United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, July 1, 1971*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.—Psalms 33: 12.

Eternal God, our Father, once again we draw near the day when our Founding Fathers with courage and faith signed the Declaration of Independence. Our minds exult with pride and our hearts expand with gratitude when we remember what was done that day. Make us so thankful for freedom and so devoted to liberty that we may continue to lead mankind to the brighter day when all men can be free.

We pray for our President, our Speaker, and these Representatives chosen by our people. By the power of Thy spirit may they be equal to their tasks, ready for their responsibilities, and adequate to lead our Nation in the ways of justice, freedom, and peace.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9271) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes."

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO FURNISH TO THE HOUSE CERTAIN INFORMATION RESPECTING U.S. OPERATIONS IN LAOS

Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 492, Rept. No. 92–327) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 492

Resolved, That the Secretary of State, to the extent not incompatible with the public interest, is directed to furnish to the House of Representatives, not later than fifteen days following the adoption of this resolution, any documents containing policy instructions or guidelines given to the United States Ambassador in Laos for the purpose of his administration of those operations controlled or directed by the country team in Laos, between January 1, 1964, and June 21, 1971, particularly with regard to—

(1) covert Central Intelligence Agency operations in Laos;

(2) Thai and other foreign armed forces operations in Laos;

(3) United States bombing operations other than along the Ho Chi Minh Trail;

(4) United States armed forces operations in Laos; and

(5) United States Agency for International Development operations in Laos which have served to assist, directly or indirectly, military or Central Intelligence Agency operations in Laos, and details of such assistance.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO FURNISH TO THE HOUSE CERTAIN INFORMATION RESPECTING THE PHOENIX PROGRAM

Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 493, Rept. No. 92–328) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 493

Resolved, That the Secretary of State, to the extent not incompatible with the public interest is directed to furnish to the House of Representatives, not later than fifteen days following the adoption of this resolution, all documents in the English language with respect to (1) the Phoenix Program, and (2) the extent of United States involvement in such program.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO FURNISH TO THE HOUSE THE REPORT ENTITLED "UNITED STATES-VIETNAM RELATIONSHIPS 1945–67"

Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 494, Rept. No. 92–329) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 494

Resolved, That the Secretary of State, to the extent not incompatible with the public interest, is directed to furnish to the House of Representatives, not later than fifteen days following the adoption of this resolution, the report entitled "United States-Viet Nam Relationships 1945–1967", prepared by the Viet Nam Task Force, Office of the Secretary of Defense.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO FURNISH TO THE HOUSE CERTAIN INFORMATION RESPECTING BOMBING OPERATIONS IN NORTHERN LAOS

Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 495, Rept. No. 92–330) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 495

Resolved, That the Secretary of State, to the extent not incompatible with the public interest, is directed to furnish to the House of Representatives, not later than fifteen days after the adoption of this resolution, any documents respecting the rules of engagement and targeting, and procedures followed by the United States Ambassador in Laos with respect to the direction and control of bombing operations conducted by the United States in northern Laos during the period beginning January 1, 1965, and ending June 21, 1971, together with the most recent aerial photographs of the following named one hundred and ninety-six Laotian villages:

The refugees who came from Xieng Khouang to Vientiane:

I. Muong Khoun (Tassengs Khoun, Sene Noi, Kang Sene, Phanh):

A. Tasseng Khoun:

1. Ban Tham (present location: Ban Thong Ba).
2. Ban Nahey (present location: Ban Thong Ba).
3. Ban Soua Tay (present location: Ban Thong Ba).
4. Ban Soua Neua (present location: Ban Thong Ba).
5. Ban Khoum (present location: Ban Thong Ba).
6. Ban Nathone (present location: Ban Thong Ba).
7. Ban Kosy (present location: Ban Thong Ba).
8. Ban Boua (present location: Ban Thong Ba).
9. Ban Phonxay (present location: Ban Thong Ba).
10. Ban Khoua (present location: Ban Thong Ba).
11. Ban Khouane (present location: Ban Thong Ba).
12. Ban Bouei San (present location: Ban Thong Ba).

B. Tasseng Sene Noi:

13. Ban Na Kho (present location: Ban Veun Khene).
14. Ban Na Ha (present location: Ban Veun Khene).
15. Ban Nhang Nhao (present location: Ban Veun Khene).

16. Ban Thouang (present location: Ban Veun Khene).
17. Ban Na Hoa (present location: Ban Veun Khene).
18. Ban Ngoua Tay (present location: Ban Veun Khene).
19. Ban Ngoua Neua (present location: Ban Veun Khene).
20. Ban Phone (present location: Ban Veun Khene).
21. Ban Manh (present location: Ban Veun Khene).
22. Ban Oh (present location: Ban Veun Khene).
23. Ban Na Ngam (present location: Ban Veun Khene).
24. Ban Nong Tay (present location: Ban Veun Khene).
25. Ban Sao (present location: Ban Veun Khene).
26. Ban Toua Neua (present location: Ban Veun Khene).
27. Ban Toua Tay (present location: Ban Veun Khene).
28. Ban My (present location: Ban Mak Hieo).
29. Ban Phou Hon (present location: Ban Mak Hieo).
30. Ban Na Su (present location: Ban Mak Hieo).
31. Ban Kandouan (present location: Ban Mak Hieo).
32. Ban Sy (present location: Ban Mak Hieo).
33. Ban Khou (present location: Ban Mak Hieo).

C. Tasseng Kang sene:

34. Ban Ha Moun (present location: Ban Y Lai).
35. Ban Na Pai (present location: Ban Y Lai).
36. Ban Xieng Dy (present location: Ban Y Lai).
37. Ban Ponh (present location: Ban Y Lai).
38. Ban Macheung (present locaton: Ban Y Lai).
39. Ban Pha Ngeun Tay (present location: Ban Y Lai).
40. Ban Pha Ngeun Neua (present location: Ban Y Lai).
41. Ban Hay (present location: Ban Y Lai).
42. Ban Nanoung (present location: Ban Y Lai).
43. Ban Soua (present location: Ban Y Lai).
44. Ban Natheng (present location: Ban Y Lai).
45. Ban Poth (present location: Ban Y Lai).
46. Ban Chao Ho (present location: Ban Y Lai).
47. Ban Na Thoe (present location: Ban Y Lai).
48. Ban Xieng Neua (present location: Ban Y Lai).
49. Ban Pha (present location: Ban Y Lai).
50. Ban Na Vane (present location: Ban Y Lai).

D. Tasseng Phanh:

51. Ban Phanh (present location: Ban Veun Kham).
52. Ban Naa Sy (present location: Ban Veun Kham).
53. Ban Nong (present location: Ban Veun Kham).
54. Ban Phonsay (present location: Ban Veun Kham).
55. Ban Poung (present location: Ban Veun Kham).
56. Ban Vene (present location: Ban Veun Kham).
57. Ban Khong Tay (present location: Ban Veun Kham).
58. Ban Khong Neua (present location: Ban Veun Kham).
59. Ban Thang (present location: Ban Veun Kham).
60. Ban Ko (present location: Ban Veun Kham).

II. Muong Pek (Tassengs Kat, He Mouane, Houang Thay, Phat, Khang, Sieng, Ang, Soui):

E. Tasseng Kat:

61. Ban Ly (present location: Ban That Xang).
62. Ban By (present location: Ban That Xang).
63. Ban Muong (present location: Ban That Xang).
64. Ban Ngoui (present location: Ban Na Nga).
65. Ban Khou (present location; Ban Na Nga).
66. Ban Boua (present location: Ban Na Nga).
67. Ban Tha Khek (present location: Ban Na Nga).
68. Ban Na Nga (present location: Ban Na Nga).
69. Ban Nam Thom (present location: Ban Na Nga).
70. Ban Vieng (present location: Ban Na Nga).
71. Ban Theune (present location: Ban Na Nga).
72. Ban Lat Houang (present location: Ban Na Nga).
73. Ban Mouane (present location: Ban Na Nga).
74. Ban Nhoun (present location: Ban Na Nga).
75. Ban Phonesavan (present location: Ban Na Nga).
76. Ban Sa (present location: Ban Na Nga).

F. Tasseng He Mouane:

77. Ban Kay (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
78. Ban Soui Tay (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
79. Ban Hop Oh (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
80. Ban Poung Bong (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
81. Ban Na Kay (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
82. Ban Ho Kang (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
83. Ban Khong (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
84. Ban Na Boune (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
86. Ban Sak (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
87. Ban Nong (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
88. Ban Soui Neua (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
89. Ban He (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
90. Ban Naleuang (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
91. Ban Na Khoaune (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
92. Ban Na Koung (present location: Ban Nam Pot).
93. Ban Bouam (present location: Ban Nam Pot).

G. Tasseng Khouang:

94. Ban Poung Leng (present location: Ban Vieng Kham).
95. Ban Poung Manh (present location: Ban Vieng Kham).
96. Ban Pen (present location: Ban Vieng Kham).
97. Ban Song Mak (present location: Ban Vieng Kham).
98. Ban Pouei (present location: Ban Vieng Kham).
99. Ban Phang (present location: Ban Vieng Kham).
100. Ban Muong Kheun (present location: Ban Vieng Kham).
101. Ban Som Ben (present location: Ban Vieng Kham).
102. Ban Don Sang (present location: Ban Vieng Kham).
103. Ban Nhom (present location: Ban Vieng Kham).
104. Ban Mak Ngouane (present location: Ban Thin).
105. Ban Sai Kham (present location: Ban Thin).
106. Ban Kham Leum (present location: Ban Thin).
107. Ban Koung Toi (present location: Ban Thin).
108. Ban Hoat Tanh (present location: Ban Thin).
109. Ban Vanh (present location: Ban Thin).
110. Ban Lio (present location: Ban Thin).
111. Ban Samuong (present location: Ban Thin).
112. Ban Beuak (present location: Ban Thin).
113. Ban Ang (present location: Ban Thin)

H. Tasseng Thay:

114. Ban Choey (present location: Ban Mak Nao).
115. Ban Pek (present location: Ban Mak Nao).

I. Tasseng Phat:

116. Ban Phat Soi (present location: Ban Phao (Phonesay)).
117. Ban Vieng (present location: Bàn Phao (Phonesay)).
118. Ban Nakhouane (present location: Ban Phao (Phonesay)).
119. Ban Nong Pha (present location: Ban Phao (Phonesay)).
120. Ban Nhap sy (present location: Ban Phao (Phonesay)).

J. Tasseng Khang:

121. Ban Phai Ngum (present location: Ban That Xang).
122. Ban Khong Vieng (present location: Ban That Xang).
123. Ban Mane Som (present location: Ban That Xang).
124. Ban Pouang (present location: Ban That Xang).
125. Ban Lao (present location: Ban That Xang).
126. Ban Samthong (present location: Ban Na lao).

K. Tasseng Sieng:

127. Ban Nathao (present location: Ban Veunkham).
128. Ban Houei (present location: Ban Veunkham).
129. Ban Na Hoi Mai (present location: Ban Veunkham).
130. Ban Phieng Luang (present location: Ban Veunkham).
131. Ban Ang (present location: Ban Veunkham).
132. Ban Teng (present location: Ban Veunkham).
133. Ban Phon Thong (present location: Ban Veunkham).
134. Ban Na Hoi Thay (present location: Ban Veunkham).

L. Tasseng Ang:

135. Ban Neua (present location: Ban Kok Kieng).
136. Ban Ang (present location: Ban Kok Kieng.)
137. Ban Poua (present location: Ban Kok Kieng).
138. Ban Om (present location: Ban Kok Kieng).
139. Ban Sy Luang (present location: Ban Kok Kieng).
140. Ban Sa Thath (present location: Ban Kok Kieng).
141. Ban Sa Mon (present location: Ban Kok Kieng).
142. Ban Xay (present location: Ban Kok Kieng).
143. Ban Kam chat (present location: Ban Kok Kieng).

M. Tasseng Soui:

144. Ban Mang (present location: Ban Nalongkhoune).
145. Ban Nakhoua (present location: Ban Nalongkhoune).
146. Ban Xieng houng (present location: Ban Nalongkhoune).
147. Ban Nong Ha (present location: Ban Nalongkhoune).

148. Ban Xieng Naa (present location: Ban Nalongkhoune).
149. Ban Nai Houane (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
150. Ban Noua Na (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
151. Ban Khay (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
152. Ban Nong (present location: Ban Nampot 2).
153. Ban Pong (present location: Ban Nampot 2).
154. Ban Sack (present location: Ban Nampot 2).
155. Ban Bone (present location: Ban Nampot 2).
156. Ban Xay (present location: Ban Nampot 3).
157. Ban Hong Keng (present location: Ban Nampot 3).
158. Ban Nato (present location: Ban Nampot 3).
159. Ban Sam tay (present location: Ban Nampot 3).
160. Ban Sam Neua (present location: Ban Nampot 3).
161. Ban He (present location: Ban Nampot 3).
162. Ban Vang Kam (present location: Ban Nampot 3).
163. Vang Xienghoung (present location: Ban Nampot 3).

