bear a grossly disproportionate share of the costs of defense."

What would Steiger have said had he toured Oahu where the cost of living is 20 per cent higher than on the Mainland? The housing pinch is also tougher on Oahu which last year accommodated 42,000 officers and enlisted men plus another 15,700 aboard ships homeported at Pearl Harbor.

The military discourages the first-terminer from bringing his family with him to Hawaii. Lacking appropriate regulations, the services cannot prohibit "non-command sponsored" families.

The Federal regulation that all services must follow is simple: "A member in pay grade E-5 (less than four years of service), E-3, E-2, or E-1 is considered at all times to be without dependents."

A married recruit with two children assigned to a Mainland post, according to Steiger, receives \$3,500 per year including allowances for quarters, subsistence, child support and tax advantages.

First termers assigned on Oahu are eligible for cost of living allowances intended to help with the cost of living here, but Federal regulations deny them these benefits which are allowed the career soldier:

Free travel of dependents.

Transportation of household effects.

Dislocation allowance.

Family separation allowance.

Such non-command sponsored families, with the exception of one block of military housing at Schofield Barracks, are denied on post housing.

Hawaii, second to Alaska in cost of living, is one of 29 states that do not allow welfare payments to service families.

Government standards for low income budgets allow a family of four a minimum of \$1,905 a year for an adequate diet. On the

basis of interviews conducted by The Advertiser it appears that some non-command families here may not have that much to spend after rent and transportation.

Servicemen are eligible for food stamps here. But a married serviceman with a family of four, according to Steiger's statistics, is allowed subsistence payments of only \$554 a year. He is eligible for \$846 a year in food stamps.

He is eligible for commissary purchases, which the military estimates carries a 20 per cent savings, but commissaries are located on military reservations.

Virtually all non-sponsored servicemen on Oahu live "on the economy," which means in off-post housing.

Higher rents near the posts force them away from the commissaries.

A 1970 Defense Department survey revealed that more than one half the wives of first-termers worked to supplement their incomes.

The necessity of having a working wife may be no news to an Island man. But look at what the serviceman faces:

There are fewer jobs available to the service wife because of City and State residency requirements which discriminate against those new to the Island.

He is not eligible for the \$30 a month separation allowance should he leave his wife at home to live with her parents or mother-in-law. Of course she doesn't want that.

She wants to come to Hawaii. She does but is forced to live under poverty conditions. She feels unwanted and complains about the State which doesn't bring much aloha from local residents.

#### FOR SOME GIs, "IT'S TOUGH" HERE

(By Richard Hoyt)

If a soldier is 19 years old, married, and on his first tour of duty, life in Hawaii is no paradise. It's an unending round of high rent, food bills and telephone bills.

There are approximately 568 such soldiers on Oahu—of pay rate E-4 or below and with less than four years of service—trying to buck the high cost of living with a family.

The Army calls them "non-command sponsored" families. That term has nothing to do with the preferences of local commanders. It is a service-wide term for first tour servicemen who have yet to commit themselves to a career in the military.

It is a product of a system which relies on the draft to provide an adequate supply of soldiers.

If a married young enlisted man cannot wangle an assignment near his home town he can get into trouble. It is especially bad to be assigned to Oahu—2,500 miles from the Mainland.

Maj. George D. Bennet, commander of Headquarters Company Troop Command, Schofield Barracks, has had to counsel a number of these men in assignments both here and on the Mainland.

Bennet said it is usually the volunteers rather than the draftees who get into trouble.

He described draftees as older and more mature. Those who enlist, he said, tend to be younger and less stable.

"In many cases the individual is just immature. He can't handle his finances," Bennet said.

"These girls (the wives) are 18 or 19, many of them, and this is their first trip from home.

"It's the first term RA's (regular Army) usually. The draftees are usually older.

"Some of these girls run up phone bills of \$300 to \$400," he said.

In the mid-1960s, Bennet was a company commander at Ft. Carson, Colo. "It wasn't too much of a problem over there.

"Over here I can appreciate the fact that they want their families with them. It isn't easy to visit home like it is on the Mainland.

"But they have to pay for them. When they first get here trying to find an apartment, why, it's tough. It's hard finding one they can afford."

A recent survey by Tom Zoller, chief of family housing and billeting at Schofield, found an approximate total of 568 non-command sponsored Army families on Oahu.

Some 149 of those families enjoy the rare privilege—for them—of on post housing.

Spec. 4 Gary L. Lindsay and his wife live in one of the units in the GG Housing Area at Schofield.

Lindsay's one-bedroom apartment at GG is neat, clean and comfortable.

"I can do anything with the place I want to but I have to do it myself," said Lindsay. "They will give me two gallons of paint and a brush and say have at it.

"The paint, incidentally, is white, so you have to tint it. But that only costs 50 cents. For an inexpensive place to live in Hawaii, I'm willing to do a little painting."

The quartermaster at Schofield will issue furniture to residents of GG or to servicemen "living on the economy" (renting an apartment in Wahiawa or elsewhere).

Lindsay has a good deal but it could come to an end both for him and the other non-sponsored families if the Army should experience a sudden influx of troops. Command sponsored families would have preference for GG apartments.

There is at least one G.I. rumor that GG will soon be closed to non-sponsored families. It may not be true but it fosters an insecurity which is unnerving.

And some young servicemen, including Spec. 4 Jerome Rogers, feels even living in GG has its drawbacks. If you live in GG your rent of \$65 a month is deducted from your paycheck and you lose your housing allowance.

"If I could find an apartment on the outside at \$130 or \$140 a month, I'd come out even," said Rogers.

Spec. 4 Russ Stanford agreed but added, "Most of the places in Wahiawa are \$160 or more. If you get a place for \$130 it's a rat hole."

GG is good by Wahiawa standards. "If I was to find something like that on the outside it would cost me \$160 a month," said Rogers.

Stanford had his wife and child with him once before but could not support her. She returned to the Mainland but will be coming back soon.

"Getting started here is what's hard," he said. "But I couldn't make it out here another year without my family."

Spec. 4 Brian Davitt, a photographer with the Signal Corps, unlike Rogers and Stanford, was drafted.

Davitt also is a sculptor; his wife is a potter. She made their dishes and found work in a pottery shop. He made their furniture and some of their cookware.

"We've had a pretty good time of it," Davitt said. "I can't complain at all. We like it out here."

Davitt, in fact, would like to stay in Hawaii and is looking for a job here as a photographer.

The big difference between a non-sponsored and a sponsored family is that the non-sponsored families are ineligible for on post housing and they cannot travel or have their household goods shipped at government expense.

Lt. Col. William L. Nichols, chief of the military personnel division at Schofield, feels some servicemen exaggerate the disadvantage they suffer at not having all their household goods shipped at government expense. He said they are allowed a shipment of 250 pounds.

"He can bring lots of things with 250 pounds. This is in addition to the 66 pounds he brought with him on the airplane."

Also, Nichols said, the non-sponsored servicemen know in advance they cannot support a wife here.

"Normally they come alone and then they have their wives follow. So they usually have an idea of what the problems are before they bring their wives with them."

Furthermore the Red Cross and the Army Emergency Relief Fund, supported by servicemen's donations, stand ready to help them should they get into trouble, he said.

The Red Cross will offer a loan first and then a grant if necessary, he said.

#### IT IS A 42-MONTH WAIT FOR HOUSING AT HICKAM

(By Richard Hoyt)

The G.I.'s say life in the military is always hurry up and wait. If you're an Air Force sergeant (pay rate E-4) committed to a six-year tour of duty you have to wait 42 months for on-post housing at Hickam Field.

At first blush, it looks like such a sergeant might get to live on post the last six months of his 48-month tour here—if he's lucky.

Of course not all enlisted men have to wait that long. Senior enlisted men and those with long service in the Air Force are moved to the top of the list.

There are 1,300 currently on the list.

The enlisted men who most need on-post housing are not eligible for the list. Some 500 of these men, pay rate E-1 through E-4, are thrown with their families onto the murderous Oahu housing market.

The local Air Force command doesn't like the situation. The commanders here try to be as fair as they can. But there is a limited number of housing units available.

Air Force officers don't like the low pay scales for the bottom four enlisted ranks either. And that isn't their fault. Congress writes the paycheck.

Also, people are too quick to compare military paychecks with civilian paychecks. Such comparisons are rarely fair to the military.

They almost never take into account the hidden but real benefits of such things as PX privileges and free medical and dental care. But you have to enjoy life segregated on a military base to enjoy all those services.

And it doesn't help the very real plight of the married man trying to live on E-3 or E-4 pay. If he is assigned to Oahu, his wife will have to work in order for his family to subsist.

If he has a child or his wife can't work, he has to have a lot of imagination to keep his family together.

"I pay \$200 a month out in Waipahu and I have to come in and out every day," said Sgt. (E-4) Carl Barone.

"If my wife didn't work I'd be stuck. The transportation costs money but I can't get any closer to base. The closer you are to base, the higher the rents are."

Barone said he has a sergeant friend who was lucky enough to get into housing leased by the government. He said the sergeant had to give up \$195 a month in housing and other benefits to live in the apartment which was far smaller than his Waipahu unit.

"You don't win in that case, really," he said.

Sgt. Randy Sharpe agreed.

"Most of the places I can afford to live in are sub-par. You can't afford anything better."

"My wife works so I can afford a \$200 apartment. But I had a hell of a time finding it." Barone said Oahu landlords keep a close eye on military pay hikes.

"As soon as the landlord finds we get a raise they raise our rent. It's happened to me twice, once for \$15, once for \$10."

Barone said he has been tempted to send his bride of six months to the Mainland so he can save some money.

"We are planning on going home in Sep-

tember. To do that means cutting back to zero and you can't live on zero."

He said life on the housing list is terribly frustrating for the low ranking enlisted man.

"The guy (on the list) is going to think about going AWOL, divorcing his old lady or killing himself. He can't live here on what he's getting."

Airman I.C. Stephen Bennett, said his situation is "very discouraging."

"After I get through with the rent and bills, I don't have anything left. I really have to scrape to make it."

"I can't afford the rent I'm paying now and I've got two years to go."

Barone re-enlisted recently; he received a \$3,000 re-up bonus.

"Yeah, \$3,000 and bang! Just gone. The \$3,000 paid all my bills and now I'm back into the same rut."

Sharpe said, "You can't get enough money in the bank to meet emergencies. You have to go down to the loan company and pay those interest rates."

"Unless they do something to increase the benefits, I'm getting out. They will have to pay me more money or I'm shipping out," said Barone.

Sgt. Carl Jones agreed: "That's it."

Jones, married and with a seven-month-old child, pays \$235 a month rent for an apartment.

"The young airman says 'it will take me forever to make it to base (housing). I'm not going to wait that long.' You can't get the guy to re-enlist under those conditions," Barone said.

The airmen The Advertiser interviewed didn't like Oahu or life on it. Similar feelings were expressed by 14 of 17 soldiers and sailors interviewed.

A frequent complaint was that local firms won't extend credit to enlisted men. And some alleged that prices in local stores go up for servicemen.