III. Muong Phan (Tassengs The, Hat Nam):

N. Tasseng The:

164. Ban San Phan (present location: Ban Nong Pene).
165. Ban Na Pa (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
166. Ban Nian (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
167. Ban Phiengdy (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
168. Ban Ka cheng (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
169. Ban Hat (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
170. Ban Xieng Kio (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
171. Ban Dong (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
172. Ban Phonesai (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
173. Ban San Phanh (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
174. Ban Phone Ngam (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
175. Ban Khane (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
176. Ban Tha Phane (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
177. Ban Piat (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
178. Ban Tat Luang (present location: Ban Nampot 1).
179. Ban Chom thon (present location: Ban Nampot 1).

O. Tasseng Hat Nam:

180. Ban Hio (present location: Ban Thath).
181. Ban Nhoun (present location: Ban Thath).
182. Ban Phone Phien (present location: Ban Thath).
183. Ban Hatio (present location: Ban Thath).
184. Ban Poun Sane (present location: Ban Thath).
185. Ban The Phane (present location: Ban Thath).
186. Ban Ha Nhone (present location: Ban Thath).
187. Ban Na Pa (present location: Ban Thath).
188. Ban Kok So (present location: Ban Thath).
189. Ban That Luang (present location: Ban Thath).
190. Ban Kouan (present location: Ban Thath).
191. Ban Houm (present location: Ban Thath).
192. Ban Phiengfay (present location: Ban Thath).
193. Ban Nay (present location: Ban Thath).
194. Ban Phon Ho (present location: Ban Thath).
195. Ban Geo (present location: Ban Thath).
196. Ban Nieng (present location: Ban Thath).

Total: three Muongs, fifteen Tassengs, one hundred ninety-six villages.

JUDITH IS GOLDEN

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, Judith Kurland, who has been my legislative assistant for the past 4 years will be leaving to go to Israel on July 11. A pall has fallen over my office, for we will all miss Judith sorely. This brilliant young woman has been a wonderfully inspiring and creative force on my staff since 1966, when she first worked for me as a summer intern. She then returned for a permanent position in the summer of 1967 after her graduation from Mt. Holyoke. Even as an intern Judith displayed a tremendous ability as a writer and legislative organizer, and I was more than pleased when she joined our regular staff upon completion of her studies. The marvellous promise which Judith showed as an intern came true, and she quickly developed into a superb legislative aide and researcher, for Judith is the highest type of intellectual, one who can translate idealistic theory into substantial results.

As my colleagues know well, competent, motivated and loyal staff people are a prerequisite for the smooth and efficient functioning of a congressional office. Judith has fulfilled her responsibilities well above and beyond the call of duty. Her judgment and insight have proved an invaluable aid to me in my work in Congress. Judith has that unusual ability to develop a close rapport with both staff people and legislators. All of us who have worked with her have come to admire and respect her tremendous energy and resourcefulness.

During our long association I have come to know Judith well, not only as a staff member of the highest caliber, but as a young woman of great courage and sensitivity. She is certainly one of the most compassionate, generous, and selfless young people I have met.

I would like to thank Judith not only for her assistance all these years in my congressional office, but for the great job she did for the whip organization. Since I became a member of the House leadership in January of this year, Judith has been my legislative assistant in the administration of my job as majority whip. She has performed that task with the same thoroughness, competence, and reliability with which she approaches all tasks. I know the assistant whips will want to join in saying goodby to Judith and will also miss the high degree of accomplishment and professionalism which she brought to the job. The whip organization is proud of Judith and indebted to her.

I speak for everyone on my staff and the entire O'Neill family when I say that Judith will always have a special place in our hearts as our own lovely golden girl.

THE SUPREME COURT AND CASSIUS CLAY

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, since 1967 when he was to have been inducted, Cassius Clay has been allowed to enjoy every right and privilege inherent in a free society while thousands of other Americans of the same age have had to endure every hardship incident to war. Now the Supreme Court has issued the edict that Clay does not have to be inducted because he does not "believe" in war.

Mr. Speaker, no draft-age young man believes in a war that he will have to fight, nor does any parent of a draft-age son believe in a war their own flesh and blood will have to fight and possibly give his life in so doing. But our people for the most part, and this is particularly true in the South, have always heeded the call of their country when asked to do so, not because they love war, but because their country has asked them to do so. Surely, our young men would much rather continue in their civilian jobs or in their educational pursuits and remain at home with their families and friends; but, in the final analysis it is duty to country that is their overriding consideration.

Mr. Speaker, and I feel strongly about this. If Cassius Clay does not have to be drafted because of questionable religious beliefs, to use the Court's own words "as he understands it," or punished for refusing it, simply because he is black or because he is a prizefighter—and I can see no other real justification for the Court's action—then all other young men who wish it should also be allowed a draft-exemption. Cassius Clay is a phony—he knows it, the Supreme Court knows it and everyone else knows it, including the parents of our draft-age sons. I would not blame any parent for refusing the induction of their son—not because they were unpatriotic or derelict in their duty—but because Clay has not had to go.

A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON DISCLOSURE OF GOVERNMENT SECRETS AND CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

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

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a constitutional amendment which would place Members of the House and Senate in the same position as private citizens who publicly disclose Gov-

ernment secrets and classified information. I think it is time that we revoke the immunity given to Congressmen and Senators who take the right to declassify unto themselves and willfully disclose information classified as "top secret." I feel sure that the Founding Fathers only intended to protect Representatives and Senators from libel and slander based upon remarks made during the heat of debate.

I do not believe they intended that Congressmen should have the right to disclose "top secret" information. In this area a Member of the House or Senate should be no better than a private citizen. They should be as liable for prosecution and suffer the same penalties as any other person.

THE PRESIDENT'S NARCOTIC PROGRAM

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every Member of this body welcomed the other day the statement by the President of the United States that he was declaring war on the narcotics problem in the United States, identifying it as public enemy No. 1 in his administration.

But evidence persists that the President is talking loud and doing comparatively little of substance in this important field. Some time ago a group of us proposed to the President that he should add the forces of the FBI and the U.S. marshals to the first line of law enforcement attempting to track down the pushers and the pros in this business.

With more than 8,800 FBI agents and more than 1,200 marshals and deputy marshals available for this assignment, the President, by a stroke of his pen, can add 10,000 experienced, front-line fighters to this important effort.

So far nothing has been done on this. Now we learn that the President is letting go forward plans to shut down one of the two Public Health Service facilities to treat addicts and to rehabilitate addicts in the United States.

This certainly is not a forward step in the war on this major problem. Let us hope that the President will put some substantial action with his words on this subject.

To make headway against narcotics traffic and use, we must recognize that we are dealing in two separate and distinct areas: health and law enforcement.

In addition to more vigorous and effectice law enforcement concentrated on the pusher, we must recognize that the addict is sick and needs treatment. President Nixon's message recognizes this, and asks for $105 million to initiate a new program. Why, then, is the administration at the same time moving toward closing one of the two Public Health Service facilities dedicated to drug treatment? The Clinical Research Center in Fort Worth, Tex., is doing an important job in the health field. The administration claims that the center's job will be taken over by community facilities. There is no evidence that these facilities have gone beyond the planning stage. Where are the Fort Worth center's patients going to go for help in the meantime? The shutdown at Fort Worth is clearly inconsistent with the thrust of the President's message.

We need more Federal research and treatment facilities in the war on addiction—not less. Local government must also do more, but the problem is national in scope and the Federal Government must meet the national challenge.

I hope and trust the President and the Congress will join together to deal effectively with this major threat to our Nation's health. The narcotics problem must be met. We cannot afford to meet it with less than a total effort, at the national as well as the local level.

THE PRESIDENT'S ACHIEVEMENTS IN STOPPING NARCOTIC TRAFFIC

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON) is still on the floor. I wonder if the gentleman would not concede that just yesterday, in an announcement by our President that Turkey agreed it would no longer grow poppies in future years, and that such agreement on the part of the President with Turkey is not a giant step forward in trying to meet the drug problem in this country and in the world.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think it is something to be cheered about. But my understanding is that they are going to stop growing after 1972, which is certainly allowing a tremendous production of this lethal drug to continue to go forward, and it seems to me that something more substantial should have been accomplished by the administration in this field.

Mr. ARENDS. I am not an expert in international diplomacy and would not know whether that is possible to have an earlier agreement, but I think we should give credit where credit is due, and that the President's action is very definitely a step in the right direction, and he should be applauded for his continuing efforts in fighting the drug problem on every front.

A COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 24, 1971.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of Section 201 of Public Law 89–298, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives of June 23, 1971, adopted Committee resolutions authorizing the following water resources development projects:

Galveston Harbor and Channel, Texas.
Tybee Island, Ga.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 24, 1971.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, and the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriation Act, 1971, the House Committee on Public Works on June 23, 1971, approved the following projects:

CONSTRUCTION

Nogales, Ariz: Border station facility No. 2.

Calexico, Calif.: Border station (amendment).

San Diego, Calif.: Courthouse, Federal office building, parking facility (amendment).

Augusta, Ga.: (1) post office, Federal office building; (2) post office, courthouse (alterations); (revised).

Houma, La.: Post office, Federal office building (amendment).

Champlain N.Y.: Border station (amendment).

New York, N.Y.: Foley Square Courthouse Annex.

Akron, Ohio: Courthouse, Federal office building, parking facility (revised).

Mansfield, Ohio: Post office, Federal office building (amendment).

Williamsport, Pa.: Post office courthouse, Federal office building (revised).

McAllen, Tex.: Border Patrol sector headquarters (amendment).

Midland, Tex.: Post office, courthouse, Federal office building (amendment).

Seattle, Wash.: Federal office building (amendment.)

Washington, D.C.: U.S. Tax Court Building (revised).

Washington, D.C.: Federal office building, south portal site (amendment).

Washington, D.C.: Department of Labor Building (amendment).

Washington, D.C.: Central heating plant (revised).

Washington, D.C.: West heating plant (revised).

REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT

Los Angeles, Calif.: U.S. courthouse (revised).

East Point, Ga.: Federal Records Center.

Worcester, Mass.: Post office, courthouse.

Kansas City, Mo.: Federal building (revised).

Arlington, Va.: Heating, refrigeration, and sewage disposal plants (revised).

Seattle, Wash.: Courthouse (revised).

Seattle, Wash.: Federal Records Center.

LEASE

Birmingham, Ala.: Social Security Administration Payment Center.

With warm personal regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

WHY DOES NOT PRESIDENT THIEU RELEASE TRUONG DINH DZU?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we are all somewhat familiar with the sly attempts of the administration to influence the upcoming presidential election in favor of perpetuating the regime of President Thieu. We are also familiar with President Thieu's efforts to bring about candidate qualification procedures which all but preclude a meaningful challenge to his reelection.

As a practical matter, President Thieu might as well proclaim himself "reelected." In the spirit of doubletalk made so manifest by the Pentagon papers, three cheers for self-determination.

But there is a way that President Thieu could salvage a certain amount of honor in regard to the election.

The problem of South Vietnamese political prisoners cannot be separated from the election nor from the ending of the war.

How can elections be fair in Vietnam when the runnerup in the last election, Truong Dinh Dzu, is still in prison—his fourth year? Dzu is in very bad health due to maltreatment, diet, and the overwhelming stress of long confinement under inhumane conditions. To make matters worse he and Nguyen Lau, former editor of the Saigon Daily News, were recently transferred from a mainland prison back to Con Son. While his situation is no different from many other prisoners, his immediate release, along with a sizable number of others who comprise the 100,000 political prisoners in South Vietnam, would be a symbol of decent, manly, and humane intent on the part of President Thieu. At least a symbol as the elections approach.

EQUITY IN THE PROCESS OF GOVERNMENTAL LEAKAGE

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

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, now that the Supreme Court has ruled on the legality of the publication of the Pentagon papers by the several newspapers that have been given these documents, I believe it is time to establish equity in the process of governmental leakage.

Is it fair, I ask you, that the New York Times and the Washington Post should always be the prime recipients of such top secret material? What about the other 1,746 daily newspapers, and the news magazines and other publications who must stand by while these two journalistic giants devour and then regurgitate the lion's share of secret documents? The newspapers scattered across the Nation's heartland are entitled to their fair share.