"As soon as they find out you're military, everything goes up," said Barone.

Bennett claimed a local policeman discriminated against him in the investigation of an automobile accident.

He said a car driven by a local man forced him to the side of the road by cutting sharply in front of him. Bennett's bumper struck the other man's rear fender.

"The policeman took the other guy aside. He didn't even talk to me. He came back and asked me if I would like to pay for the damage out of court."

#### THE MILITARY'S TOP SECRET IS—HOW EM'S MAKE ENDS MEET

(By Richard Hoyt)

An enlisted sailor struggling up through the bottom four levels of pay is not married when he arrives for duty at Pearl Harbor. From the Navy's point of view it doesn't matter if he happens to have a wife or not.

He is not married because the military services do not consider marriage appropriate for low ranking enlisted men. Proper support for these families would be expensive. And for those who stick with the Navy, life becomes better.

The Navy discourages—but cannot prohibit—a seaman from bringing his wife with him to Oahu.

But the seaman must pay for his wife's air fare and support her on pay intended for a single man and modified only slightly to accommodate his new circumstance.

He is not eligible for Navy housing. Neither is he eligible for a number of other benefits intended to help the married sailor who has made it past what is known in Navy slang as the "P-Line" (peon line). The P-Line is a four-year enlistment term.

In order to qualify for government-paid shipment of his household belongings and for Navy housing he must achieve an E-4

pay scale (Petty Officer Third Class) with at least four years of service or he must have enlisted for a six-year term.

"Otherwise you are just words," said PO 3.C. Vincent J. Dostaler.

Dostaler is lucky. His wife, a registered nurse, is employed at Queen's Medical Center.

"If my wife wasn't working, I'd be living by the skin of my teeth, from pay day to pay day. Others aren't so lucky as me. They have to scrimp like hell to buy a \$3 case of beer once a month."

Young sailors are warned before they leave the Mainland—and after they arrive here—not to bring their wives to Hawaii.

But it's asking a lot of a young wife for her not to see what Hawaii is all about.

Navy Chaplain Charles Shaw would agree with Dostaler. "I know you may say this is easy for me to say (Shaw is a commander) but I think a man and a wife ought to be together."

"I think we're suffering from antiquated thinking that has been gathering dust for years."

And it's not that the married men have all the problems. Even a single sailor in Hawaii is hard-pressed to afford basic amenities he enjoyed as a civilian.

Seaman Apprentice (E-2) Robert Hill, a young South Carolinian, has one disastrous vice for a man of his rank—he makes car payments of \$73 per month. He said as a civilian such payments would be within his means.

But with the \$113 a month remaining, "even getting stuff like shaving cream and razor blades at the PX is a hassle," he said.

Of the \$113, he sends \$30 or \$40 home to help his mother. "Once, after I got the allotment sealed in the envelope, I didn't have enough money for stamps."

If Hill resents his situation, look at the cases of two pretty young WAVES, Seaman (E-3) Michele F. Preston and Seaman Terry L. DeWeese. Miss Preston is engaged to be married to a sailor. Mrs. DeWeese is married to a sailor serving in Vietnam.

If Mrs. DeWeese was not a WAVE, say if she waited tables in a Pearl City restaurant, her husband could receive an allotment for her support and a quarters allowance—a total sum of about \$190 a month.

"I can't get any of the benefits a dependent wife can get. We even had to fight for separation pay because he's in Vietnam."

"They say he has a place to sleep—on the ship—and I have a room—in the barracks. But I can't live on ship and he can't live in the barracks."

Miss Preston said her fiance is shore-stationed, yet the Navy won't consider her a dependent after she is married, "simply because I'm in the Navy."

So both women are forced to live in a crowded barracks.

The Navy does not deliberately persecute its enlisted personnel. Pay and allowances for all services are set by the same Department of Defense scale.

Senior Chief Petty Officer (E-8) D. L. Kramer, a personnel specialist at Pearl Harbor, said it is Navy policy that an enlisted man below the P-Line "is not considered to have dependents even if he does."

A married sailor must have shore duty to qualify for a housing allowance and then must get the command's permission.

"The base pay (for E-1 through E-4) is so low we have to run very fast just to stand still," said M. L. Ornelles, director of the finance center.

Ornelles said recent across-the-board pay raises did nothing to close the gap between high and low ranking enlisted men.

A Navy family is not eligible for welfare because the State assumes that it is cared for by the military—even though the family income may fall below the poverty line.

Navy families are eligible for public hous-

ing supported by Federal money—such as The Hawaii Housing Authority. But they are frequently on the bottom of long waiting lists.

Furthermore, Navy families who do make it into public housing such as Kuhio Park Terrace are likely to encounter resentment from those who feel such housing should be reserved for local people.

Also young wives with talents they could have sold on the Mainland labor market must buck City and State residency requirements of up to three years before they can be hired.

Those are just some of the obstacles. Yet young sailors still want to have their wives with them.

Dostaler is working hard to make E-5 before he leaves so his household belongings may be moved at government expense.

P.O. S.C. Peter G. Menihan, married and with a B.A. in psychology, drives a truck for the Navy. He had to go to Wahiawa to find an apartment he could afford.

But he can't buy appliances he needs at the PX because he can't afford to have them shipped to the Mainland. And the Navy refused him a 30-day early release so he could accept a job offer in a tight Mainland labor market.

"We just make ends meet," he said. "We have to budget like hell to do it."

"If my wife didn't work we would starve," said Dostaler.

"I have about \$3 from every paycheck to last me to next pay day," said Hill. "What kind of life is that?"

#### POSTAL WORKERS' RIGHTS TO COMMUNICATE WITH CONGRESS MUST BE PROTECTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to guarantee the right of Postal Service employees to communicate with Members of Congress, and to assure Congress that it will have direct access to the information it needs to evaluate the operation of the Postal Service.

This bill would prohibit anyone from interfering with the postal employee's right to communicate freely and openly with Congress. It contains a penalty provision which is exactly the same as the penalty provision contained in the Hatch Act, passed by Congress in 1939 to prevent pernicious political activities.

My proposal provides for a maximum \$1,000 fine and up to a year in prison for any Federal officer or employee who discriminates in any manner against any postal employee for communicating with a Member of Congress or a congressional committee.

It is unfortunate that legislation of this nature has become necessary. However, in view of the policies being implemented by the Postmaster General, I can see no other way to guarantee the postal employees' right to communicate with their elected Representatives in Congress.

There can be no doubt about the Postmaster General's attitude in this matter. In his now infamous memorandum of last January 12, he stated in part:

It is mandatory that postal employees immediately cease any direct or indirect contacts with Congressional offices on matters involving the Postal Service.

He later attempted to clarify this "gag rule," but his intention remains obvious. In his "clarifying" directive, the Postmaster General stated:

In the event that a direct contact with a Congressional office becomes necessary, it is to be coordinated in advance with the (new) Congressional Liaison Office.

Perhaps the Postmaster General simply does not realize that the enforcement of this policy would contravene the laws of the United States. Perhaps it has not occurred to him that enforcement of the "gag rule" would interfere with a basic constitutional right to which every American citizen is entitled—the right to petition his Government.

But there can be little doubt that the policy presently advocated by the Postmaster General does interfere, both directly and indirectly, with the postal employee's right to communicate with his Representative in Congress. There can be little doubt that present policy unnecessarily inhibits the free and open communication which has traditionally existed between postal employees and Congress.

The bill which I am introducing today, rather than creating any new rights, would simply provide for the protection of presently existing legal rights. The specific language setting forth the postal employee's right to communicate with his Congressman was written into law in 1912. Section 7102 of title 5 of the United States Code states:

The right of [postal] employees, individually or collectively, to petition Congress or a Member of Congress, or to furnish information to either House of Congress, or to a committee or Member thereof, may not be interfered with or denied.

My bill would simply make the existing law something more than a hollow pronouncement of this right. It would assure that this right could actually be enforced. Under my proposal, the postal employee would have the assurance that his right to communicate freely with his Congressman would not be violated, and Congress would have the assurance that it would always have access to the information it needs to evaluate the operation of the Postal Service.

I would like to emphasize that the penalties provided under this legislation are the same as those provided under the Hatch Act. The Hatch Act, as we are well aware, forbids the employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government from using their official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof.

It would seem to me that the activities Congress has attempted to prevent by enacting the Hatch Act—interfering with or affecting the result of an election—are certainly no less pernicious than the activities which could and would be prevented by the enactment of this bill—interfering with a Federal employee's right to communicate with his Representative in Congress. For these reasons, I feel that enactment of this bill is vital.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that my colleagues will give this bill the prompt and favorable consideration it deserves,

and at this point, I would like to insert the text of the bill into the RECORD.

H.R. —

A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to facilitate direct communication between officers and employees of the United States Postal Service and Members of Congress, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act (84 Stat. 722-727; Public Law 91-375), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 413. Communications between Postal Service personnel and committees and Members of Congress

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title or of any other law, or any rule, regulation, order, or directive of, or applicable to, the Postal Service, neither the Postal Service nor any officer or employee of the Government of the United States outside the Postal Service shall prohibit or prevent any officer or employee of the Postal Service from having any direct oral or written communication or contact with any Member of Congress or with any committee of Congress in connection with any matter pertaining to the employment of such officer or employee or pertaining to the Postal Service in any way, irrespective of whether such communication or contact is at the initiative of such officer or employee or in response to the request or inquiry of any such Member or committee.

"(b) The preceding provisions of this section shall not be construed to affect in any way the authority of the Postal Service to establish, operate, and maintain any office or other organizational unit within the Postal Service to maintain liaison with the Congress and process all inquiries, requests, and other communications from the Congress to the Postal Service on an official basis; but such office or other organizational unit shall not be operated and maintained in any manner, or in accordance with any rule, regulation, order, or directive which is in violation of subsection (a) of this section."

(b) The table of sections of chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act (84 Stat. 722; Public Law 91-375), is amended by adding at the end thereof—

"413. Communications between Postal Service personnel and committees and Members of Congress."

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1924. Interference with communications by Postal Service personnel to Congress

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of the Postal Service or any officer or employee of the Government of the United States outside the Postal Service, removes, suspends from duty without pay, demotes, reduces in rank, seniority, status, pay, or performance or efficiency rating, denies promotion to, relocates, reassigns, transfers, disciplines, or discriminates in regard to any employment right, entitlement, or benefit, or any term or condition of employment of, any officer or employee of the Postal Service, or threatens to commit any of the foregoing actions with respect to such officer or employee, by reason of any communication or contact of such officer or employee with any Member of Congress or any committee of Congress as described in section 413(a) of title 39, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

(b) The table of sections of chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by

adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1924. Interference with communications by Postal Service personnel to Congress."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective at the beginning of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this Act.