And what about the other media: television, news magazines and other periodicals, as well as weekly newspapers and publications of specialized interest? Women's Wear Daily has not had a good Washington exclusive since it published drawings of Lynda Bird Johnson's wedding dress. And "Jack and Jill" should be considered, too; after all, our younger citizens will be voting sooner than ever.

But there is a problem that surely will soon confront us. When the flow of secret documents has been regulated, and every news outlet in the Nation is receiving its fair share, the torrent of leaks will inevitably result in a shortage: a "secrecy quantity-gap," if you will.

We should, I feel, consider the establishment of a Commission—a blue-ribbon panel—charged with the high responsibility of classifying Government papers in quantity calculated to keep leakage flowing steadily.

We must recognize that this Commission will have a very sensitive assignment. Because of this, the Commission's activities should be carefully shielded from scrutiny by the press and the public. Its membership must be kept confidential.

And all reports, memorandums, studies, evaluations, and expense account vouchers should be boxed, labeled "secret," and sent to the Pentagon for safekeeping.

THIRTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET UNION IMPOSITION OF ITS WILL UPON PEACE-LOVING PEOPLES OF THE BALTIC STATES

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

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, for several years, I have raised my voice to decry the plight of the Baltic peoples, the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians, as they search for freedom from an unwanted oppressor. The people of the Baltic States have been for more than three decades subjected to a government established, not of their own determination, but rather imposed totally contra to international law.

June 15 marks the 31st anniversary of that unhappy moment when the Soviet Union, by force of arms, first imposed its will upon the peace-loving peoples of the Baltic States. The early years of occupation—1940–1952—were marked with armed resistance against the Soviet intruders. It was a time of great losses, when in Lithuania alone some 30,000 freedom-fighters lost their lives striving for self-determination. The search for freedom is still alive, but we must lend our strong moral support so that the Baltic peoples may continue in their quest for a just government.

Mr. Speaker, to reaffirm my commitment to the cause of freedom in the Baltic States, I wish to support the resolution which will be introduced by my colleagues—similar to House Concurrent Resolution 416. This resolution is an expression of will, that the Baltic peoples may once again enjoy both peace and freedom.

FIFTY-TWO NOW COSPONSOR EMERGENCY STRIKE LEGISLATION

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

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing Emergency Strike legislation with 15 additional cosponsors, bringing to 52 the number of Members who have joined in this bipartisan effort to seek a solution to crippling national transportation strikes. The measure was first introduced as H.R. 8385 and later modified in H.R. 9088 and H.R. 9089.

The need for legislation in this area remains as probable future business for this Congress. Although the United Transportation Union and the carriers are presently negotiating, either party could break off at any time and precipitate a series of selective strikes by the brotherhood and possibly lockouts by management. This could result in an emergency of sufficient proportions to require congressional attention.

Another situation which could easily result in the need for Congress to act is the unresolved dispute between the carriers and the signalmen. This difference has merely been postponed until October 1. Unfortunately, there is presently no sign of progress toward settlement.

I am also pleased that all indications are that our House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold hearings on this legislation this month. I am convinced that most Members of Congress do not favor the cumbersome ad hoc process that has characterized the recent history of railroad strikes. National emergency disputes should and can be settled without recourse to congressional intervention with proper legislative action.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from part of yesterday's session. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall No. 172, the vote on House Resolution 489, a motion to table a request that the President furnish the text of the study entitled "United States—Vietnam Relationships, 1945–1967," I would have voted "yea"; and

On rollcall No. 173, the vote on H.R. 7016, the conference report on the Office of Education appropriations bill on fiscal year 1972, I would have voted "yea."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 31, EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 31) to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to address an inquiry to the chairman of the Committee on Education and

Labor. I would like to know if he is acquainted with the bogus report entitled "Report on the Hyden, Ky., Coal Mine Disaster" that has been reported in the press as having been issued by the General Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me answer my distinguished colleague by saying I am not acquainted with any bogus report but that I am acquainted with the committee print that has been circulated. To my way of thinking, the committee print is factual. If the gentleman from Illinois takes exception to the committee print, he has a perfect right to call it up before the subcommittee. It is my judgment that the subcommittee will adopt it as a subcommittee report. If the gentleman wants to go further, he can call it up before the full committee. And, my judgment is that the full committee will adopt it as a full committee report.

Now, let me say something further to the gentleman.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further at this point.

Let me make the observation that the gentleman says that it may be called up before the committee and probably will be adopted. The gentlemen, then, admits that the committee has not acted on this report and that the report has not been approved by the subcommittee and that the report is not factual. When the gentleman says that the report is factual that is not correct, because the report says that the committee made findings and recommendations, and the committee has not acted and could not have submitted findings and recommendations.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is my best judgment that the majority of the members on the committee, both the subcommittee and the full committee, will state that the report is accurate.

I think if the gentleman will take a careful look at this committee print, he will see that the conclusions set out in that report are inescapable.

I think the gentleman is complaining where there is no basis for any complaint.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, let me make the observation——

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan will state his point of order.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, we are not proceeding in the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Regular order is demanded by the gentleman from Michigan.

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

The SPEAKER. 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 28, 1971.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring before the House conference report No. 92–310 to accompany the bill S. 31, the Emergency Employment Act.

It was nearly a month ago, on June 2, that the House amended and passed S. 31 as a means of providing jobs during periods of high unemployment by assisting States and local governments in providing needed public services.

During subsequent conferences with the Senate, we have arrived at a meeting of the minds.

What we bring before you today is not all of the House bill, and not all of the Senate bill. Through a process of give and take, we have arrived at a bill with which all of us can live. This, we endorse to the Members of this House.

Neither the majority nor the minority members of the committee or the conference have any interest in passage of a bill that would meet with a Presidential veto. And we were all pleased when word came this week—well in advance of final passage—that the President will sign this legislation.

I would like, however, to review briefly some of the history that preceded the measure before us today.

We recognize, Mr. Speaker, that despite a long period of prosperity, the country has been unable to solve a chronic problem of unemployment.

To alleviate this situation, many Members of the Congress—I included—came to feel that willing, able-bodied men and women have a right to employment, and that the Government should act as the employer of last resort. That is, if private enterprise could not provide a willing citizen with a job, then he had every right to expect his Government would.

I personally feel that it is far, far better for people to perform useful work on public services and receive for it a decent wage, than to do nothing and draw welfare payments.

With that thought in mind, last year I introduced public service employment legislation, and subsequently joined with other members in including this concept in H.R. 15915, a comprehensive manpower training bill which the Committee on Education and Labor reported to the House on October 5, 1970.

This measure passed the House last November 17 by a voice vote, after the House decisively turned back an amendment to strip the Public Service Employment title from the bill.

Both House and Senate passed the conference report on this legislation last December 10, and it was felt that a great service had been performed by the strong bipartisan majority who supported it.

It was most unfortunate, in my judgment, that the President saw fit to veto the manpower legislation passed by the Congress last year. Had it been signed into law, it would be operating today to combat the unemployment rate that has subsequently gone above the 6 percent mark.

So strongly did I feel about this that on the first day of the new session of Congress in January of this year, I introduced H.R. 17, to assure an opportunity for employment to every American seeking work. And I have subsequently joined with other members of the Committee on Education and Labor in forging the new manpower legislation which we are considering today.

The legislation before us is not brought forward as the be-all and end-all of legislation to provide work for the needy and willing unemployed. It does contain many of the features embodied in the public service employment title voted last December, but it has been modified to meet administration objections and to forestall another Presidential veto.

Notwithstanding its deficiencies, it is a step in the right direction, and I commend it to the Members.

Now, briefly, the differences between the bill passed by the House on June 2 and this conference report are these:

DURATION

The House bill would have authorized a 4-year program. The conferees agreed on a 2-year program, extending through fiscal year 1973.

APPROPRIATIONS

The conferees agreed on a $750 million appropriation for fiscal year 1972, and a $1 billion appropriation for fiscal year 1973, which is somewhat below the $4 billion authorized under the House-passed bill for the "regular" program. In addition, the conference report contains authorization for a "special" employment assistance program of $250 million a year for 2 years in areas where unemployment exceeds 6 percent.

MISCELLANEOUS

The conference report retains the House bill's exclusion of public and private nonprofit organizations as eligible applicants.

While the House bill had a flat salary limitation of $12,000 per year payable to an enrollee in a public service job, the conference bill modifies this somewhat by saying that the Federal contribution may not be more than $12,000 a year for any such job.

Also accepted was the House provision that up to one-third of the jobs created under the act can be in the professional category.

The distribution formula for the funds authorized conforms to the terms of the House bill.

The Senate conferees accepted the House position that a limit of 15 percent be set on funds used for training and manpower services. The remaining 85 percent of the funds must be used for wages and benefits.

The Senate bill used and emphasized the word "transitional" to qualify public service employment under this legislation.

The conferees agreed to keep the Senate version, but accompanied by report language indicating that "transitional" not describe the nature of the job, nor the duration of the time the enrollee may keep the job. The word is merely descriptive of the fact that this is an emergency program which has been authorized for only 2 years.

I wish to emphasize this paragraph from the report:

For individuals employed under the program, it is the intention of the conferees that public service employment jobs lead wherever possible to permanent positions in the public or private sector.

We are all agreed that the public service employment created by this act shall not be of the dead end, make-work va-

riety, long feared by the critics of this legislation.

This is good legislation, and badly needed in an era when a high rate of unemployment is coming to be the rule. Here, in one bold stroke, we create new jobs, and we give a hand to those hard pressed State and local units of government who find it increasingly difficult to perform the public service functions.

I certainly want to commend my colleagues, Representative DANIELS of New Jersey, and the members of his Select Subcommittee on Labor, for the fine work they did in preparing this legislation and shepherding it through to final passage. In Congressman DANIELS, the subcommittee has a leader of great ability and compassion for the working people of this country, and he deserves the thanks of all of us.

Congressman ESCH, who has devoted so much time and effort to this legislation, in the subcommittee, the committee, on the floor of the House, and in the conference, likewise is entitled to the thanks of all of us for his contributions.

Congressman QUIE, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, also contributed much to the legislation. He has my personal thanks, as well as those of all the committee for his work.

All of the conferees were diligent to the position of the House, as the resulting conference report clearly proves.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will lose no time in enacting this legislation into law. The States and the towns and counties all over America are waiting for it.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky just what type of jobs the committee contemplates that this bill would provide?

Mr. PERKINS. All types of regular jobs that are necessary in connection with assisting the police, jobs in the parks, jobs in public institutions, in county boards of education, city boards of education, in city halls, court houses, cleaning up streets, and so forth.

Mr. KAZEN. In other words, manual jobs?

Mr. PERKINS. Manual jobs, and other office jobs, both manual and professional and office jobs, jobs that are needed.

Mr. KAZEN. In other words, we can properly say, then, that whatever jobs the city or county or governmental unit has to offer will be included?

Mr. PERKINS. They have to submit a plan to the Department of Labor, and the Secretary of Labor has the discretion to approve the plan of that governmental unit. Yes.

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) said about all the conferees in the House signing the report is accurate. Some people may wonder about at least the Republican conferees who all voted against the bill as it went to the House, signing the conference report, and it is because we did make significant changes that now make the legislation acceptable to us. We will vote for the conference report.

Let me point out those changes.

If you will look at the conference report on page 4, indicating the language in section 7(a) you will find the words "transitional employment for unemployed and underemployed persons."

At the end of subsection (a) it says:

> To enable such persons to move into employment or training not supported under this Act.

This, to us, is an indication of the type of transitional employment that we are talking about.

It is also recognized that the majority side of the aisle has felt very strongly all the time that they did not want the Secretary of Labor to remove people from public service employment during the term of the act.

When the bill passed the House it authorized a 5-year program. In Conference we accepted a 2-year bill. This is the way we compromised our differences.

As you will recall, the Esch amendment that was offered in the House would have permitted the Secretary to require that people move off public service employment after 2 years. In the conference in resolving that question, we just reported a 2-year bill, but we made it clear in the report that there could not be a requirement that a person be taken off a job before the expiration of this two-year act nor could it be a requirement that the job must of such a nature that it would only be a period of less than 2 years. So we resolved our differences.

If you will also look at subsection (b) of section 7 following subsection (a), also on page 4, you will see this language that we accepted in conference on the Senate bill:

> (b) Programs assisted under this Act shall, to the extent feasible, be designed with a view toward—
>
> (1) developing new careers, or
>
> (2) providing opportunities for career advancement, or
>
> (3) providing opportunities for continued training, including on-the-job training, or
>
> (4) providing transitional public service employment which will enable the individuals so employed to move into public or private employment or training not supported under this Act.

I believe this is the language that now gives the assurance of transitional employment as the President wanted when he vetoed the manpower bill last year and why he assured us when he vetoed the accelerated public works bill, that he will sign this bill.

I might also point out that there was some question on our minds on the prevailing wage language in the House bill. We adopted the Senate language, meaning the prevailing wage would be limited to the same employer. Because we ran into the difficulty of say, a city hospital and a Federal hospital in the same city paying different wages and that the wage in the city hospital would then have to be increased for all its employees if the prevailing wage were determined for the entire locality.

Therefore, we do not interject the Federal Government into the wage levels of the local government and the State government, as seemed to be the danger in the House bill.

We found when we got through with the semantics of what everybody was saying, that there was agreement and we agreed on the Senate language in the conference report.

Also I should point out the language we wanted so much in the House bill was retained in regard to veterans.

The special emphasis for the veterans is now written "special consideration" instead of "preference" as it was in the House bill. But it will enable veterans returning from action in Vietnam or Korea, if they have served since August 1964 to receive special consideration.

So I am pleased with the legislation, but as with all legislation it is not 100 percent the way I wanted it or the way anybody else wanted it, but it is I think an excellent compromise and should be supported.

There is one other matter, of course, of concern to the administration. They want strenuously to have the Congress consider their legislation which has been introduced called "special revenue sharing for manpower."

In talking with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), the chairman of the subcommittee, and with the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the full committee, we have an agreement and I would like at this time to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) to discuss that at this time.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have stated on several occasions, not only to the gentleman in the well, but in the subcommittee, in the full committee, before the rules committee, and during the course of debate on the bill on the House floor in early June that it was my intention as chairman of the Select Committee on Labor to conduct hearings on comprehensive manpower legislation, which would include not only legislation that is pending but also any legislation on the subject matter that might be introduced in the future, and the administration's manpower revenue-sharing bill. I will do all in my power as chairman of the subcommittee to move that legislation along and to try to get a bill reported to the full committee so that the full committee may act upon such legislation before the end of this year.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman. I want to say publicly, too, I know that when the gentleman from New Jersey says that, he means it, as everyone should know. I am confident the gentleman will see that hearings are held and such comprehensive manpower legislation as the majority of the subcommittee will support will be reported this calendar year 1971.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky a similar question also on this subject following the assurance of the gentleman from New Jersey. While the gentleman from Kentucky has said many times that the gentleman from New Jersey has the responsibility for

holding hearings, he has given assurance to me time and again that he will see that the full committee takes action on whatever the subcommittee reports to him.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague that I was not interested in marching up the hill and down again on the manpower bill. We had great need for these jobs throughout America last year—and this I have discussed with the gentleman the proposition that if we could arrive at a meeting of the minds, we would certainly like to have a meeting of the minds. I did agree with the gentleman that as soon as the bill was introduced, I would refer it to the subcommittee. I further told the gentleman from Minnesota that I did not know the type of bill the full committee would vote out, but that we would take the bill up immediately after it is reported by the subcommittee for action. No one can make any commitment as to the type of bill the full committee will report.

I am sure the gentleman realizes that within the next couple of weeks he will be assisting in the mark-up of the so-called Economic Opportunities Act, which includes several of these manpower programs which we desire to extend. Of course, if you have plans at a later date to merge those programs in connection with your special revenue-sharing proposals, that will be a matter for the committee to decide.

At the same time I can assure the gentleman that we will not obstruct orderly procedure. We will make sure that any bills that are introduced will be promptly referred, and that any bills that are promptly voted out of the subcommittee will be taken up by the full committee. I think that is the full extent of the gentleman's agreement with myself.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for his assurance.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. This conference report, as I understand it, authorizes $1,750 million over a 2-year period. What was the money figure in the original authorizing legislation as passed by the House?

Mr. QUIE. The money figure as passed by the House was the same as the amount in this bill for the 2 years in question. Of course, there was 1 year, being fiscal 1971, which was included in the bill passed by the House, which is not a part of this and 2 years beyond this bill, fiscal 1974 and 1975. But I might say that the amount of money that the gentleman refers to now of $1,750 million is $500 million short of what is actually in this bill. There is $750 million on the national triggering, plus the $250 million of section 6 money, making it $1 billion for the fiscal year that began today. There is $1 billion in the national program and $250 million in section 6, being the local program for fiscal 1973, which makes it a total of $2,250 million authorized in this conference report.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for including the additional amount. I had not noted it in the conference report.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished author of the bill, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS).

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, unemployment in America is our most serious domestic problem. It has risen steadily for the past 2 years—by 73.5 percent from the first quarter of 1969 to the first quarter of 1971—and shows no sign of declining in the coming months.

There is no more desperate plight than that faced by the man or woman who wants to work but for whom there is no work. That desperate situation is faced right now by over 5 million of our fellow citizens.

The "Emergency Employment Act of 1971," for which I ask your support is designed to deal with a real emergency.

People do not want to sit home and receive welfare checks with no accomplishment to show for their money. They want to make it on their own. They want to work and feel the rewards of employment—the reward of pride in seeing tangible results of efforts on their part. This is why we need this bill so desperately.

The principal purposes of S. 31 are:

First. To put unemployed persons to work, and

Second. In doing so, to provide needed public services to our citizens.

The conferees present to you a bill which enjoys the widespread support of the House, the Senate, and the administration.

The compromise provides for a 2-year authorization; $750 million is authorized for the fiscal year ending in June 1972, and $1 billion is authorized for the fiscal year ending June 1973. If the national unemployment rate grows to 4.5 percent or more for 3 consecutive months, the Secretary could begin to contract for programs. The funding mechanism is designed to be retroactive, so our present economic conditions would make this act immediately effective.

The bill also contains a "special employment assistance program." It authorizes to be appropriate for this program $250 million for each fiscal year ending in June 1972 and June 1973. In order to be eligible for assistance under this section, an applicant must have an area within its jurisdiction that has had a rate of unemployment of 6 percent or more for 3 consecutive months. This provision focuses funds into local areas of great need that are pockets or chronic unemployment.

Eligible applicants under the "Emergency Employment Act" are units of Federal, State, and general local government; public agencies and institutions which are subdivisions of State or general local government and institutions of the Federal Government; and Indian tribes on Federal or State reservations.

Some of the other reconciled differences include the House provision which gives special consideration to the need for jobs for veterans who served in the Armed Forces in Indochina or Korea, on or after August 5, 1964.

We also adopted the House provision which provides that an applicant must give assurances that no more than one-third of the participants in the program will be professionals within the meaning of section 13(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, although the Secretary may waive the limitation in exceptional circumstances. This restriction does not apply to classroom teachers.

The House provision that no person employed in a public service job may be paid in excess of $12,000 per year was adopted. This provision is not intended to limit the total amount an individual can receive, but simply limits the Federal contribution.

The conferees also adopted the House distribution formula. Eighty percent of the funds appropriated under section 5 will be distributed among and within the States on the basis of the proportion which the total number of unemployed persons in such States bears to such total number in all States, with $1.5 million as a guaranteed minimum to each State. The Federal share will be up to 90 percent; the non-Federal share may be in cash or kind.

Nothing could be worse than to put together training programs for particular skills and then find after the program is completed that there is no job available for the skills attained. Raising expectations without available jobs could create a very tense and frustrating experience for the persons involved.

The clear intent of this bill is to create jobs. Therefore, the conferees agreed that not less than 85 percent of the funds appropriated under this act shall be used for wages and employment benefits.

The 150,000 jobs created by this measure will not be a cure-all to the crisis that claims over 5 million Americans who are unemployed. But this is an important move in forming a realistic approach to the severe employment and manpower problems facing this Nation.

On Tuesday, June 29, 1971, the President, in his veto message to Congress on the accelerated public works bill, stated that—

> Expansion of job opportunities for those presently unemployed is one of this administration's highest priorities.

He said that measures to provide more jobs must be effective and must "hold real promise of providing the jobs when they are needed, where they are needed, for the persons who most need them." The President further stated that the public srevice jobs bill meets this test.

Before concluding, I must stress that the untiring efforts and bipartisan cooperation of all the conferees from both bodies have made S. 31 a compromise in the true sense of the word and a measure that we all can support and be proud of.

Every day we waste in not achieving the passage of this legislation is another day lost in the effort to reverse the trend of our great cities and rural areas toward degradation and decay and the feeling of hopelessness among their inhabitants.

We must act now—I urge immediate passage of the Emergency Employment Act of 1971.

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I rise in support of this conference report; I also want to pay special tribute and commendation to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) whose diligence, whose patience, whose understanding really brought about the possibility of a compromise substantively, first of all, to make it possible to get on with the program of actually providing 150,000 jobs for unemployed people today, in the main part of the bill, plus $250 million for jobs in those areas of high unemployment.

Beyond his work, his patience and his diligence in bringing about substantive changes, he also had the patience to bring about a compromise which was acceptable to both parties, and both the Senate and the House, and therefore on which would be signed into law and would end up in actual jobs rather than just political rhetoric.

I believe he is an outstanding chairman of the subcommittee, and I cannot praise him too much for the manner in which he goes about doing his job.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I thank the gentlewoman for those kind remarks. I do wish to add that this report is the product of the work, the effort and assistance and cooperation rendered by all the Members not only of the subcommittee but of the full committee as well.

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAZZOLI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Oregon in paying tribute to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Daniels, for the excellent work he has done in committee and obviously now in the conference. If there is one thing which is going to help America at this time, and our working people, it is giving them something to do which is gainful and productive. I should like to add my words to the many said concerning the good work the gentleman has done.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to yield briefly to two of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH).

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I believe we should recognize that any time we have a conference report back the major criterion we should examine is as to whether the bill which came back is a better bill than was originally in the House. In the case of this bill that surely is true.

The bill we have before us today, in terms of the conference report, as outlined by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) does give indication that it is substantially improved. First and foremost, the concept of transitional is in the bill. That is a major factor in which there has been great discussion. Moreover, it does have a 2-year limitation, and that too is an improvement. We have been assured—and this is most significant—that hearings will be held and we will have an opportunity to present on this floor a comprehensive manpower training bill, during the course of this year.

Additionally, we were able to retain the provisions of the House regarding veterans "special consideration" and the provision regarding that the recipients be subdivisions of local units of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to call the attention of the Members of the House to what this bill does not do. It will not solve the problem of unemployment in this country, but it will go a long way toward reaching out to those pockets of high unemployment and hopefully getting people immediately into public service jobs. Unemployment in this country has been caused by President Nixon's successful winding down of the Vietnamese war and the cut in military spending. Considering all of the elements, I would support the conference report and urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the adoption of the conference report.

There are three things that I want to briefly comment on.

One is to suggest to the Members of the House that this bill which comes to us in this form is a vastly superior bill, in my judgment, to that which passed the House. The work of the conference succeeded in achieving the result of securing a bill which would be acceptable and put people to work and which would do it on a basis that would make sure they could have the kind of movement necessary from subsidized public service employment to regular public employment or the private sector. Others have noted the differences between the House passed version which I opposed and this conference report and those improvements made in conference have made it possible for me to sign the report and urge its adoption.

Second, it is important for the Members of the House to recognize that the work of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) in the subcommittee, in the full committee and here on the floor with the substitute bill is a significant reason for the fact that we come here today with a bill that has been signed by all of the conferees. Yes, there were differences, but I think the gentleman from Michigan deserves the thanks of all the Members of the House for the kind of work he put in in making it possible for the House to go into the conference on the basis that it could work with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) and the other members of the conference committee to bring this conference report back.

I, for one, want to take some time here to salute the work that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) has done in bringing about this compromise and conference report.

Mr. Speaker, third, there are two specific features of this bill about which I have some concern.

In the language of the statement of the managers, there is a listing of cities for section 6. I must say that I want to make sure it is clear that while I agree Bedford-Stuyvesant and Watts were two cities mentioned for this particular program, I did not find at any time in the conference that there was any discussion of some of the other cities listed. The language of the managers in the report I hope will not be construed by the Department of Labor to require them to carry out a program in "portions of Seattle" or other cities listed and which were not discussed in the conference itself and which I think goes beyond what the conferees intended. We have a definition, but I hope that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) would agree with me that the listing of those cities in no way means the Department of Labor must designate those particular sections for this program.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I concur with the gentleman that it was not the intention of the conferees to limit consideration of areas of high unemployment to Watts and Bedford-Stuyvesant and the other places in the country mentioned in the report where there are high degrees of unemployment. Those examples were merely mentioned to give some idea of what the conferees and the Congress had in mind when we referred to these areas.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate very much the gentleman's clarification of the language of the statement of the managers so as to insure that eligibility must be determined and simple mention in the report does not require the Secretary to take action.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. By the same token, I am sure the gentleman would agree with me that if the unemployment situation in the areas listed were such that would qualify them to come under the auspices of this section 6 the determination would have to be made that they would qualify.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Yes.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a sad commentary on the management of this Government when the "make work" programs must be resorted to. It is a sad commentary on the management of the country, with an annual gross national product of $1 trillion and $65 billion that it must pass a bill to provide "make work" to the tune of $2.2 billion for 2 years. That is a WPA with a vengeance.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I must say to the gentleman that I do not be-

lieve this bill creates a "make work" job program. It is designed to assure that the jobs are productive and needed ones.