#### MATERNAL AND INFANT PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in 1963, a new program of maternity and infant care focused on high risk maternity patients was established to help reduce the incidence of infant and maternal mortality, and other crippling conditions caused by complications associated with pregnancy. The Child Health Act of 1967—title V of the Social Security Act—extended this authorization for the Maternity and Infant Care projects to June 30, 1972. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the valuable service the Maternity and Infant Care special projects are providing to the newborn infants of low-income mothers.

In 1962, data gathered by the President's Panel on Mental Retardation, indicated that thousands of low-income women, especially those in inner-city ghetto areas, were giving birth to premature and low-birth weight babies at two and one-half times the expected rate and that these low-birth weight babies were likely to have brain damage. A baby born to a poor family has one-half the chance of reaching the age of one that a middle class baby has, and a similar proportion exists for black babies as compared to white babies. Infants born in Mississippi are much less likely to reach healthy adulthood than those born in Utah.

Similar data revealed the desperate need for adequate care of newborn infants from low-income families. The Maternity and Infant Care projects, responding to this need, began operation in 1964. Today, there are 55 project centers in 35 States. The projects are located in rural areas as well as urban, although the emphasis has been on inner-city ghetto areas. Maternity and Infant Care projects are providing prenatal care, hospital in-patient service, delivery and postpartum care to about 125,000 women yearly. Maternity and Infant projects also provide comprehensive care to newborn infants. In the first three quarters of 1970, 30,761 infants were admitted to the project clinics, 86 percent—26,443—were born to project mothers. Primary diagnosis of the infants admitted revealed 780 with congenital defects, 115 with birth injuries, 12 percent—3,703—exhibiting either prematurity or immaturity, 15 percent—4,865—with various other conditions, and 65 percent—20,209—were found to be perfectly normal. Maternity and Infant projects also provided for the hospitalization of over 14,000 newborns and over 2,500 infants. This care provided to new-

borns and infants by the Maternity and Infant projects is responsible for the reduction of preventable deaths, illnesses and many handicapping conditions among the poor. The earlier the detection and treatment of possible crippling conditions, the less likely they are to have permanently adverse effects on the child in later life.

The principal cause of infant death during the first year of life is prematurity, or the birth of infants weighing less than 5½ pounds. Premature births occur twice as frequently among black women as white, and they are much more common in women exhibiting maternal high-risk factors. Women served by these projects are frequently plagued by pregnancy complications, give birth to more than the usual amount of premature babies, and these babies need special care. Maternal and infant programs have provided for early recognition of high-risk infants not identified during the prenatal period, and have arranged for the immediate transfer of distressed infants to better equipped facilities when necessary. The programs have shown that intensive-care management of high-risk newborn infants results in the reduction of infant mortality.

Maternal and infant care projects are providing an invaluable service to high-risk pregnant women and the infants of low-income mothers. These programs are assuring that babies born to poor mothers have a chance of reaching a healthy and productive adulthood.

Mr. Speaker, because the authorization for these worthwhile projects is scheduled to terminate in fiscal year 1972, I have today introduced legislation to extend this authorization until 1977. Because of the importance of this legislation to Chicago and other major urban areas, I have been joined by seven of my Chicago colleagues in the introduction of this measure; RALPH METCALFE, ABNER MIKVA, MORGAN MURPHY, JOHN KLUCZYNSKI, GEORGE COLLINS, FRANK ANNUNZIO, and SIDNEY YATES.

Mr. Speaker, the value of these programs has been amply demonstrated since their inception in 1965. They need to be continued.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would be grossly negligent if I failed to mention the efforts of my good friend, the distinguished Representative from New York, Mr. KOCH, whose efforts in this area have been outstanding. His concern for the continuation of these programs has led to the endorsement of this extension by more than 64 Members of this House. We, in the Chicago delegation, are united in our strong support of the efforts of the gentleman from New York.

#### SUPPORT FOR SHORTER CAMPAIGNS

(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, on May 20 I introduced legislation to shorten presidential campaigns to 2 months by making impossible the nomi-

nation of candidates for President more than 60 days prior to election.

Recent efforts by several States to hold the earliest presidential primary make this legislation imperative. Candidates and voters now face the possibility of another half year of jockeying for position, an extended primary period, and finally a 4-month presidential campaign.

While the Congress would find it difficult to regulate the preprimary and primary periods, it can control the length of time between national conventions and election day. My bill, H.R. 8606, would reduce this time to 60 days, a reasonable and adequate period in this age of mass media and transit.

The short campaign makes sense in several ways. It would exert an indirect control over campaign expenses, avoid the tedious over-exposure of our candidates, and by sparing the electorate of drawn-out boredom, possibly increase the voter turnout.

In recent testimony before the House Subcommittee on Communications and Power, I pointed out that genuine campaign reform is bogging down in the variety, complexity, and party politics of the many proposals now before Congress. My bill offers a simple, direct approach to campaign reform, that is, at least for presidential campaigns, both workable and enforceable, and avoids the complexities that Congress is now struggling with.

I am pleased to have grassroots support for this position. I would like to offer for the consideration of my colleagues an excellent editorial from the Meriden, Conn., Record of June 19, 1971. I will be reintroducing my shorter campaign bill with cosponsors on Monday, June 28. I urge my colleagues to join me in working for passage of this vital reform.

The editorial follows:

#### AN UNWARRANTED DRAIN

Eighteen months from now there will be millions of election-weary Americans who will be wondering why it was necessary to go through a long, tedious, expensive presidential election campaign when it would have been possible to cut campaign time and spending to reasonable limits.

Congressman John Monagan, who represents Meriden and other towns in the Fifth District, in appearing before the House Subcommittee on Communications and Power in Washington on Wednesday, pressed his proposal to limit presidential campaigns to two months, making it illegal to nominate presidential candidates earlier than 60 days before the election.

Monagan's proposal to limit campaign time and spending is not the only such measure before Congress. There are myriad reform proposals, he said. "Each person is pushing the merits of his particular remedy, of his particular limits, while unfortunately genuine campaign reform is bogging down in the variety, complexity, and technicality of the proposals." Monagan claimed his own proposal was "simple, direct, workable, and enforceable."

By this time next year, the presidential campaign will be in full swing with the nominating convention for the Republicans in June and that of the Democrats later. By the time the election comes in November the candidates will be exhausted and the electorate bored, and millions of dollars in money spent.

As for spending money, a report issued

Thursday by the Federal Communications Commission reveals that in the 1970 off-year political campaigns at Congressional, state, and local levels the Democrats outspent the Republicans in television and radio advertising; \$26 million spent by the Democrats, \$21.7 million by the Republicans.

All told, political advertising spent on radio and television last year amounted to \$50.3 million, including \$2.7 million by minor parties. This was an increase of 57 per cent over 1966, the last comparable off-year figure when the radio-tv spending reached \$32 million.

Traditional Democratic contentions, which involved a number of primary fights, increased the total spending by the Democrats last year. In the general election itself, Republicans outspent the Democrats. Gov. Rockefeller, New York Republican, spent \$1.2 million to get re-elected as compared with \$364,500 spent by Arthur J. Goldberg, his Democratic opponent.

These figures from an off-year election bolster Congressman Monagan's proposal for restricting both the money and time spent on elections in the interest of both the electorate and the candidates. Congressman Monagan's colleagues will be well advised to adopt his proposals.

#### MILITARY DRUG ADDICTION

(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, since my introduction of "The Armed Forces Drug Abuse Control Act of 1971," on May 10, 50 of my colleagues in the House have joined with me in cosponsoring this bill.

Two weeks ago, when President Nixon announced his comprehensive program for combating drug abuse problems, both in the military and among civilians, and incorporated many of my ideas in his plan, my proposal was strengthened considerably. Yesterday, Mr. John E. Ingersoll, the active Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, assured me that the President had been particularly interested in the provision in my bill that would retain addicted servicemen beyond their normal term of duty for the purpose of rehabilitation and treatment and a form of this provision is included in the President's proposal. The President's plan does not carry the retention proposal as far as my own bill, but I welcome its advancement as a contribution to the ultimate solution.

I am including for the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Trumbull Times for June 17. Although the editorial does not fully agree with my own suggestions for rehabilitating addicted servicemen, I am pleased that it focuses attention on the general problems and on my proposal and I appreciate the suggestions that it sets forth.

I am also including for the RECORD a letter which I wrote to the New Republic, which was printed in the June 26, 1971 issue of that magazine.

The articles follow:

[From The New Republic, June 26, 1971]

#### MILITARY DRUG USE

SIR: I was interested to see the article, "Hard Drugs in the Military," by Senator Harold E. Hughes in the June 12 issue. His proposal exactly parallels my own bill, H.R. 8216. "The Armed Forces Drug Abuse Con-

trol Act of 1971," which now has 49 co-sponsors of both parties in the House. I am delighted that Senator Hughes is following my proposal on the Senate side.

Under the terms of my bill, a Drug Abuse Control Corps would be established in each branch of the Armed Forces to carry out comprehensive treatment-rehabilitation programs and to cut off the illegal traffic in drugs; a uniform amnesty-treatment program would be established in each of the Armed Forces; and the key provision of the bill states that "no member of an armed force who is adjudged by competent medical authority during his active duty to be addicted to a narcotic drug 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."

In outlining solutions to the drug abuse problem in the military, Senator Hughes proposed, "Universal drug treatment, rehabilitation, and preventive education programs throughout the armed services. Universal amnesty policies for drug addicts seeking help that are set forth and backed up by the highest levels in DOD. No GI with a drug problem should be discharged to return to society until his addiction is under control." I agree and I think it essential that favorable action be taken on our proposal at an early date.

JOHN S. MONAGAN,  
Member of Congress.

[From the Trumbull Times, June 17, 1971]

#### UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

U.S. Representative John S. Monagan (D-Waterbury) is still grappling valiantly with the problem of what to do with some 50,000 Vietnam War veterans who are reported to be addicted to hard drugs.

At the moment, there are more than 50 co-sponsors of his proposed bill in the House hopper which would force each separate branch of the service to provide educational and rehabilitative treatment by means of a Drug Abuse Control Corps.

Rep. Monagan's bill is designed to prevent any person being tried for an offense involving the possession of a narcotic drug if, before his court martial is convened, he voluntarily agrees to under-go treatment and rehabilitation via the Drug Corps. It also will prevent any drug-addicted serviceman from being discharged from the armed services until he is free from active addiction.

The sincerity and tenacity of Rep. Monagan, in tackling the GI drug problem, are not to be questioned. Yet nagging questions still need answers.

Let us suppose that Rep. Monagan's bill were passed tomorrow, an absurd premise since the House Armed Services Committee hasn't even held hearings on it yet. But let us pretend the bill has become law. What happens now?

The Pentagon says it simply does not have the facilities, physicians and supportive staff to handle the problem.

Rep. Monagan himself has said that the Veterans Administration hospitals are, at least at this point, unable to handle 5,000 drug addicts, let alone 50,000.

So this means that special facilities will have to be constructed by and for each branch of the service. Doctors must be found who are willing to work in these facilities, yet even in civilian life there aren't nearly enough doctors who are willing to undergo the special training needed to acquire the expertise to treat addicts.

How long would it take, and how much money will be required to build the physical plants?