Further, Mr. Speaker, section 8 of the bill contained in the conference report comes back with the language of the other body in which the Department of Labor may pay up to 90 percent of the cost of the application. This is different from the House version which required 100-percent payment by the Federal Government. I think it is helpful to allow flexibility to the local community and the Department of Labor to work out what amount each shall support and contribute. I think this change from the version of the bill which was passed by the House is an improvement at this point.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. It would provide the incentive and the requirement for the local communities and the States to assume more responsibility for their public service employment and the adoption of this language, "not to exceed 90 percent" certainly will cause them to accept what responsibility they can. As the gentleman from New Jersey said, the local communities and the States share may be in cash or kind, and I think the change to in cash or kind should be an improvement so the local and State responsibility may be met.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky

Mr. PERKINS. The provision in the bill unequivocally provides that the Secretary shall pay 90 percent of the cost of the jobs.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield further to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman from Kentucky will read section 8(2) it says not to exceed 90 percent. That is the language that is in the bill as the conference reported.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I clearly do not think that the gentleman from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. PERKINS. That is the argument we had last year, whether we would limit the Secretary to pay less than 80 percent. I think it was the intent of the committee that the Secretary pay 90 percent. I feel that is the construction that we have to place on that language.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman from Kentucky I think it was the clear intent of the conferees that the language of the bill contained in the conference report is that the Secretary of Labor shall pay not to exceed 90 percent and is language which by no means requires that he has to pay 90 percent.

Mr. PERKINS. But it says "not to exceed 90 percent." The discussion in conference was not 90 percent or 85 percent or 80 percent. We said the Secretary may approve an application upon determining that the request does not exceed 90 percent of the cost, and gave him leeway to waive the 10 percent. It is clear that the conferees did not contemplate Labor Department jockeying with that 90 percent Federal share. I hope the day will never come when a Secretary of Labor will welsh on a firm congressional commitment to the Nation's unemployed.

Mr. QUIE. I made the motion in the conference committee to accept the Senate language in regard to 9010, receding from the 100 percent in the House bill. The decision was to accept the Senate language and the Senate language is in the bill, "(2) the approvable request for funds does not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of carrying out the program proposed in such application, unless the Secretary determines that special circumstances or other provisions of law warrant the waiver of this requirement;". So you cannot make any interpretation on it other than what is in the bill.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I completely agree with the gentleman from Minnesota and I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 343, nays 14, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]

YEAS—343

Abbitt	Brown, Ohio	Dingell
Abernethy	Broyhill, N.C.	Dorn
Abourezk	Burke, Mass.	Dow
Abzug	Burlison, Mo.	Downing
Adams	Burton	Drinan
Addabbo	Byrne, Pa.	Dulski
Anderson, Calif.	Byrnes, Wis.	Duncan
Anderson, Ill.	Byron	du Pont
Anderson, Tenn.	Cabell	Dwyer
Andrews, Ala.	Camp	Eckhardt
Andrews, N. Dak.	Carey, N.Y.	Edmondson
Annunzio	Carney	Edwards, Ala.
Arends	Carter	Edwards, Calif.
Ashley	Casey, Tex.	Eilberg
Aspin	Chamberlain	Erlenborn
Aspinall	Chappell	Esch
Badillo	Chisholm	Eshleman
Baker	Clancy	Evans, Colo.
Begich	Clark	Evins, Tenn.
Belcher	Clausen, Don H.	Fascell
Bennett	Clawson, Del	Findley
Bergland	Clay	Fish
Betts	Cleveland	Fisher
Bevill	Collins, Ill.	Flood
Biaggi	Conte	Flowers
Biester	Conyers	Flynt
Blanton	Coughlin	Foley
Blatnik	Culver	Ford, Gerald R.
Boggs	Daniel, Va.	Ford, William D.
Boland	Daniels, N.J.	Forsythe
Bolling	Danielson	Fountain
Brademas	Davis, S.C.	Fraser
Bray	Davis, Wis.	Frelinghuysen
Brinkley	Delaney	Frenzel
Brooks	Dellenback	Frey
Broomfield	Denholm	Fulton, Pa.
Brotzman	Dennis	Fulton, Tenn.
Brown, Mich.	Derwinski	Fuqua
	Dickinson	Galifianakis
	Diggs	Gallagher
Garmatz	Mathis, Ga.	St Germain
Gaydos	Matsunaga	Sarbanes
Gettys	Mayne	Satterfield
Giaimo	Mazzoli	Scherle
Gibbons	Meeds	Scheuer
Goldwater	Metcalfe	Schneebeli
Gonzalez	Michel	Schwengel
Goodling	Mikva	Scott
Grasso	Miller, Calif.	Sebelius
Gray	Miller, Ohio	Seiberling
Green, Oreg.	Mills, Md.	Shipley
Green, Pa.	Minish	Shoup
Griffin	Mink	Shriver
Grover	Mitchell	Sisk
Gubser	Mizell	Skubitz
Gude	Mollohan	Slack
Hammer-schmidt	Monagan	Smith, Calif.
Hanley	Montgomery	Smith, Iowa
Hanna	Morgan	Smith, N.Y.
Hansen, Wash.	Morse	Snyder
Harrington	Mosher	Springer
Harsha	Moss	Stafford
Harvey	Murphy, Ill.	Staggers
Hastings	Murphy, N.Y.	Stanton, J. William
Hays	Myers	Stanton, James V.
Hechler, W. Va.	Natcher	Steed
Helstoski	Nedzi	Steiger, Wis.
Hicks, Mass.	Nelsen	Stokes
Hicks, Wash.	Nichols	Stratton
Hillis	Nix	Stubblefield
Hogan	Obey	Stuckey
Holifield	O'Hara	Symington
Horton	O'Konski	Talcott
Hosmer	O'Neill	Teague, Calif.
Howard	Patman	Teague, Tex.
Hull	Patten	Terry
Hungate	Pelly	Thompson, Ga.
Hunt	Pepper	Thompson, N.J.
Hutchinson	Perkins	Thomson, Wis.
Ichord	Pettis	Thone
Jacobs	Peyser	Tiernan
Johnson, Pa.	Pickle	Udall
Jones, Ala.	Pike	Ullman
Jones, N.C.	Pirnie	Van Deerlin
Karth	Poage	Vander Jagt
Kastenmeier	Podell	Vanik
Kazen	Powell	Veysey
Keating	Preyer, N.C.	Vigorito
Kee	Price, Ill.	Waggonner
Kemp	Price, Tex.	Waldie
King	Pryor, Ark.	Ware
Koch	Pucinski	Whalen
Kyl	Quie	Whalley
Kyros	Quillen	White
Leggett	Railsback	Whitehurst
Lent	Rangel	Whitten
Link	Rarick	Widnall
Lloyd	Rees	Wiggins
Long, Md.	Reid, Ill.	Williams
McClory	Reid, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
McCloskey	Reuss	Winn
McCollister	Riegle	Wolff
McCormack	Roberts	Wright
McDade	Robinson, Va.	Wyatt
McEwen	Robison, N.Y.	Wylie
McFall	Rodino	Wyman
McKay	Rogers	Yates
McKevitt	Roncalio	Yatron
McKinney	Rooney, N.Y.	Young, Fla.
Macdonald, Mass.	Rooney, Pa.	Young, Tex.
Madden	Rosenthal	Zablocki
Mahon	Rostenkowski	Zion
Mailliard	Roush	Zwach
Mann	Roy	
Mathias, Calif.	Roybal	
	Ruth	
	Ryan	

NAYS—14

Archer	Colmer	Henderson
Ashbrook	Crane	Jarman
Blackburn	Dowdy	Schmitz
Burke, Fla.	Gross	Spence
Burleson, Tex.	Haley	

NOT VOTING—76

Alexander	Dellums	Kluczynski
Baring	Dent	Kuykendall
Barrett	Devine	Landgrebe
Bell	Donohue	Landrum
Bingham	Edwards, La.	Latta
Bow	Griffiths	Lennon
Brasco	Hagan	Long, La.
Broyhill, Va.	Hall	Lujan
Buchanan	Halpern	McClure
Caffery	Hamilton	McCulloch
Cederberg	Hansen, Idaho	McDonald, Mich.
Celler	Hathaway	McMillan
Collier	Hawkins	Martin
Collins, Tex.	Hébert	Melcher
Conable	Heckler, Mass.	Mills, Ark.
Corman	Johnson, Calif.	Minshall
Cotter	Jonas	Moorhead
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Tenn.	Passman
de la Garza	Keith	

Poff	Ruppe	Sullivan
Purcell	Sandman	Taylor
Randall	Saylor	Wampler
Rhodes	Sikes	Watts
Roe	Steele	Wilson,
Rousselot	Steiger, Ariz.	Charles H.
Runnels	Stephens	Wydler

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Roe with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Steele.
Mr Hébert with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Poff.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Hamilton with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Collins of Texas.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Dellums.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Wampler.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Randall.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SIT DURING THE SESSION OF THE HOUSE TODAY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 2133) to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, for 3 months.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2133

An act to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, for three months

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the funds authorized to be appropriated in sections 5(n) and 6(e) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.), for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, shall remain available until September 30, 1971.

SEC. 2. Section 7(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 446 et seq.), is amended by inserting after "$10,000,000" the following: ", and for the three-month period ending September 30, 1971, $2,500,000".

SEC. 3. The second sentence of section 8 (d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.), is amended by striking "and $1,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971." and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; and $500,000,000 for the three-month period ending September 30, 1971."

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, for the last month the Committee on Public Works has been holding oversight hearings on the operation of the water pollution control program. We have heard from representatives of the Environmental Protection Agency and State and local governments on the many problems involved in the implementation of this most important program. The hearings have been extremely helpful in reviewing the status of the program and in spotlighting many of the major issues which must be solved.

These oversight hearings will probably continue for another week. Thereafter, the committee will consider the various legislative proposals now pending before it. The legislative hearings will be in depth and, in all probability, will continue beyond the August recess before the Committee will report out a bill for the consideration of the House.

Because of the necessity to continue the funding for programs under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, it is necessary to call up S. 2133 for immediate House consideration. The bill includes three sections.

Section 1 provides that funds authorized for research, investigations, training, and information under section 5, and for research and development under section 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, would remain available until September 30, 1971.

Section 2 authorizes $2,500,000 for grants for State water pollution control programs for the 3-month period ending September 30, 1971, a level which is 25 percent of the fiscal year 1971 authorization.

Section 3 authorizes construction grants for the 3-month period ending September 30, 1971, in the amount of $500 million, a level which is consistent with the administration's budget request for this program.

I would emphasize that the Committee on Public Works is well aware of the importance of this program. This extension is needed at the present time and it may be necessary to later request a further extension if the committee has not completed action on the bills pending before the committee by September 30. I would urge the immediate passage of S. 2133.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, in supporting S. 2133.

This bill would extend expiring authorizations for parts of our water pollution control program for 33 months. In so doing, it would provide time necessary for the Public Works Committee to continue the difficult task of evaluating existing legislation for water pollution control programs and to develop comprehensive water pollution control legislation, probably by the end of the 3 months.

S. 2133 would preserve the continuity of the water pollution control program while providing additional time.

Specifically, S. 2133 would extend authorizations for appropriations in three areas. Section 1 of S. 2133 makes the $75 million authorized to be appropriated by section 5(n) and the $60 million authorized to be appropriated by section 6 (e) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, "available until September 30, 1971." A total of $59.5 million of these authorizations have not been appropriated and would be available for appropriation under this section. This will extend the existing authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, until September 30, 1971. Thus, with the required appropriation, EPA could continue the obligation of funds through September 30 for research, investigations, and training per section 5 use for grants for research and development per section 6.

Section 2 of S. 2133 authorizes the appropriation of $2,500,000 for grants to States for water pollution control programs for the 3-month period ending September 30, 1971. This authorization is at the same annual rate as the $10 million authorized to be appropriated by section 7 of the Water Pollution Control Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. These grants assist the State and interstate agencies in meeting the cost of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution, including the training of personnel of public agencies.