Once the plants are built, how long will it take to staff them with the kind of technical experts, administrators and nurses who will be required?

What will happen to the GI addicts while they are waiting for these curative measures to be provided?

Wouldn't it be better, or at least faster, to try to expand already existing facilities, such as the VA hospitals?

These are just a few of the questions that, hopefully, will receive answers from the committee hearings.

Until then, one can only be pessimistic about the prospect that 50,000 GI addicts face as they are withdrawn from Vietnam.

#### CHAPTER III—CHILDREN AND YOUTH AND MATERNAL AND INFANT CARE PROGRAMS

(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, this is the third in a series of articles on children and youth and maternal and infant care programs. Support of H.R. 7657 as amended is increasing. The bill which would extend for an additional 5 years the children and youth and comprehensive health projects and maternal and infant care projects which are now slated for oblivion as of June 30, 1972, has at this time 65 cosponsors.

There are at present 59 regional children and youth programs with additional satellites and 56 maternal and infant care programs in existence delivering comprehensive health care to almost half a million children and youth of lower socioeconomic levels in central cities and rural areas. These projects represent one of the major reservoirs of experience in comprehensive health care today, especially to the poor children of the country.

I have received from the directors of these programs descriptions of the programs in their community and what it would mean if their particular program were terminated. To give our colleagues an insight into these programs, I am placing in the RECORD each day descriptions of three maternal and infant care and three children and youth programs.

The material follows:

#### MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECT, MOBILE, ALA.

The Mobile County Maternity and Infant Care Project number 04-H-000,011-01-0, formerly Project number 551, since its inception in September, 1966 has delivered 8,312 infants.

During the period April 1, 1970 to March 31, 1971, 1,621 new patients were admitted to the project; 476 maternity clinics were held; 10,936 ante-partum visits; 1,089 post-partum visits; 266 infant clinics were held; 7,674 infant visits; 1,299 hospital deliveries; 9,828 family planning clinic visits; and 3,393 dental clinic visits.

One of our original objectives, when the Project was initiated, was to reduce the infant death rate in Mobile County. Substantial progress has been made in this area with a reduction in the non-white infant death rate of 35.3 per 1,000 live births in 1966 to 22.0 in 1970.

Project objectives for the coming fiscal year include increasing the percentage of patients admitted to the program during the first trimester of pregnancy; increasing the percentage of live births weighing over 2500 grams; significantly increasing the number of patients for which dental care is completed; increasing the number of patient deliveries returning for the post-partum clinic visit; and increasing the number of patients receiving family planning services.

**MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECT, HOUSTON, TEX.**

The following is a summary of the services rendered, with particular reference to minority populations by the Houston M&IC Project.

Unfortunately, Houston has not been funded for a Children and Youth Project to operate in conjunction with its Maternity and Infant Care and Family Planning Projects. An acceptable project has been submitted, but the funds which the Congress has made available have not yet permitted funding of this important adjunct to health care for Children and Youth.

For the five years during which the Houston M&IC Project has been in operation, a total of 26,168 patients were admitted to the Project for prenatal care. 17,849 of these (or 68%) were black, and 17% of the remainder were Spanish Surname.

During this same period, 3,035 mothers at risk, and their infants, had their medical care, including in-patient care, paid from Project funds. An additional 3,958 infants at risk, born to mothers not at risk, had their medical care, including a follow-up period of one year, paid from Project funds.

Family Planning services were an integral part of the M&IC Project, and later augmented by a separate Family Planning Project. A total of 29,671 new patients have received Family Planning services during this five year period. Additionally, 3,991 tubal ligations were performed at Jefferson Davis Hospital, where approximately 99% of patients receiving Project prenatal care, are delivered.

Using 1965, the year prior to the beginning operation of the M&IC Project, as the reference year, the impact on the black minority population is as follows:

1. Infant mortality for blacks in 1965 was 32.09/1000 live births. This declined by 21.6% in 1970 to 25.16/1000 live births. Among whites, including Spanish Surname patients the rate declined from 22.26 in 1965 to 18.98 in 1970, a reduction of 14.3%.

The lowest rate yet recorded for Houston residents was 20.99 in 1970, a reduction of 17.8% from the rate of 25.53 in 1965.

2. The perinatal mortality rate for blacks fell from 40.96 in 1965 to 36.39 in 1970, a reduction of 11.2%. The rate for whites showed a slight increase of 1.4% from 26.12 in 1965 to 26.50 in 1970.

3. The maternal mortality rate of 10.61 for blacks in 1965 declined by 30.1% to 7.33 in 1970. For whites the 1965 rate of 5.27 fell to 2.36 in 1970, a decline of 55.2%. However, the rate at Jefferson Davis Hospital where almost all Project patients are delivered showed a decline of 73.3%, from 4.5/10,000 live births in 1965 to 1.2/10,000 live births in 1970.

4. The birth rate in the black population was 32.49/1000 population in 1965, declining by 9.7% to 29.35 in 1970. For whites a slight increase of 0.2% from 18.12 in 1965 to 18.16 in 1970 occurred.

Local funds available for maternal and infant care are inadequate to maintain the upgraded care available to poor and minority groups, made possible by the federal funds for this purpose which have allowed improvement over the past five years, and it would seem imperative to extend the legislation funding these life saving health programs, and to increase the funds available so that present projects may be more adequately funded and additional projects established.

**MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECT, ORANGE COUNTY, FLA.**

Maternity and Infant Care Project (MIC) of Orange County, Florida, was funded by a grant from the Department of Health Education and Welfare under provisions of Title V of the Social Security Act late in 1966

CXVII—1379—Part 17

through the State of Florida's Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services. The grant is locally administered by the Orange County Health Department for indigent and/or medically indigent women and infants. Comprehensive obstetrical, pediatric and family planning services are provided through Health Department Centers in Orlando, Apopka, Winter Garden, Winter Park and Eatonville (population of Orange County, 1970—346,300).

MIC Project Medical Services are directed and provided by diplomats of the American Board of Obstetrics and Gynecology and the American Board of Pediatrics in 18 clinic sessions per week. From the project's inception late in 1966 to May 30, 1971, 16,162 patients received service in the following categories.

Maternity admissions..... 5,783  
Infant admissions..... 2,800  
Family planning admissions..... 7,579

Fifty-six percent of project patients served are non white (2/3rds of all non white deliveries in Orange County each year receive maternity and infant care services from the project).

Maternal and infant mortality in Orange County have declined since 1966 especially in the non white group. In 1970 maternal and infant mortality in Orange County were the lowest ever recorded! The birth rate in Orange County has declined despite a general population increase from 302,200 in 1960 to 346,300 in 1970. Premature birth rate and stillbirth rate have declined in Orange County and in the project populations.

Despite increased maternity, infant and family planning caseload\*, and increased project costs, federal funds available to Orange County's MIC Project have declined from \$392,990 in 1966-67 to \$283,000 in 1970-71. Some additional local matching funds are available if additional federal funds become available. Anticipated growth in Orange County is expected to accelerate with the opening of Florida Technological University, U.S. Naval Training Center and Disney World in 1971. These events will no doubt bring an increase in project activities and the need for additional funds!

**CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 651, NEW HAVEN, CONN.**

This communication is to inform you of my concern that the C & Y programs require funding through 1977. The Hill Health Center (C & Y Project No. 651) is the first community health center for infants, children, and youth in the state of Connecticut. The Hill Health Center (HHC) provides comprehensive health services to 5,000 of the 8,000 residents of the neighborhood under 21 years of age. This service includes medical (physical) services in the Health Center, hospital, and home. These medical services are combined with nursing services in the home and Health Center.

In addition, the Health Center provides mental health, nutrition, dental, and health education services to the same families. During the past year the Health Center provided 25,000 units of service to the population of the Hill neighborhood.

These services included much needed preventive and health promotion services as well as treatment and rehabilitative services for acute and chronic conditions. Equally important are the mental health services to school-age children which were virtually absent prior to the opening of the Health Center. There has been an increase of tenfold in the amount of mental health services to children since the Health Center first opened its doors.

There cannot be a measure of the number of school days attended or serious illnesses averted due to the fact that adequate health services are immediately available to families. The Health Center maintains a 24-hour seven

day a week on call schedule so that when the Center is officially closed families can contact a doctor to advise and if necessary see their sick child.

Unless there is continued funding, these services will not be available to the Hill neighborhood. It is imperative that legislation be introduced and passed to continue the C & Y program for another five years.

**CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 611, ENGLEWOOD, COLO.**

We are a semi-rural two-County area surrounding the City of Denver.

We serve 3,800 children, 1,396 families: 44% Spanish-American, 1% Black, and 55% White.

The mean age of our population in these counties is 19 years, compared to 26 years for the State of Colorado.

Our major problem is that we have no public transportation and the nearest outpatient services available are approximately 20 miles, located at Colorado General Hospital, where a fee is charged according to income. The only other resource is private M.D.'s and dentist, and a dire lack of both exists in our area; many exclude Medicaid patients from their care. There are no County hospitals in the area.

The median income for our area is \$3,296, and 80% of our C & Y patients are the working poor who subsist without welfare and who, even, if medical care were available, could not afford to pay for it.

Our program is preventively oriented and comprehensive in scope:

1. We stress the social, emotional, as well as the physical aspects of daily living.

2. This is accomplished by input in the areas of mental health, home management, ecology and job improvement.

3. By this kind of stimulation some of our consumers have become employees.

Via the use of a comprehensive health team consisting of; pediatricians, clinic and field nurses, social work, audiology and speech pathology, ecology, dentistry, nutrition, we invest our resources in prevention and early casefinding, thus less expenditures are needed for costly cures.

Because of our philosophy of care:

1. Number of days of hospitalization have been radically decreased, making our project the fourth lowest in hospital costs (10.72 per 1,000 patients per quarter).

2. Fifty-three percent of our total C & Y population (3800) have remained on the project for two years or more.

3. Ninety-four percent of patients on the project two years or more have had services a minimum of once yearly and many, more frequently.

4. Via health teaching, patients have learned to cope with minor crisis, learned something about prevention and are thus using our facilities more constructively.

5. Seventy-three percent of our population (3800) have reached health supervision; of the latter, many developed upward mobility and moved into the private sector for medical care.

In teaching a value for health we hope to reduce the high incidence of chronic disease in our adults of tomorrow, thus reducing substantially the need for welfare.

**CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 617, DAYTON, OHIO**

The Children and Youth Project of Children's Medical Center, Dayton, Ohio, provides the children from low-income families in a wide geographic area in Southwestern Ohio a facility for the delivery of health care of the highest quality. There is no comparable service available to these children. It is probably needless in this report to reiterate the facts relating to this poor health, for the current literature, as well as supporting evidence in favor of the legislation which gave birth

to the Children and Youth Projects, is replete with such information. The project, now in its fifth year, has become a highly significant influence in facing the problem of poor health among medically indigent children. This report constitutes a resume of the activity of Project.

The Children and Youth Project is considered principally an Out-patient service. We have defined a family as indigent if the gross annual family income is below \$4,500 for a family of four. The income may be greater in increments of \$500 for each additional member dependent upon that income.

The project has also developed a wide array of affiliations with community agencies and their programs. It has become the principal medical resource for most of these agencies, which include Children's Services Boards of several counties, Early Childhood Education, local health departments, Family and Children's Service, Summer Head Start, Planned Parenthood Association, Children's Psychiatric Hospital, Project Search, Project Follow Through, Dakota Street Center, Model Cities, West Dayton Self-Help Center, Hearing and Speech Center of Dayton and Montgomery County, United Cerebral Palsy of Metropolitan Dayton, and local Boards of Education.

By the end of 1970 over 15,000 indigent children considered the Children's Medical Center their "family doctor" and were enrolled in the Children and Youth Project. In addition, the Children and Youth Project organized the medical program, examined and made appropriate referrals for 4,600 children in the year-round and summer Head Start programs.

The relationships developed between the Children and Youth Project and the community are far-reaching and have permitted it to become in many cases the only health resource available. It would be as untenable to end this service as it would be to close our public schools. Programs of this nature are of such vital importance in an age when the cost of medical care is becoming prohibitive for millions of people that their continuance and expansion would seem to be not only logical but imperative.

#### AN INTERVIEW WITH DANIEL ELLSBERG

(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, last night the Columbia Broadcasting System featured an exclusive interview with Daniel Ellsberg, a former State Department and Pentagon aide whose name is mentioned frequently in connection with the "Pentagon papers." A 7-minute portion of the interview with Mr. Ellsberg was broadcast on the "CBS Evening News" at 7 p.m., EDT, and a 30-minute telecast of the interview was presented in a special news broadcast at 10:30 p.m.

I have obtained copies of both telecasts from CBS, and I am today inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of our colleagues who might have missed them.

Our Government is quite unique. It has three separate, independent and equal branches. In performing their functions properly they operate as checks and balances, preventing any one branch from assuming or asserting undue power. Sometimes we fail in that respect—and I believe that the Congress has been remiss and has permitted the President to assume war powers which he does not

have—and we deprive ourselves of the information needed to make rational decisions.

In the history of our Government, one nongovernmental institution that has come to the aid of the people when any branch of government has been remiss has been the free press of this country. All of us in this House owe a great debt of gratitude to that free press, the foremost among them being the New York Times, Washington Post, Boston Globe, the Chicago Sun-Times, and the Knight newspapers for publishing the Pentagon papers. I agree completely with Mr. Ellsberg when he says:

We cannot at all let the officials of the Executive Branch determine for us what it is that the public needs to know about how well and how they are discharging their functions.

If both the public and the Congress are to fulfill their obligations under the Constitution to participate in government, they must have access to all information necessary to make intelligent decisions. To date, neither the public nor the Congress has been receiving that kind of information regarding Vietnam.

As Mr. Ellsberg points out, the Pentagon papers are especially revealing regarding the United States lack of concern for the Vietnamese people. The documents indicate that the successive managers of U.S. activities in Vietnam looked upon the situation solely from an American military point of view. Vietnamese leaders—both popular heroes and American-picked figureheads—were regarded contemptuously and seldom consulted. Civilian casualties, defoliation, and saturation bombing were looked upon as military questions, and their effect upon the Vietnamese people was never seriously weighed in the decisionmaking.

In closing his interview, I think Mr. Ellsberg summed up the real effect of the disclosure of the Pentagon papers:

My father had a favorite line from the Bible which I used to hear a great deal when I was a kid. "The truth shall make you free." And I hope that the truth that's out now, it's out in the press, it's out in homes where it should be, where voters can discuss it. It's out of the safe and there is no way, no way, to get it back into the safe. I hope that truth will free us of this war. I hope that we will put this war behind us. And we will learn from it in such a way that the history of the next 20 years will read nothing like the history of the last 20 years.

The transcripts of the interviews appear below.

#### EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW WITH DANIEL ELLSBERG CBS Evening News With Walter Cronkite

ANNOUNCER. Direct from our newsroom in New York, this is the CBS Evening News with Walter Cronkite and Dan Rather at the White House, Robert Schackne in New York, Ike Pappas in Pittsburgh and tonight an exclusive interview with Daniel Ellsberg, the mystery man of the Pentagon papers, conducted by Walter Cronkite at a secret location.

CRONKITE. Good evening. Publication of parts of the 47-volume top-secret history of American involvement in Vietnam has triggered a major constitutional legal battle over government secrecy and freedom of the press. The man most frequently suggested as the source for the Pentagon documents is Daniel Ellsberg, 40, Ph. D. with honors, one-time

Marine, now a researcher at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Ellsberg was a Pentagon and State Department analyst during the Vietnam buildup. Later he worked on the now-controversial Pentagon study of the war. Perhaps because of his clearly delicate legal position, he will not talk right now of whatever part he played in the release of the secret documents. But he talks freely of what he hopes their release will accomplish, and what turned him from hawk to dove. Such as what he believes was official cold-heartedness toward the civilian casualties of war.

DANIEL ELLSBERG. The fact here is that in the seven to ten thousand pages of this study, I don't think there was a line in them that contains an estimate of the likely impact of our policy on the overall casualties among the Vietnamese, or the refugees to be caused, the effects of defoliation in an ecological sense. There is neither an estimate nor a calculation of past effects, ever. And the documents simply concern the internal concerns—reflect the internal concerns of our officials. That says nothing more nor less than our officials never did concern themselves, certainly in any formal way or in writing, and I think in no informal way either, with the effect of our policies on the Vietnamese.

I'm so struck by the cover of Newsweek here, if I can refer to this. The secret history of Vietnam. Map of Vietnam. With the faces of the important people who perfected that secret history of Vietnam, and you'll notice they're all American. Every one of them. Now that reflects accurately the way the history of Vietnam emerges from those studies. That is from the internal documents of the United States. It reflects the way the Vietnam war is seen from Washington, as to who matters and who doesn't. And there's great realism to that, actually. As I say, I'm familiar. I was part of that system. I know how that's looked at. There's realism to that.

The war has been an American war. And there's certainly realism to the way that it's reflecting the actual attitudes of the people making the decisions. Never in those cables or estimates, I think, outside of memos by a few people, General Lansdale being one, I think will the public find when they read these, a Vietnamese leader described with concern, friendship, respect, or evaluated in any terms other than as an instrument of American policy.

The Vietnamese leaders with whom we've been dealing, unfortunately have the character that they tend to see themselves that way. And the other Vietnamese know it. As for Vietnamese who weren't leaders, they're not in the study at all. They're just not there, on either side. And that's a large part of what's been wrong.

I came back then with a sense—an additional sense of concern, and about what we were doing to the people of Vietnam as well as what was happening in this country. A concern that many people shared by '67 and '68. By '68, I had read most of the study, written a draft for one volume of it. And, well, can you imagine yourself what you'd feel like to have read those 7000 pages, judging from the thousand or so you've seen summaries of so far? And reading the news to the public every night, not able to tell them the existence of the study or what it was you had read?

Suddenly I've been reading about myself obviously, in these accounts, and it's—some of it is almost amusing. The inferences, as my being very tortured by guilt. Actually, I had to say I didn't feel guilty for the things I'd done in Vietnam. I felt very concerned. I felt that the knowledge gave me a kind of a responsibility that I otherwise didn't have. But the very simple explanation came to me as to the impression I apparently had been giving to people over the last year, was that I'd read this history. I've read all of it. I've read it several times. I think it obviously led me to

kinds of activity against the war, publicly. But it was simply very baffling to my colleagues, none of whom had read the study. Almost none of whom knew of its existence or the fact that I had read it.

I think maybe they'll understand there are some strange things about my intensity that they described, a month from now. I hope we'll see some more intense involvement in ending this war. I'm sure this story is more painful for many people at this moment than for me because, of course, it is familiar to me, having read it several times. But it must be painful for the American people now to read these papers, and there's a lot more to come, and to discover that the men who they gave so much respect and trust, as well as power, regarded them as contemptuously as they regarded our Vietnamese allies.

**IKE PAPPAS.** It's a black history as it's been drawn so far. Are there any heroes in it?

**ELLSBERG.** I think of the man I read about, I think Bernhardt, who put his rifle down to the ground the rest of his life and refused the order of his superior commander to fire at civilians in My Lai. He's a hero.

**PAPPAS.** You don't find them on a higher level than this?

**ELLSBERG.** That's a hard question you've asked me. I should not find it easy to answer. I should as an American not find it easy to answer. Looking at the record, it seems hard to me to find men who have lived up to their responsibilities of their office, in terms not only of what they did, but of what they could have done, what they should have done given their feelings.

**PAPPAS.** What would you expect to be revealed from the documents that might come out in future days or weeks? What's still back there that we can look forward to?

**ELLSBERG.** Well I think that the real lessons to be drawn are yet to be seen by the public. And they're not from any one period or any one episode. They really come from seeing the whole sweep of the history. There has never been any year when there would have been a war in Indo-China without American money shoring it.

The perception that I had, just like I think most people in the country, that this was in some sense an on-going war which we had joined for good or bad, screened out many of the moral aspects of the conflict. And to discover on the contrary, that in Indo-China, if we had not been supplying the money and the napalm, and buying soldiers, paying for equipment, and finally supplying our own soldiers, there would have been violence. There would have been violence among non-Communists, among sects. Political violence. There would have been assassinations, raids, some degree of guerrilla action. Communists against other Communists. The Trotskyists were wiped out by other Communists in Saigon in '45. There wouldn't have been anything that looked like a war, and to say that, is to say that Americans may bear the major responsibility, as I read this history, for every death in combat in Indo-China in the last 25 years. And that's one to two million people.

**CRONKITE.** An expanded version of that interview will be broadcast over many of these stations at ten-thirty tonight Eastern Time.

#### CBS SPECIAL—DANIEL ELLSBERG

**ANNOUNCER.** The Pentagon Papers: A Conversation With Daniel Ellsberg. Correspondent Walter Cronkite talks to the Pentagon papers mystery man in an exclusive interview. Next on CBS.

**ANNOUNCER.** This is a CBS News Special Report. The Pentagon Papers: A Conversation With Daniel Ellsberg. Here is CBS News Correspondent, Walter Cronkite.

**WALTER CRONKITE.** Good evening. In recent

hours there have been two important decisions in the courtroom battles between the government and the press over publication of those secret papers, documenting the causes and conduct of the Vietnam war. An appellate court tonight granted the Washington Post permission to continue its series of articles after 6 PM Friday. That time to permit the government to appeal to the Supreme Court.

The New York Times, which began the scenario eleven days ago by publishing lengthy excerpts from the documents also won a courtroom skirmish of sorts. In a split decision, another appeals court said the Times on Friday may begin publishing some remaining parts of its series. Other material, however, must be withheld while a judge decides whether publication would affect national security. The Times says it will appeal that decision to the Supreme Court.