Section 3 of S. 2133 authorizes the

appropriation of $500 million for grants to States, municipalities, and intermunicipal and interstate agencies for the construction of waste treatment works. The $500 million for the 3-month period is equal, on an annual rate basis, to the $2 billion requested by the administration for such grants for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1972, 1973, and 1974, which amount the House approved by passage of the Agriculture-Environmental Protection Appropriation Act last week. This increase in authorization is consistent with the need for an increase in the rate of construction of treatment works and it will prevent delay in the acceleration of this needed construction.

Mr. Speaker, because of major legislation on accelerated public works, economic development, and Appalachia programs, the Public Works Committee was precluded from starting consideration of water pollution legislation as early as desired. The oversight hearings presently being held have also demonstrated that existing legislation requires major revisions in some areas. Thus, the completion of this task in the thorough manner required, dictates that the extension authorized in S. 2133 is urgently required. We must, at this point, take the time and make the effort required to develop workable, effective, and efficient legislation.

The product of the committee's time and effort must be the providing of the legislative and fiscal tools needed to bring the Federal, State, and local governments' programs along with private, industrial, land use, and agricultural projects and programs into harmony. Also, our Nation's industries which, I believe, are willing to shoulder their portion of the burden of investment in the environment, must be in a position to base their future investment decisions on a predictable legal environment.

In addition, we must develop an environmental maintenance framework which includes more effective support of and reliance upon State efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the Public Works Committee will start legislative hearings on the comprehensive water pollution control legislation and the required fiscal authorizations after the July 4 recess. Because of the comprehensive nature of the legislation, the Public Works Committee will probably not be able to report a bill to the House by October 1. It may be necessary either to come back for additional authorizations for a short period or to have a period of time during which no authorizations will be available to continue the program. This, however, can be determined as the legislative hearings proceed, and at this time we ask only for a 3-month authorization.

The Public Works Committee recognizes that the additional authorizations are not as desirable as having comprehensive and effective legislation available on July 1. However, it is also necessary to recognize that the expiration of the fiscal year should not in any way preclude the completion of the committee's work. It is a difficult and time-consuming task and it must be completed in the detail required to provide the effective, comprehensive, and lasting program for water pollution control that our Nation requires. I urge your support of S. 2133.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8629, COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH MANPOWER TRAINING ACT OF 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 481 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 481

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8629) to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to provide increased manpower for the health professions, and for other purposes, and all points of order against page 11, line 6 through line 23 of said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, Rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order under clause 7, Rule XVI the amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed on page 3, line 18 of the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 481 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 8629, the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971. All points of order are waived against lines 6 through 23 on page 11 of the bill because of an appropriation in a legislative bill—clause 4, rule XXI—and against line 18 on page 3 because of nongermaneness—clause 7, rule XVI.

The purpose of H.R. 8629 is to extend for 3 years, with modifications, the existing program for grants to medical and other schools training health professionals and for assistance to students at those schools.

Appropriations are authorized in the total amount of $2.8 billion over the 3-year period for a number of programs. There is a shortage today of approximately 50,000 doctors. With this legislation, it is hoped that gap will be closed by 1978.

There is presently a backlog of approximately $600 million in approved but unfunded construction projects under existing authorizations; $750 million is authorized over the 3-year period for this program.

A total of $872 million is authorized over the 3-year period for capitation grants and $412 million is authorized for special project grants for schools in the health professions which are in serious financial condition.

The bill includes a program called Health Manpower Education Incentive Awards and $270 million is authorized for it. Included in this program are projects for continuing education of physicians and training of other health personnel in nonmedical school settings.

The bill also provides for training teachers for medical schools, providing training in family medicine, special grants for assistance to new schools, and continues the program of student loans and scholarships.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 481 in order that the bill may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 481 provides an open rule with 1 hour of debate for the consideration of H.R. 8629, the Comprehensive Manpower Training Act of 1971.

Points of order are waived in two instances because of transfer of funds, and in a third instance because about four words add additional duties, and they are nongermane to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule, and I urge its adoption.

Does the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) wish to be heard on this resolution? If so, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the gentleman has answered the question I had in mind as to why there is a waiver of points of order in the rule.

Mr. SMITH of California. Specifically, the language provides for transfer of funds on line 6 to 23 on page 11 and the transfer of funds are in violation of clause 4, rule XXI.

In section 1 there are about five words in there that we added to the committee bill. Actually, they would go beyond the scope of the bill and so would be nongermane.

We waived points of order to just those two matters.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize for 3 years—through fiscal 1974—a continued expansion of assistance to institutions involved in training men and women in the health fields.

The bill authorizes $2,806,600,000 over a 3-year period, $754,600,000 for fiscal 1972, $914,000,000 for 1937, and $1,096,000,000 for 1974.

The report details a continuing shortage throughout the health professions, including doctors, dentists, optometrists,

pharmacists, and veterinarians. Financial assistance both for construction and modernization of facilities, as well as direct student assistance, would be provided by the bill.

Construction grants totaling $750,000,000 over a 3-year period are authorized to construct new teaching facilities and to rehabilitate existing ones. The Federal share of the costs of new construction is increased under the bill from 66 percent to 75 percent. On all other construction costs the Federal share is increased from 50 percent to 67 percent.

Loan guarantee funds totaling $48,000,000, are authorized for the payment of interest subsidies on long-term construction loans made to health profession training schools as part of their construction programs.

During the 3 years covered by the bill $135,000, is authorized to provide loans to students of the health professions. The maximum loan for each year is increased from $2,500 to $3,500. The Secretary of HEW is authorized to repay up to 75 percent of a student's loan if he agrees to practice his profession for 3 years in an area designated as one having a shortage of medically trained personnel—$94,000,000 is authorized for scholarships, with the maximum yearly amount increased from $2,500 to $3,500.

Other major authorizations are made to: First, encourage medical schools to carry out training of doctors to be family physicians—$100,000,000; second, support special projects—$142,000,000; third, help new schools get started—$30,000,000; and fourth, support a new program of initiative awards to improve our health services distribution system—$270,000,000.

Finally, the bill authorizes $872,000,000 for capitation grants over the next 3 years to be granted to health professions training institutions under a formula based partially on the number of students enrolled. This is aimed at insuring such schools rather definite indications as to how much Federal assistance they are due in the ensuing school year, under a formula based on the number of students.

A National Advisory Council on Health Professions of 20 members is created, and two existing such councils are abolished by the bill. The Council is to report to the Congress by June 30, 1974, on the operation of programs under the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8630, NURSE TRAINING ACT OF 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 482 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 482

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8630) to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for training increased numbers of nurses, and all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require and at the conclusion of my remarks I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 482 provides an open rule with 1 hour of debate for consideration of H.R. 8630, the Nurse Training Act of 1971. All points of order are waived against the bill for failure to comply with clause 4 of rule XXI—appropriations in a legislative bill.

The purpose of H.R. 8630 is to provide for training increased numbers of nurses.

The bill provides a 3-year extension, with modifications, of the Nurse Training Act and authorizes a total of $710 million over the 3-year period.

Capitation grants to all schools of nursing would be provided in the amount of $200 for each student, plus $500 for each graduate; $169 million is authorized for this program over the 3-year period; $24 million is authorized for startup grants to new nursing schools.

In addition, the legislation authorizes matching grants for construction of teaching facilities and grants for special projects at nursing schools, plus traineeships to train teachers, and loans and scholarships for students.

There is presently a shortage of approximately 150,000 nurses and it is anticipated that this legislation will go a long way toward closing the gap.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 482 in order that the bill may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 482 provides for 1 hour of debate. It is an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 8630, the Nurse Training Act of 1971.

Once again we waive points of order because it is a transfer of funds in several different instances or a reappropriation which is in violation of clause 4, rule XXI.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule and urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize $710 million over a 3-year period— through fiscal 1974—for construction grants and student assistance in the field of nurse training.

Over the 3-year period the authorized sum of $710 million would be expended as follows: fiscal 1972, $206 million; 1973, $237 million, and 1974, $267 million.

Today some 700,000 nurses are in active practice and another 150,000 are needed. By 1980 the projected need is for 1,100,000 active nurses. The bill seeks to assist in meeting this need by providing direct student assistance and aid to nursing schools to insure a continuing supply of trained nursing personnel.

Construction grants totaling $105 million are authorized, on all new facilities construction. The Federal share is increased from 66 to 75 percent. On all rehabilitation projects the Federal share is increased from 50 to 67 percent.

Special project grants are authorized at $83 million and may be used to assist financially troubled schools; $169 million in capitation grants are authorized. These grants, based on the number of nursing students in the school, are to enable a nursing school to predict how much Federal aid will be available to it during the coming school year.

Direct assistance to nursing students is also authorized; $75 million in loan funds are made available, with the maximum yearly loan increased from $1,500 to $2,500 and the aggregate amount of loans one student may receive is increased from $6,000 to $10,000. Students who agree to work in shortage areas may have up to 75 percent of their loans forgiven by the Government.

Scholarship grants are authorized—$57 million over the 3-year period and traineeship grants are also authorized at $66 million. These last grants are for training graduate nurses in administrative and faculty positions in teaching hospitals.

There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH MANPOWER TRAINING ACT OF 1971

Mr. STAGGERS. 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. 8629) to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to provide increased manpower for the health professions, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8629, with Mr. GRAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take too long, but I do want to explain what the bill is about. It is, perhaps, one of the most important bills that will affect America to come out of this session of Congress for all the people.

First, I would like to read a letter which was just delivered to me from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1971.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that the House of Representatives will today consider H.R. 8629, the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971.

As you know, on February 18, 1971, the President transmitted a Message to the Congress calling for reform of the Nation's health care system. An important part of that strategy was a measure to produce more health professionals, especially to perform critically needed services, and to encourage the more effective use of medical manpower.

The pending bill, H.R. 8629, is the product of extensive consideration and effort on the part of your Committee and its Subcommittee on Public Health and the Environment, under the leadership of Chairman Paul G. Rogers. While the bill varies in several respects from the Administration's proposal, it does contain many of its essential principles. We commend the Committee on its work and look forward to final action on this health manpower legislation in this session of Congress.

With warm regard,
Sincerely,

ELLIOT RICHARDSON,
Secretary.

I wanted to get that letter in the RECORD to show that the administration is wholeheartedly for the bill. The bill closes a gap that has needed to be closed for a long time. It is landmark legislation.

At this time I wish to commend the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment for the great job they have done in bringing this measure to the floor under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida, PAUL ROGERS, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSON), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SATTERFIELD), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER), the gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HASTINGS), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHMITZ), and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ROY). All of those gentlemen played a major part in the development of this legislation, legislation which I believe will be helpful to every individual American in the years to come. These men deserve the thanks of all Americans for the outstanding work they have done on this bill and the one to follow this one.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a 3-year extension, with modifications, of the existing program under which grants are made to aid medical schools and other schools training health professionals, and under which assistance is provided to students at those schools.

The Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment held 3 weeks of hearings on this bill, and several weeks of executive sessions before reporting the bill to the full committee. The full committee considered it in executive session, and adopted all the proposals recommended by the subcommittee.

The bill authorizes appropriations totaling $2,800,000,000 over a 3-year period, for a variety of programs designed to close the gap between our Nation's supply of manpower in the health professions and our need. It is estimated that we are 50,000 doctors short today, and if this bill is fully funded, we would expect to close that gap by the year 1978.

The bill authorizes matching grants for construction of teaching facilities, or research facilities, at schools of medicine, dentistry, optometry, pharmacy, podiatry, veterinary medicine, and public health. There is today a backlog of approximately $60 million in approved but not funded construction projects under existing authorizations. Of this $600 million, approximately $250 million is ready for immediate letting of contract subject to the availability of Federal funds. In other words, these are projects where the matching funds are already available, and the only thing holding up the project is the availability of Federal funds. This is one of the expensive items in the bill, and a total of $750 million in authorizations over a 3-year period is provided for this program.

Another major feature of the bill consists of capitation grants for schools of the health professions. The authority for capitation grants has been in the law for a number of years now, but specific amounts have never been authorized, and the formula set forth in the law applies equally to all schools, whether they be schools of medicine or schools training members of other disciplines. Obviously, the costs of training a doctor are considerably in excess of training a pharmacist, or an optometrist, for example. Therefore, the reported bill sets different levels of capitation grants for each of the disciplines. The bill is also designed to provide some financial incentives to change from 4-year programs to 3-year programs. In addition to the increase in manpower which would be provided in the short run by such a change, this change would also add 1 year to the period during which physicians practice their professions, by permitting them to start their professional careers 1 year earlier.

The subcommittee worked long and hard devising the capitation formula, and although the formula set provides more money per student than was recommended by the administration, and less money per student than was recommended by the institutions, we feel that the amount provided is a reasonable compromise between these points of view and is a realistic level of support for the schools.

This program of capitation grants is also an expensive one, with overall authorizations totaling $872 million over the 3-year life of the bill.

In addition, the bill authorizes $412 million over a 3-year period for special project grants for schools of medicine, dentistry, and other health professions. Special projects can be used to provide financial assistance to schools which are in serious financial condition in order to help them to continue to meet the growing student population and in some cases to keep them from having to close for lack of funds. As Members may know, two dental schools have closed in recent years for this reason.

The committee also included a program recommended by the administration called Health Manpower Education Initiative Awards totaling $270 million over the 3-year life of the bill. These are projects for continuing education of physicians, and for training of other health personnel in nonmedical school settings, for the purpose of improving the supply and distribution of health manpower.

The bill also provides for training teachers for schools of medicine, for providing training in family medicine to increase the number of family practitioners special grants for start-up assistance to new schools of medicine, dentistry or osteopathy, and continues the program of student loans and scholarships under existing laws, with modifications in those programs.

Overall, Mr. Chairman, this bill provides a balanced program of assistance to schools training health professionals, and if it is passed and fully funded, we believe it will go far toward solving many of our problems today arising out of shortages in the health professions.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is there anything in the report which breaks out the grant features of the bill; that is, the total grants in the bill and the repayable loans?

Mr. STAGGERS. This is in the bill. I would cite page 5 of the report. I might say that it is all grants, except the loans that are provided.

Mr. GROSS. Page 5 indicates this is a 3-year bill; is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. I ask again whether there are any figures showing the total grants under the bill and the total of loans that are repayable?

Mr. STAGGERS. Only the student loans, and I might say there is $135 million for this.

If the doctor, when he graduates, or the other personnel under this bill, will practice in an area where the Secretary determines there is a shortage and a need, then there is forgiveness up to $15,000, or three-quarters of the loan, whichever is the smallest.

Mr. GROSS. What is the total for bricks and mortar, in other words for construction?

Mr. STAGGERS. The total for construction is $750 million. As I said, today we have over $600 million in projects that are approved, and $250 million of them are waiting to go under contract as soon as we can get the money.

Mr. GROSS. Is any of that $750 million repayable?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. I ask the gentleman to turn to page 96 of the report, please.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOODLING. I am reading from the section under the heading "Tolerances for Pesticide Chemicals in or on Raw Agricultural Commodities."

Under (g), I read this—and I believe this is part of the existing report:

> Whenever the referral of a petition or proposal to an advisory committee is requested under this section, or the Secretary otherwise deems such referral necessary, the Secretary shall forthwith appoint a committee of competent experts to review the petition or proposal and to make a report and recommendations thereon.

This is my question. Is this not in conflict with the newly created Environmental Protection Agency?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, not in any way. All this does is to correct technical error in previous legislation. There is no money involved. We needed this in order to correct some previous legislation where technical changes were required. No substantive amendments are made by section 203 of the bill and the remaining sections.

Mr. GOODLING. As I recall it, under the new agency, the Food and Drug Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and practically every other department is now subject to the EPA.

Mr. STAGGERS. This makes no change whatsoever in the substance of existing law. There were some technical errors that needed to be corrected, and they are made here. There are no funds involved whatsoever.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, health manpower for the purposes of the bill we have before us today consists of the national supply of doctors, dentists, osteopaths, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, and veterinarians. There are broader aspects to health manpower which are treated in other legislation such as nurse training and allied health professions training. They also have received attention in recent years, and the Nurse Training Act will be considered along with H.R. 8629 which we have before us now.

It is hardly necessary to make a long or complicated argument to demonstrate that the delivery of health services and the improvement in health care to be received by our population is first and last founded upon the presence of adequate numbers of well trained and well motivated health professionals. Without them no system can maintain or improve the health of our citizens. We did not discover this truth yesterday. Congress has provided legislation over the last 8 years designed to produce more doctors and related professionals. Enlarged numbers of doctors meant more and better medical schools. We have provided funds and programs designed to create them. Since 1963, 164 schools have received $791 million for construction. There have been 26 new schools created and 138 have been expanded, renovated or remodeled. Spaces for 6,000 more students have been created. Most of these graduates will continue to serve the public for the next 40 years.

It is pleasing to see a program produce as anticipated. It would be nice to be able to close it out and announce the attainment of the goal set forth at the beginning of the program. No one, however, expected to be able to do so at this point. Even at the very beginning of the medical educational assistance effort we recognized the magnitude of the task. So far we have been trying to catch up.

The problem keeps running ahead of us because of the increase in population and the constant changes in distribution of people and the health services as well. So we cannot close shop and rest upon the past accomplishments. Prepaid health care, health insurance, health maintenance organizations, all under consideration at the present time, mean nothing if we cannot produce the necessary numbers and appropriate types of health professions.

The bill before us today will help. Nine more new medical schools await funding. If the authorities provided under this legislation are used to the fullest, we shall be producing health manpower in far larger numbers and very near anticipated needs. Physicians will be graduated this year at about the 9,500 rate. By 1980 this number will be increased to 17,350, and we will have about 436,000 doctors in the country. This takes into account the influx of about 3,000 graduates of foreign schools each year also. As good as all this sounds, it will be necessary to take advantage of the authorities and funding levels set forth in the bill from now until 1980 to be able to say that the doctor shortage has been alleviated.

Most of the provisions of H.R. 8629 are not new. They have been gradually developed as we have gained experience with the building, equipping, and manning of new medical and other professional schools. This bill would continue them with some changes which we believe and hope are definite improvements.

Grants for construction of new teaching facilities or those in critical shortage areas may go as high as 75 percent of the costs. All others would remain at the present 67 percent. It might be noted here that the traditional two-thirds of 66⅔ percent used in the past has been changed to 67 percent. The reason for this insignificant change is the fact that computers seem to choke on those fractions.

The rules have been expanded to allow grants for the acquisition of existing buildings and interim facilities which could hurry the opening of a new school and get it in operation while more permanent quarters are still under construction.

In order to assure the presence of bricks and mortar the bill also makes available loan guarantees and subsidies to pick up the tab for 3 percent of the interest. Grants and loans together can amount to 90 percent of the funding necessary for a major project. Loans, although a very useful device for carrying part of the load of school construction, cannot provide enough assistance alone. Schools, to put it mildly, are not profitmaking institutions. Especially is this true of professional schools. Mighty few would be built if only loans were available for financing.

To further emphasize the fact that schools cannot carry large financing burdens over into the operational years, we have found that continuing support is necessary in the form of assistance for day-to-day operating expenses. This has now taken the form of capitation grants which provide varying sums per student depending upon the kind of school. To spur streamlining a graduation sum is also offered.

Obviously all of this is useless unless it results in more students and more graduates. Since the very beginning of this program I have insisted that all grants and other aid be tied to a requirement for increased enrollments. I have never been entirely satisfied with what we have demanded. This time we have doubled the requirement to not less than a 5-percent increase per year or 10 students. In addition, the bill provides an incentive in the way of $1,000 for each student enrolled over and above the statutory minimum. It is the intention to squeeze school administrators to use the facilities to the limit at all times consistent with high grade education.

To hurry things along, schools are offered startup grants. Early projects clearly showed the need for them. Schools could be built and then drag along for long periods while equipment was obtained and other first-time expenses were sweat out. In building a new medical school or other professional school, any institution necessarily extends itself to the limit to build the most and best that it can. These major expansions must last for many years, so they go all out. When it comes time to meet those necessary extra startup costs, the cupboard is bare. Government assistance for on-going operations will eventually help, but before that can happen the first classes must get underway. The bill provides such help on a declining basis over the first 3 years. The first class must be at least 24 students to qualify.

Student loans are continued, but the amount available to the individual student is increased from $2,500 per year to $3,500 per year. If graduates will agree to practice in shortage areas for 3 years, and actually do so, 75 percent of the loans they have piled up acquiring their degrees may be forgiven. In exceptional cases scholarships are available for students with extraordinary need and great

potential. Such assistance should be minimal since loans are adequate in most situations and can be worked off easily by the successful graduate. The funds outlined in the report for scholarships assume that all schools will take up all that the formula calls for. That is unlikely, and realistic estimates put the figures considerably lower.

Other provisions include project grants and initiative awards. Both of these are favorably considered by the administrators of this program. Project grants give great flexibility to assist schools with innovative ideas and promising curriculum or organizational improvements. Initiative awards are meant to spur activity and trials in training, and in the more efficient use of people and facilities. Also it has been discovered, to our dismay at times, that despite their very best efforts and for reasons none can well foresee, professional schools find themselves in desperate financial situations. Some of these are caused by general conditions and affect all schools to greater or lesser degrees. Some situations are the result of peculiar local conditions which cannot be controlled but must be coped with. It has been difficult at times to help them when the help was most needed. Some schools have come perilously close to folding, and we cannot afford to lose them.

In the present bill the project grant money can be used in such cases. It is not intended to bail out everyone who cries wolf, and careful scrutiny is expected. From these situations much can be learned, however, about the sticky problems which plague the schools. Helping one school may very likely make it possible to avoid a similar catastrophe elsewhere.

Health manpower is the key to better health care for the country. No new schemes for organization or delivery can make any difference or get off the ground without necessary supplies of health care professionals. If the country were to be blessed with more than adequate numbers of health professionals, most organizational problems would become fairly simple. The tendency would be for them to solve themselves. I do not envisage such a situation. But I must repeat that the key to any improvement in health care is the recruitment, education, and continued practice of professional personnel. If money must be spent in amounts in the billions to solve health problems, this is the logical place to start—or not start at all. It is a long and expensive battle which must be fought and must be won. This bill takes a realistic approach.

Much of what is proposed here coincides with what the administration wants to do. It includes some programs, such as direct grants, which it would prefer to change. The overall authorizations are considerably larger than administration requests, but in those areas where agreement on a program is achieved, and that includes much of this bill, the predicted costs and resulting authorizations are very close to those recommended.

It is likely that budget requests will not equal the authorizations set forth in this bill in future years. The tools are here, however, and it is the feeling of the committee that those who administer the programs and wrestle with the broad problem of public health will find that the level of effort possible under this legislation may be necessary. For these reasons I recommend that the bill be approved by the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished minority member of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment. the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN).

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express appreciation to my colleague from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) for his guidance and untiring efforts, as subcommittee chairman, during the consideration of the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971.

I also compliment the members of the subcommittee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on their understanding of the substantive provisions of this important bill authorizing a Federal financing program designed to alleviate a critical stortage in the health professions.

The bill, H.R. 8629, continues those specific authorities which have proved to be effective for the past several years and adds authorities which are currently lacking and which have been identified as necessary to meet the Nation's growing health needs.

It is a costly bill, but the help it provides is desperately needed. It authorizes, over a 3-year period, over $2.8 billion for facilities, training and other programs to meet the projected health manpower needs during the next decade. Our space programs are costly, so are the education programs which Congress authorizes. These programs are all necessary, nevertheless, to respond to the requirements of our present day society.

I would caution, however, those who plan college and hospital programs that congressional authorizations are not always matched by congressional appropriations and that often funds, when appropriated, have been withheld by the Government to keep budgets more nearly in balance. These are the realities which concerned administrators should keep in mind when studying their future plans.

Among the most needed of the new authorizations contained in H.R. 8629 are the "startup" grants" to aid in the establishment of new medical schools. In order to qualify for such startup funds, a new school must enroll at least 24 students in its first class.

One of the primary goals of the health manpower legislation is to increase, as rapidly as possible, the number of practicing physicians and dentists. To help meet this need the bill provides that priority shall be given to applications for grants for construction of teaching facilities with special consideration to applications for new school startup grants.

In this connection, our committee report states at one point:

> The Committee is aware of proposals by several outstanding institutions—including the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota—to establish new schools of medicine, osteopathy or dentistry.

The Mayo Clinic is known and respected worldwide, and a medical school established in conjunction with the clinic is something that all Americans should look forward to as a great training center for the medical profession.

I am also convinced the Mayo Clinic will provide a casebook study as to medical school organization, with particular reference to detailed accounting methods, procedures for determining costs—all of which can be used as a model for all medical schools of the country. For the first time, we may be able to break down the items of cost in medical education and see where the strengths and weaknesses lie.

Both direct loans and guaranteed loans for needy students who attend the health professions schools are provided by the bill. The committee hearings established that generally students have a difficult time securing loans from a bank and that loans administered by the schools are far more practical. Scholarship grants will be provided for those students who qualify, with particular attention being given to qualified students of minority groups.