During the controversy a single name has been mentioned most prominently as to the possible source of the Times' documents. Daniel Ellsberg, a former State Department and Pentagon planner, and of late something of a phantom figure, agreed today to be interviewed at a secret location. But he refused to discuss his role, if any, in the release of the documents.

I asked him what he considers the most important revelations to date from the Pentagon documents.

**DANIEL ELLSBERG.** So far, I think both from the papers themselves, and the reaction to them in the public and from the Administration, I think the lesson is that the people of this country can't afford to let the President run the country by himself. Even foreign affairs any more than domestic affairs, without the help of the Congress, without the help of the public. Obviously the public needs more information than it's gotten from the past four presidents in the area of Vietnam, if they're to discharge their responsibilities, I think.

**CRONKITE.** Isn't this correcting of this problem of public information more in the character of the leaders in Washington than it is in anything that can be legislated? If the leadership wishes to be candid with the American people, presumably it will be. If it does not wish to there's almost nothing that the press can do other than attempt to expose the truth. But getting to documents is another problem.

**ELLSBERG.** I would disagree with that. It seems to me that, again, the leaders, by whom I think you're referring, to the executive officials, to the Executive Branch of government, have fostered an impression that I think the rest of us have been too willing to accept over the last generation. And that is that the Executive Branch is the government. And that indeed they are leaders in a sense that may not be entirely healthy if we're to still think of ourselves as a democracy.

I was struck in fact by President Johnson's reaction to these revelations as close to treason. Because it reflected to me the sense of—that what was damaging to the reputation of the particular administration or particular individual, was in effect treason, which is in effect very close to saying, I am the state. And I think that quite sincerely many presidents, not only Lyndon Johnson, have come to feel that.

What these studies tell me is we must remember this is a self-governing country. We are the government. And in terms of institutions, the Constitution provides for a separation of powers, for Congress, for the Courts, informally for the press, protected by the First Amendment. We're seeing all of those branches—if we call them branches of the government—alive and functioning, and I think very well this last week. It hasn't always been the case. I think we cannot at all let the officials of the Executive Branch de-

termine for us what it is that the public needs to know about how well and how they are discharging their functions.

**CRONKITE.** Speaking of Mr. Johnson's words that this is treasonous, or whatever that exact quote was, there is a question here though, isn't there, of an individual setting up his own moral judgment over that of the law in the question of revealing these documents, for instance? I mean when we talk about public responsibility and private morality, and government responsibility, there's a crossroads there. And what about this question of individual moral responsibility and the law?

**ELLSBERG.** I think you're right in describing it as a moral choice. A very difficult one. Very similar, I would take it to be responsibility, the choice that the New York Times and the Washington Post, and now the Globe, sometimes I believe have faced, having been informed by the Justice Department that in the interpretation of the law by the Justice Department, James Reston, Sulzberger, or Bradlee and Catherine Graham would be in violation. They went ahead at their jeopardy, I think, feeling that their obligation to the people of the country, and their rights under the First Amendment, came above the interpretation by the Justice Department or the Defense Department. Now that's basically an analogy.

**CRONKITE.** Mr. Ellsberg, could a government function however if there was not a loyalty to the system? Now the system maybe should be changed. I think that's a comparatively good point to be made. But, if the system is not changed, then how does the government sort of protect its own operations if each man makes his own decision on security?

**ELLSBERG.** The system should be changed I think, to begin with. One way that it should be changed is to—and I think Congress has an interest in this, as does the public, as does the press—is in some way to protect the honest man in that system. I know people who have spoken out. Individuals. Any official does. If that official stays silent it's because he has seen what happened to the ones who went before him who spoke out too frankly. It's very hard really, the way our system operates now, for a truly frank, honest man, to stay in that system indefinitely, without being weeded out, or fired, or made apathetic, or in fact, corrupted in the end.

That has to change. And the government—you ask how can the government function. I have to say the government is not functioning well with the odds weighted as they are now towards concealment, towards fright, in effect, fear. Fear of the consequences of obeying the constitutional obligation to inform the people.

**CRONKITE.** Now concerning the documents that we have seen in the Times, Post, sometimes the Globe, so far. These documents as released, it has been pointed out, are incomplete history, for example. They do not include the State Department documentation, the White House documentation, except as that across the Pentagon areas, and the individuals were not available. I gather, to you drawing up these innocent investigations.

**ELLSBERG.** It was simply existence of the study that was a secret. And that was why we were forbidden to interview . . .

**CRONKITE.** Let me ask about that. How was it kept a secret from the White House?

**ELLSBERG.** How was it kept a secret from the New York Times? The fact is that secrets can be held by men in the government whose careers have been spent learning how to keep their mouths shut. I was one of those.

**CRONKITE.** The documentation, being somewhat incomplete—flawed history is what some have said about it.

**ELLSBERG.** Incomplete. Like all history it is

flawed. It's certainly very incomplete. It's a start. It's a beginning towards history. I would say it's an essential beginning. But it's only a beginning.

CRONKITE. Well then it is possible to draw conclusions, Mr. Ellsberg, from what we have read so far in this documentation? And I ask that with a couple of specifics in mind. I mean, let's just take some cases. Assistant Secretary of Defense McNaughton, I think in 1964 I believe it was, came up with a paper that was in there, suggesting possible provocation of North Vietnam as an excuse for escalation of the bombing. There is really no evidence at all that President Johnson approved such a program or a thought or would have entertained it if it had been brought to him, is there?

ELLSBERG. When you say there's no evidence on President Johnson you are correct. The record, the documentary record available for this study is fairly complete on the record of presidential decisions. But on the thinking that the President may have brought to bear on those decisions are not on the internal memoranda that I'm sure flowed within the White House. As a matter of fact, my impression is that presidential opinion on such matters is less committed to paper than that of almost any other official. More on the telephone, more in private conversation. It doesn't leave a documentary trail.

So it would certainly be right from an historical point of view to say that conclusions about presidential motive are least accessible from this particular documentary record.

CRONKITE. So all we really do have here, except where the presidential documentary trail, as you say, crosses the Pentagon area—what we have here then is the thinking of lower echelons on the contingency planning basis primarily, isn't it?

ELLSBERG. For more than contingency planning. That is a quite deceptive description being given to this by former officials and current ones. Were talking in most cases about plans that were called for by the President because of the recommendation by a high official, one or another, that they might well be used in the future. They were done in most cases in the period you're talking about, with the expectation that one of several of a small group of plans would be used.

In many cases we're talking about a plan that was used, or a plan that was recommended. The fact that it was recommended, the fact that it had the character that it did, and the kind of argument that it did, is information that I would say is very much needed to know by the public. The quality of thinking, the kinds of alternatives that are presented to the public—to the President.

I certainly agree that one of the limitations to this is that it would be a mistake to infer too much from it as to what the President's own thinking was. For example it's quite possible that he was not getting at all alternatives that he would have been very receptive to. But it seems absurd to say that the public has no need to know, let alone a right to know, the nature of the recommendations ultimately that have been made by the appointed officials. And as a matter of fact, the President's judgment in choosing his appointed officials, and in staying with him year after year of experience, is again a (sic) aspect of presidential decision making. How much the President can be judged only if we know the kind of service he was getting from those subordinates.

CRONKITE. Why now, why today, when President Nixon has a policy of withdrawal from Vietnam and seems to be proceeding along in that plan, should this be thrown up to the—for the American people? Wouldn't it be better to let this war get over with and

then take a look at how decisions were made and see how we can improve that process in the future?

ELLSBERG. The impression of the public, the voters, in 1964 was not unlike the impression you've just described right now. But they were wrong. They were mistaken as to where their president meant to take the war. As a matter of fact we have the ironic news which we now learn, and I think again it is worth having learned this, that his opponent in that election knew more than the public did and more than he chose to tell the public about the nature of that planning.

I've been very concerned for the last two years—almost two years now, since the fall of '69—based on some information that I had from people that I trusted and respected within the Administration, that we were in for a replay of the year 1964. If that were—if not evident to the public, that in itself didn't prove it was not possible because it hadn't been evident in 1964. That's one of the . . .

CRONKITE. What do you mean by a replay of '64? In what specifics?

ELLSBERG. In 1964, the officials who were my colleagues at that time in the Department of Defense had come to believe that it was essential that the United States be bombing North Vietnam, with whom they were not then at war, shortly. They did not wish the public to have really any inkling of this necessity, even whether there was a possibility or a contingency, or as they saw it, a high probability, because an election was coming up, and they were going against an opponent that—this is the sort of thing, by the way, that is not written down in those documents, are not accessible to the study. It is accessible to special assistants. This is the kind of thing that is discussed with special assistants as a matter of fact. It's the sort of thing that can't be put down on paper.

All right, going then against an opponent who was to be portrayed as irresponsible, reckless, and a war monger, it did not seem a suitable time to share with the public the knowledge that the highest advisers of the public—of the President, if not the President—and I've never been certain in my own mind what the President's attitude was at that time—felt that it was essential for us to be bombing sooner, rather than later, North Vietnam.

Now, I came to believe in late '69, on the basis of information from the Administration, that again we had an administration, of which at least two high officials, President Nixon and Henry Kissinger, believed that it was essential to their purposes, their understanding of American interests, that the President have again a credible threat of bombing. This came in conflict, of course, with the cutoff of bombing in the—November, 1968. In effect, we had set conditions in which we would restore bombing, and could not really make a threat credible unless those conditions were violated.

Apparently it seemed essential that the President, in his eyes—I am told to understand—again be ready to threaten bombing. And he understood that to do this would require demonstrations which would require the actual practice of bombing, to achieve again either an acceptable settlement, acceptable to him in terms defined very similarly to those of the past, or an acceptable stalemate, which by now would have to mean one with less U.S. ground troops involved.

The evidence, as time went on, in '69 and then Cambodia in '70, Sontag and the bombing of North Vietnam in the fall of 1970. The bombing, almost very frequently after that, in the operation into Laos. All convinced me, and I think ultimately, began to suggest to a larger number of the public, that this was the direction we were going. A direction

in which the threat of escalation and the practice of escalation was once again part of U.S. policy.

In this sense, it did come to seem to me, especially in the spring of 1970, after Laos, that suddenly the history of 1964, '65, had become of extremely urgent relevance to the people of this country. To the Congress. And to the officials.

CRONKITE. Clearly, the impact of the Pentagon papers reaches beyond military security, and encroaches on the world of politics. I asked Ellsberg what political effect he thought the documents would have.

ELLSBERG. Well, the—actually all the questions so far have been based I think on a slightly wrong premise, and that is that the heart of the study is out, which has been stated by, I think, Newsweek and a couple of people. And that thus the study involves mainly the Johnson Administration. That's far from true. In my own case, actually, the greatest impact of the study by far came from the very earliest periods, to learn much more about the Truman Administration. The period from '45 to '50. The period from '50 to '52, '54. That had I think more effect on my thinking about the war than almost any other thing that I've ever read.

Those revelations it so happens are in the study, had not on the whole come out. Again the period '54 to '56 is I think almost more significant than what comes later. The Kennedy period is just beginning to come out. I think the notion that this study was designed, that the revelations were designed, to embarrass Johnson versus Kennedy, I think will be quickly allayed within the days, given what I find coming out in the papers right now.

We're talking now about a history that covered four administrations. Three Democrat, one Republican. One of the striking aspects of it I think is the sameness of policy throughout those four administrations. If there are implications for the current administration, I think it's because it's really difficult to read those studies from the beginning and consecutively, and conclude that any one of them, any one of those administrations, would have behaved very differently than Lyndon Johnson did. It may be that they would, but you can't have much confidence that they would, in 1965 and the circumstances in 1965. And that's not reassuring at all.

It does in effect take the issue out of politics as you defined it, I think, and raise much more questions of whether we have been playing follow-the-leader a little too long, and whether we should not look very hard at the question of the Congressional role in foreign policy. The role of the courts in passing upon relations between the President and Congress. And the relation of our policies to our international obligations. And the need for the public to take a much more active and informed role.

So I think ultimately the effect will be far more on our institutions under the Constitution than it will be on the fate of any one party.

CRONKITE. But a point that you made in some of your writings is that throughout all of the deliberations, all the papers, all of the accounting of the costs in dollars and of expenditures and the inputs and the outputs as you mentioned it, there was never any mention of consideration of civilian casualties. And does that apply to the John Kennedy Administration as well?

ELLSBERG. Oh it certainly does. I made that a very general statement that this had never been looked at. At that time I did not allude to these studies. Nor had I publicly, however, at that time. But the fact is that in the seven to ten thousand pages of this study I don't think there is a line in them that contains an estimate of the likely impact of our policy on the overall casualties among the

Vietnamese, or the refugees to be caused, the effects of defoliation in an ecological sense. There is neither an estimate nor a calculation of past effects, ever. And the documents simply concern the internal concerns—reflect the internal concerns of our officials. That says nothing more nor less than our officials never did concern themselves, certainly in any formal way or in writing, and I think in no informal way either with the effect of our policies on the Vietnamese.

**CRONKITE.** How would you describe the men who do not have the same emotional reaction to reading this, in knowing these—being privy to these secrets as you? Are they cold? Are they heartless? Are they villainous?

**ELLSBERG.** The usual assumption, of course, the usual description of them is, that they are among the most decent and respectable and responsible men that our society has to offer. That's a very plausible judgment in terms of their background. And yet having read the history, and I think others will join this, I can't help but feel that their decency, their humane feelings are to be judged in part of the decisions they brought themselves to make. The reasons for which they did them and the consequences.

Now I'm not going to judge them. The evidence is here. I'm sure this story is more painful for many people at this moment than for me because of course it is familiar to me having read it several times. But it must be painful for the American people now to read these papers, and there's a lot more to come, and to discover that the men who they gave so much respect and trust, as well as power, regarded them as contemptuously as they regarded our Vietnamese allies.

**CRONKITE.** We've talked mostly about long-range effects of these revelations in changing the relationship of the government to the people. But what about the immediate effect on the war as of these days in June, 1971?

**ELLSBERG.** Yes the war is going on. I was of course delighted by the vote that I read of this morning, the headline this morning, that the Senate had taken affirmative action to bring this war to an end, and of course I hope they will go much further. I'll hope that they discover that their responsibilities to their citizens, the citizens of this country and to the voters, do go beyond getting re-elected, and that they're men, they're free men who can accept the responsibility of ending this war.

My father had a favorite line from the Bible which I used to hear a great deal when I was a kid. "The truth shall make you free." And I hope that the truth that's out now, it's out in the press, it's out in homes where it should be, where voters can discuss it. It's out of the safe and there is no way, no way, to get it back into the safe. I hope that truth will free us of this war. I hope that we will put this war behind us. And we will learn from it in such a way that the history of the next 20 years will read nothing like the history of the last 20 years.

**CRONKITE.** And so the epilogue has begun before the curtain has fallen on the last act of this long-running drama called Vietnam. Even before American involvement or the war itself has ended, the inquiry has opened on how it all began. Ellsberg speaks eloquently, with conviction, and clearly with a point of view. But only one side of the continuing debate.

The Pentagon report is only the beginning in itself. The incomplete history. There will be much more. And temptation will be great for a witch hunt, the unmasking of villains, and the manufacture of scapegoats. Should this happen, it would divert our attention and energy from a far more serious and urgent task made clear, if nothing else has been, by the Pentagon study. And that is the reestablishment of that cornerstone of demo-

cracy. Mutual trust between the branches of government, and more importantly, between the government and the people. Good night.

#### HOUSE SHOULD ADOPT MANSFIELD AMENDMENT

(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 have today introduced as a House resolution the Mansfield amendment to declare it the policy of the United States to terminate the war in Indochina at the earliest practicable date.

I believe we should join the other body promptly in an expression of what I believe is the majority sentiment in the Congress against the continuation of U.S. involvement in this tragic conflict.

We cannot simply say that this is the President's war. The Congress has been involved as a supporter of the venture because we have provided the means for our involvement to be carried forward under a succession of Presidents.

Now the time has come to make it clear that we disassociate ourselves from further involvement, that we no longer support the maintenance of U.S. military forces in Indochina and that we insist that they be withdrawn as quickly as possible subject to the release of all American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and its allies.

The text of my resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 510

*Resolved,* That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should terminate at the earliest practicable date all military operations of the United States in Indochina, and to provide for the prompt and orderly withdrawal of all United States military forces not later than nine months after the date of the adoption of this resolution subject to the release of all American prisoners of war held by the Government of North Vietnam and forces allied with such Government. The House of Representatives hereby urges and requests the President to implement the above expressed policy by initiating immediately the following actions:

(1) Establishing a final date for the withdrawal from Indochina of all military forces of the United States contingent upon the release of all American prisoners of war held by the Government of North Vietnam and forces allied with such Government, such date to be not later than nine months after the date of the adoption of this resolution.

(2) Negotiate with the Government of North Vietnam for an immediate cease-fire by all parties to the hostilities in Indochina.

(3) Negotiate with the Government of North Vietnam for an agreement which would provide for a series of phased and rapid withdrawals of United States military forces from Indochina in exchange for a corresponding series of phased releases of American prisoners of war, and for the release of any remaining American prisoners of war concurrently with the withdrawal of all remaining military forces of the United States by not later than the date established by the President pursuant to paragraph (1) hereof or by such earlier date as may be agreed upon by the negotiating parties.

My resolution differs from the Mansfield amendment, which was added to the

draft extension bill by a vote of 57 to 42 on Tuesday, only in expressing the sense of the House rather than directly declaring it to be the policy of the United States to terminate the war. I was advised by the Legislative Counsel's Office that this change in form was necessary in a House resolution. But there is no difference in substance and I believe there would be no difference in moral effect if we acted promptly to record the House of Representatives alongside the Senate in opposition to the continuation of the war.

I am moved to act because the distinguished chairman of our Committee on the Armed Forces has indicated publicly that he does not look with favor on the retention of the Mansfield amendment in the draft bill when it comes from the conference committee, and because the White House has said through its spokesmen that it rejects the amendment as being only the expression of the sentiments of 57 Senators, not the views of the entire Congress.

I think the world and the country should know that the Congress does support an early withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Indochina, and I believe adoption of this resolution by the House would make it clear that we disassociate ourselves from an indefinite prolongation of this war.

I have therefore urged the House Foreign Affairs Committee in my testimony before its subcommittee headed by our able colleague, Congressman GALLAGHER, to report out this sense of the House resolution to provide a vehicle for an early vote. It is imperative, I think, that we let the country know where the House stands on this vital issue.

#### CENSURE SOVIET PERSECUTION OF JEWS

(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 have introduced today a House concurrent resolution calling upon our Government to instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to move for a censure of the Soviet Union for its persecution of Soviet Jews.

The Soviet Union stands in violation of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights and, as a member of the United Nations, we have an obligation to call attention to this flagrant violation before the bar of world opinion.

I have previously supported legislation to call upon our Government to use its direct diplomatic procedures to lessen the burdens imposed on Soviet Jewry. I have also joined many of my colleagues in letters to the President and the Secretary of State urging their utmost efforts to end this persecution. I feel we now need to go further and take this matter to the United Nations General Assembly.

The text of my resolution is as follows:

Whereas, the Russian Jews are forced to remain in a country that in practice, if not

in law, compels them to abandon their very identity; and

Whereas, in the name of abstract political-economic theory, of cynical geopolitics, human beings are denied a freedom recognized as basic by all civilized countries of the world, indeed by the Soviet Constitution; and

Whereas, the Jews of Russia, who, through a history of persecution and oppression, were able, as a distinct and identifiable group, to contribute to the spiritual and cultural advancement of the human race; and

Whereas, they (the Jews of Russia) are now systematically and efficiently being denied the means to sustain their identity as Jews inside Russia and the opportunity to maintain that identity by moving elsewhere; and

Whereas, the right to emigrate, which is denied the Jews, is a right guaranteed by the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights, to which the Soviet Union is a signatory; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, That:* the President of the United States is authorized and requested, to issue a proclamation calling upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by its Jewish citizens in accordance with the Soviet Constitution and

To utilize formal and internal contracts with Soviet officials in an effort to secure a lessening of the domestic burdens of the Russian Jews and

To demand of the Soviet Government that it permit its Jewish citizens the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as guaranteed by the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights, and

To instruct the United States delegation to the United Nations to move to censure the Soviet Union from the floor of the General Assembly for violation of the Declaration on Human Rights.

#### LOUIS WOLFSON ON PRISON REFORM

(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, as chairman of the Select Committee on Crime and as one who is vitally interested in recommendations to improve this Nation's archaic prison system, I commend the following short article written by financier Louis Wolfson which appeared in the April edition of *Signature*, a magazine published by Diners Club of New York.

Entitled "The Urgent Need for Prison Reform," Mr. Wolfson's article presents many of the stark realities of life in today's prisons and suggests a determined Federal, State, and local assault on a prison system that makes repeaters of offenders.

The article follows:

Serving nine months and one day in Federal prison at Eglin Air Force Base does not necessarily qualify anyone as an expert in penal reform or parole procedures. But this experience, substantiated by the research of my staff, has convinced me that the policy of punishment in our penal system has resulted in virtually total failure to accomplish its most vital and basic mission: rehabilitation.

The United States has the largest prison population of any nation in the world, with more than 400,000 people actually locked up every day. About 70 percent of today's in-

mates have had prior convictions and 19 out of every 20 eventually return to society—hypersensitive and insecure. Bold and imaginative programs must be developed so that they can be rehabilitated as human beings able to make some contribution to society.

I have learned from many inmates that two major factors trigger their hatred toward authority and block them from responding favorably to such efforts. One is the lack of uniform court sentencing for identical or similar crimes, and the other is the failure of parole boards to give prisoners reasons for denial of paroles so that they know precisely how they have failed to meet the board's approval.

When an inmate is able to obtain parole, he receives as little as \$10, rarely more than \$40, a bus ticket and a "civilian" suit of clothes. He seldom has any job prospects and as soon as his money is spent he usually returns to crime as his only means of survival. As citizens it is our responsibility to correct this deplorable situation, even if it requires providing business and industry with tax incentives in order to provide jobs for these lost souls.

Top authorities in this field are convinced that more severe sentences—even to the extent of life imprisonment or death—will not deter crime. We spent hundreds of billions of dollars for wars and after we defeat our enemies we rehabilitate them. Yet we find it impossible to appropriate a small portion of this amount to rehabilitate our own people.

Rehabilitation—or lack of it—is only one of our national horrors. A complete revamping of our archaic and, in my view, sadistic penal system should be instituted immediately. A prison ombudsman appointed to investigate irregularities or corruption would help to correct many of these problems. In practically every prison, for the right amount of money, narcotics or liquor and virtually every other type of contraband become available. Strong laws might aid in reducing the corruption among prison authorities—including the guards—who allow this black market to flourish. And persons proven guilty of violating such laws should be criminally prosecuted and, whenever applicable, lose their pension rights and other benefits.

Prisoners would benefit greatly—in psychological terms—if a sex program were instituted in our prison system as indeed it already is in many others, notably in Mexico. A married person confined to prison should be allowed to *earn* the right to engage in marital relations at certain intervals.

To achieve progress and efficiency, a new and separate Cabinet-level post should be considered that would have under its jurisdiction some or all of the following: The Bureau of Prisons, the Parole Board and all Federal judges—thus removing them from the jurisdiction of the Justice Department. I firmly believe that there should be some division of responsibility between the branch of government concerned with law enforcement and that governmental branch involved in our correction system.

It is impossible to outline even sketchily my personal recommendations on this single page. I can only say that our President and other elected officials should give top priority to reforming our penal and parole systems. As recent events have shown, the deplorable condition of our prisons is one of America's gravest domestic problems. Let your Senators, your Congressman, your President know of your concern, and insist that they act aggressively and immediately to alleviate this great need.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. BOLAND), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MAYNE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRIFFIN (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, on Monday, June 28; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ICHORD, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VEYSEY) and to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. STEELE, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRENZEL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROY) to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ASPIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ROY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BOLAND, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 10 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. KOCH.

Mr. Dow prior to the teller vote on the Yates amendment to H.R. 9272.

Mr. ROONEY of New York to include tables and extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VEYSEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in three instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. KING in two instances.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. McDADE.

Mr. HARSHA.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROY) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in three instances.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. FRASER in three instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. ROE in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. HATHAWAY in two instances.

Mr. FUQUA in two instances.

Mr. BRASCO.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas.

Mr. RARICK in five instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.

Mr. BARRETT.

Mr. PIKE in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. UDALL in two instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in two instances.

Mr. ASPIN in four instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. SCHEUER in five instances.

Mr. DENHOLM in two instances.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 414. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the Central Dakota Nursing Home; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1206. An act to amend subsection (d) of section 2 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, relating to the terms of office of the members of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 28, 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:

891. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize a treatment and rehabilitation program for drug-dependent members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

892. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of the Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, July 1970-March 1971, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

893. A letter from the Secretary of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on the amount of Export-Import Bank loans, insurance, and guarantees, issued in March and April 1971, in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

894. A letter from the Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of properties added to the National Register of Historic Places; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

895. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on a proposed transfer of research and development funds to the Construction of facilities appropriation, fiscal year 1971, pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act, 1971; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

#### 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. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3344. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell at prices which he determines to be reasonable under prevailing mortgage market conditions direct loans made to veterans under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4762. A bill to amend section 5055 of title 38, United States Code, in order to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and carry out a program of exchange of medical information (Rept. No. 92-307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 9417. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-308). 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. ASPIN:

H.R. 9393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an excise tax on emissions of sulfur oxides and particulate matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 9394. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9395. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with teachers and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia for the purchase of annuity contracts; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. BURLINSON of Missouri, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H.R. 9396. A bill to provide public financing of certain campaign costs incurred in campaigns for election to Federal office, to insure full public disclosure of campaign finances, and to regulate unfair campaign practices; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. BURLINSON of Missouri, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 9397. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a tax credit for individuals for certain political campaign contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9398. A bill to provide for the establishment of projects for the dental health of children to increase the number of dental auxiliaries, to increase the availability of dental care through efficient use of dental personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9399. A bill to increase the contribution by the Federal Government to the costs of employees' health benefits insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 9400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN (for himself, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FLYNT and Mr. HAGAN):

H.R. 9401. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a program to promote the production and marketing of farm-raised fish through the extension of credit, technical assistance, marketing assistance, and research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRIFFIN (for himself, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. STEED, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 9402. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a program to promote the production and marketing of farm-raised fish through the extension of credit, technical assistance, marketing assistance, and research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 9403. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain tax-exempt organizations to engage in communications with legislative bodies, and committees and members thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 9404. A bill to allow a credit against Federal income tax for State and local real property taxes or an equivalent portion of rent paid on their residences by individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 9405. A bill to restore the income tax credit for investment in certain depreciable property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. STOKES, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. BERGLAND):

H.R. 9406. A bill to amend title V of the

Social Security Act to extend for 5 years (until June 30, 1977) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 9407. A bill to require the establishment on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 9408. A bill to provide for the striking of medals and \$1 pieces in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 9409. A bill to protect ocean mammals from being pursued, harassed, or killed; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 9410. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend for 5 years (until June 30, 1977) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 9411. A bill to restore balance in the federal system of government in the United States; to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 9412. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow carryovers and carrybacks of unused medical expense deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. CORMAN, and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 9413. A bill to provide localities with financial assistance to meet their responsibilities and increasing fiscal problems by providing for a general grant of Federal revenue which shall be allocated on the basis of need; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 9414. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the survivorship reduction during periods of nonmarriage of certain annuitants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9415. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9416. A bill to increase the contribution by the Federal Government to the costs of employees' health benefits insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 9417. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (for himself, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. BELCHER):

H.R. 9418. A bill to designate the Mountain Park Reservoir, Okla., as the Tom Steed

Reservoir; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 9419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9420. 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.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9421. A bill relating to the withdrawal of U.S. Armed Forces from Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 9422. A bill to enforce the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo as a treaty made pursuant to article VI of the Constitution in regard to lands rightfully belonging to descendants of former Mexican citizens, to recognize the municipal status of the community land grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 9423. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9424. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that, for purposes of the provisions thereof relating to deductions from benefits on account of excess earnings, there be disregarded, in certain cases, income derived from the sale of certain copyrights, literary, musical, or artistic compositions, letters or memorandums, or similar property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9425. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KEE, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LANDGREBE, and Mr. MADDEN):

H.R. 9426. A bill to make it unlawful in the District of Columbia to intentionally promote or facilitate illegal drug trafficking by possession, sale, or distribution, of certain paraphernalia, and further to make it unlawful for a person to possess an instrument or device for the purpose of unlawfully using a controlled substance himself; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. MANN, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. WINN, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BARING, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CLEVELAND, and Mr. COLLIER):

H.R. 9427. A bill to make it unlawful in the District of Columbia to intentionally promote or facilitate illegal drug trafficking by possession, sale, or distribution, of certain paraphernalia, and further to make it

unlawful for a person to possess an instrument or device for the purpose of unlawfully using a controlled substance himself; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr.

MATHIAS of California, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. REES, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHMITZ, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ZWACH, and Mr. PASSMAN):

H.R. 9428. A bill to make it unlawful in the District of Columbia to intentionally promote or facilitate illegal drug trafficking by possession, sale, or distribution, of certain paraphernalia, and further to make it unlawful for a person to possess an instrument or device for the purpose of unlawfully using a controlled substance himself; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself,

Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MORSE, Mr. WYDLER, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 9429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax relief for homeowners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9430. A bill to create a National Agricultural Bargaining Board, to provide standards 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. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 9431. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to permit a city whose population falls to below 50,000 to convert any outstanding urban renewal projects from a two-thirds to a three-fourths capital grant formula; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 9432. A bill to amend section 301 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, so as to increase from 50 to 80 percent the amount that may be paid as the Federal Government's share of the costs of any cooperative meat inspection program carried out by any State under such section; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 9433. A bill to designate the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore as the "Paul H. Douglas National Lakeshore"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 9434. A bill to increase the contribution by the Federal Government to the costs of employees' health benefits insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 744. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the fiscal year 1972 for the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.J. Res. 745. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee on Classified Information; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.J. Res. 746. Joint resolution; Stable Purchasing Power Resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.J. Res. 747. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the busing or involuntary

assignment of students; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (for himself, Mr. BARING, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DORN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.J. Res. 748. Joint resolution amending title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide certain assistance in the establishment of new State medical schools; the improvement of existing medical schools affiliated with the Veterans' Administration; and to develop cooperative arrangements between institutions of higher education, hospitals, and other public or nonprofit health service institutions, and the Veterans' Administration to develop and conduct educational and training programs for health care personnel; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 347. Concurrent resolution to declare congressional policy regarding Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PIKE, Mr. REES, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. UDALL):

H. Con. Res. 348. Concurrent resolution to establish a select joint committee to be known as the Committee on Freedom of Information; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 349. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress respecting the treatment of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 350. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress toward ending the war in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN (for himself, Mr. ELBERG, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ADDABBO,

Mr. STRATTON, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DOW, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H. Res. 509. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the negotiation of an American-Israeli Treaty of Friendship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 510. Resolution relating to the withdrawal of the United States from Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota: H.R. 9435. A bill for the relief of certain individuals and organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts: H.R. 9436. A bill for the relief of Mario Auciello, his wife and child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE—Thursday, June 24, 1971

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 23, 1971)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, 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:

God of our fathers and our God, amid the tensions of our times, unite all elements of the Nation in a firm spiritual alliance, that we may remain "one nation under God." Fortify us against all evil forces. May our armament be the arms of righteousness and our strength be in the sinews of the spirit. May the Nation achieve her greatest eminence in the everlasting verities which endure all change. May our supremacy be in the morality and virtue of the people, that we falter not in the things that matter most. Make us each ready to share the blame and the fame of our country, and may our frame rest in that righteousness which exalts a nation. Fire our spirits with a new determination to achieve justice and a full life for all men. Finally, so assure us of Thy presence working in us that we may live in peace with all men and be at peace with them. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 23, 1971, be approved.

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.

CXVII—1380—Part 17

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with New Reports.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with New Reports, will be stated.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Laurence E. Lynn, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

#### U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

The assistant legislative clerk read the nominations in the U.S. Tariff Commission, as follows:

Catherine May Bedell, of Washington, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 16, 1974.

Joseph O. Parker, of Virginia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1977.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### EXTENSION OF THE DATE ON WHICH THE COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT SHALL SUBMIT ITS FINAL REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 225, H.R. 4848.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4848, to amend the Act of November 26, 1969, to provide for an extension of the date on which the Commission on Government Procurement shall submit its final report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 92-231), explaining the purposes of the measure.