The bill provides for the forgiveness of student loans if graduates spend 3 years in practice in an area where a shortage of doctors exists. I am heartily in favor of this provision, with one exception. Certainly, I will support any reasonable effort to get doctors, dentists, and other medical professionals in rural areas and other shortage areas where they are badly needed.

It is my feeling, however, that each student should be required to pay back a small part of the Government loans so these funds could be used to help other students. Doing this would tend to give a young doctor an understanding of the cost of his education and a sense of obligation to help others as he has been helped.

I, therefore, supported a provision which would have forgiven 75 percent of the student loan rather than the 100 percent as contained in the bill.

Of great importance to people in rural areas is a provision which provides grants to hospitals to institute programs of training in the field of family medicine. This would include advanced training for doctors already in practice or residents and new graduates. It is hoped this program will encourage a larger number of family medicine practitioners than are now graduating from medical schools.

Another great feature of the bill is the recognition it gives to the schools of veterinary medicine. As a member of the senate in the State of Minnesota, I introduced and helped guide to enactment a bill establishing a School of Veterinary Medicine at the University of Minnesota. I am indeed gratified that this bill recognizes the growing need for veterinary medicine which makes such a necessary contribution to the Nation's nutrition and health.

The testimony of all the health professions representatives, including their associations and the labor groups, which appeared before the subcommittee contributed greatly to our knowledge and made possible the writing of a better health manpower bill by the subcommittee. It is my feeling that none of the professions have been slighted and all will be able to go ahead with expanded training programs which are so sorely

needed to meet national health requirements in the years ahead.

I am glad to have had a part in developing this legislation and it has my wholehearted support.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the Chairman for yielding and I shall not take a great deal of time.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment has devoted a great deal of time to the subject matter of this bill. It has been very carefully considered, and as has been stated by the ranking member of the committee, representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were most helpful and I commend them publicly for their help to the committee. Many organizations, particularly the Association of American Medical Colleges were most helpful to us in gathering information. Only today I received the following letter in support of the bill from the American Medical Association:

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., June 30, 1971.

Hon. PAUL G. ROGERS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: Representatives of our Association recently appeared before your Subcommittee to testify on various bills which would extend the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. At that time we urged that the law, due to expire June 30, 1971, should not only be extended, but that financial assistance for medical education should be at an increased level of support.

H.R. 8629, the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971, approved by your Subcommittee, is now scheduled for consideration by the House of Representatives. We are pleased that your bill does provide for continuation and expansion of federal support for medical education. We are grateful for the recognition which you and members of your Subcommittee have shown concerning the need for development of adequate medical manpower.

At this time I would like briefly to review provisions of H.R. 8629, which are of particular concern to the medical profession. The bill provides for increased support for construction grants and loans, for institutional and project grants, and for assistance to medical students through loans and scholarships, with incentive provisions for service in shortage areas. In addition, support would be provided for family practice training programs. All of these programs we support.

The provisions funding construction grants will provide necessary assistance for development of teaching facilities, and we believe the new program of loan guarantees for construction of these facilities to be salutary. In our testimony before your Committee, we had indicated that a program of guaranteed loans would permit a beneficial use of federal funds and assist in the construction of needed medical schools.

Concerning provisions for institutional and special project grants, we are pleased that your Committee's bill will provide much needed additional funding for medical schools. We note that it provides support to various kinds of professional institutions at different levels of financial assistance, which we indicated in our testimony to be a reasonable approach to the relative costs of education in the various professions.

Under the provisions for special project grants and for health manpower education initiative awards, we note that grants or contracts may be made to and with "public or private health or educational entities." These terms are not defined in the bill. We are confident it would be your intent that only approved educational programs be supported, thus insuring the continued development of quality training programs in medicine. We believe it is important that this legislation continue to support only accredited and approved programs. An amendment was made in the provision for family practice training to support approved programs, and we believe that a similar requirement in the provisions for special project grants and health manpower education initiative awards would strengthen the legislation.

H.R. 8629 increases the level of assistance for medical students in the loan and scholarship programs. We believe such increased support is advisable and necessary in order to provide adequate assistance to medical students. We are also pleased that the bill contains provisions for loan forgiveness as an incentive for service in shortage areas.

While the bill contains other beneficial features, we will comment only on one additional provision. In our testimony before your Committee we asked that a broad range of support be provided for training in family practice. H.R. 8629 does provide grants for training in family medicine, and, in addition, training programs may be supported through special project grants. These provisions merit strong support. In encouraging the training of additional family practice physicians, the legislation will help to meet a critical need in our health delivery system.

In closing, on behalf of the medical profession we wish to commend your Subcommittee and the full Committee for the comprehensive consideration given to this important legislation, and in particular we wish to recognize the great contribution which you have personally made in the formulation of this bill.

We welcome every opportunity of being of assistance to you, and we want to extend our appreciation for the cooperation and courtesy extended to us by the Committee and its staff.

Sincerely,

RICHARD S. WILBUR, M.D.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation is committed to the principle that its citizens are entitled to access to adequate medical acre. Although during the past decade we have made great progress toward guaranteeing this right, today many Americans still are beset with enormous health problems—reflected in high levels of premature deaths, infant mortality, and the prevalence of disease and disability. Despite the medical profession's brilliant advances in the knowledge and practice of medicine, millions of Americans face inadequate medical care or none at all.

Mr. Chairman, the key to achieving a high level of health and well-being for our citizens is the expansion of the Nation's health manpower and training facilities. Only through a major expansion effort can we insure the availability of physician services. Without this assurance any further Federal guarantee of payment of such services is meaningless.

The imbalance between the demand for health-care services and the capacity of health-care system to respond has increased tremendously in the past 10 years. The national increase in U.S.-trained physicians has barely kept pace with population growth. The result is a national shortage of physicians that now approaches 50,000. The shortage of dentists is about 30,000; of allied health personnel, more than 250,000.

Over the past decade, most of this Nation's medical schools have attempted to expand as rapidly as they could to provide additional physicians. Federal aid was made available by Congress, but it simply has not been sufficient to overcome the crippling problems of inadequate classroom space and restricted operating budgets. As a result, U.S. medical schools have been brought to the brink of financial chaos. The financial crisis that long has been predicted has arrived at last—and with a vengeance. All across the country, medical schools are finding themselves in a severe financial situation. In the past year alone, 61 of the Nation's 102 medical schools received special governmental grants to offset financial distress. In 32 of these instances, the financial problems were so serious that the continued operation or accreditation of the schools was threatened. Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine in Baltimore is a case in point. As you know, it is one of the oldest, most prestigious, and apparently most wealthy medical schools in the country. Yet, last year the State of Maryland had to extend $800,000 of emergency financial aid, just to enable Hopkins to survive.

Mr. Chairman, this health manpower legislation is designed to treat the academic institutions involved in medical education as the national resources that they truly are, thus alleviating this country's physician shortage by 1978.

H.R. 8629 is the product of intense work by the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment. The subcommittee held extensive hearings exploring a wide variety of problems in the health manpower field. We did not limit our efforts to Washington. The subcommittee conducted hearings at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., and in Topeka, Kans. Many members of the subcommittee visited medical schools across the United States to inquire of their needs, capabilities, and receive their advice. The subcommittee was impressed by the progress that has been made; however, much remains to be done. Passage of this legislation will insure further progress critical to the health of our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I shall now summarize the major facets of this legislation.

CAPITATION GRANTS

One of the major provisions of the bill is a new program of capitation grants for schools of the health professions. Many schools, particularly schools of medicine and dentistry, are having difficulty meeting their expenses, and some are questioning whether they can remain in operation.

The subcommittee worked long and hard over many formulas in its attempt to develop a capitation grant that would provide increased, but reasonable and appropriate, Federal assistance to schools of the respective disciplines. The capitation levels proposed in the bill are designed to provide dependable and stable fiscal resources for the educational programs of these institutions, to alleviate the serious financial distress of many of these schools, and at the same time to

prevent inequitable windfalls for schools that are more fortunately situated. Because of the critical importance of increasing the numbers of physicians and dentists as rapidly as possible, the subcommittee included in the formula special incentives for graduate and expanded enrollments in schools of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry.

The capitation levels proposed in this bill represent significant increases in the amount of Federal assistance the schools are now receiving. In order to receive capitation grants the schools would be required to increase their first-year enrollments by 5 percent or 10 students, whichever is the greater, over their first-year admissions in the fall of 1970. The subcommittee expects that with the substantial sums available to the schools even greater increases can be made.

CONSTRUCTION

One of the aims of this legislation is to make teaching space available as rapidly as possible for expanding enrollments and new schools. The appropriations for construction have been limited; the schools have had difficulty in raising the matching moneys. This bill would extend the present construction grant program and would provide a much needed increase in the Federal share of the costs of construction. It would add new authority for loan guarantees and interest subsidies recommended by the administration for assistance to private nonprofit schools of the health professions with approved construction projects. Appropriation authorizations for the grant program, if fully funded, together with the proposed new financing mechanisms, could substantially accelerate the availability of teaching space to train the personnel now and in years to come.

STUDENT AID

The student aid amendments proposed in this bill are designed to assist increasing numbers of students to undertake and complete training in the health professions and to assure that lack of financial means on the part of their families will not prevent capable young people from entering these professions.

SCHOLARSHIPS

In view of rising costs of professional education, the maximum scholarship to a student in any year would be raised. Amendments to the scholarship provisions are intended to direct scholarship funds to schools in proportion to their numbers of needy students and to students having the greatest financial need.

LOANS

The bill also continues the present health professions student loan program and raises the maximum amount a student could borrow in any year.

One of the most significant amendments is the new loan repayment authority designed to encourage physicians, dentists, and other health professionals to practice in areas where they are most needed. These amendments would allow cancellation of 75 percent—or $15,000, whichever is lesser—of health professions student loans, and any other professional education loan, for 3 years of service in a shortage area.

This amendment is one of several provisions of this bill directed toward the improvement in distribution by area or specialty of health professions personnel.

HEALTH MANPOWER EDUCATION INITIATIVE AWARDS

Greater efforts must be made to relate health manpower education more directly to the delivery of health services, to make the best use of existing as well as new manpower training resources, and to improve the distribution of training opportunities.

At the present time there is no effective way to target support for health manpower training activities in areas of greatest need and across disciplinary lines. The proposed authority for the Health Manpower Education Initiative Awards has great potential for improving the distribution, supply, utilization and efficiency of health personnel. It offers great opportunity for relating health manpower training more directly to the changing patterns of health care. Of particular promise is the establishment of a series of area health education centers related to the health manpower needs of the service area in which they are located.

FAMILY MEDICINE

More family doctors must be trained. Many communities today are without physicians, and still more are faced with the possibility of not having a doctor.

The bill would authorize a new program of grants to support training activities in family medicine, including the establishment and expansion of approved residency programs in family practice.

Amendments to the special project authority would also authorize preceptorships for undergraduate medical students to receive part of their training under a preceptor in family medicine. This will enable medical students to obtain firsthand experience in primary-care specialties in a community and provide a counterbalance to prevailing influences which now attract students to other specialties. If appropriate emphasis is to be given to family medicine, increased opportunities must be provided for training not only for medical students and residents but also for continuing education for practicing physicians.

FACULTY

To enable health professions personnel to acquire or enhance their teaching skills, a new program for special grants for training programs and fellowships is authorized. These grants would allow potential faculty members, and some who already have faculty appointments, to keep up with advances in teaching techniques and methods which could contribute to the more effective teaching of significantly increased enrollments in their schools.

STARTUP GRANTS

One of the primary goals of the legislation before us today is to increase as rapidly as possible the number of practicing physicians and dentists.

The bill contains new authority for startup grants to assist certain new schools in meeting their initial costs of operation. Special consideration will be given to applications for new schools which, because of the use made of existing facilities—including Federal medical or dental facilities such as Public Health Hospitals and Veterans' Administration Hospitals—will be able to accelerate the date on which they begin their teaching programs, especially those which can begin instruction with larger entering classes.

SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS

Special project assistance complements the capitation grant assistance to schools of the health professions to meet particular needs of the individual institution and to encourage participation in special efforts which are of particular importance in achieving national health manpower goals and objectives.

The bill would continue the authority to assist these schools through special projects, continuing the present purposes with new emphases and several important additions.

Under this authority, schools could be assisted to expand enrollments, shorten their curriculums, and establish or expand special programs of education. Particular emphasis is given to curriculum components emphasizing aspects of drug use and abuse, the science of nutrition, or establishment or expansion of programs for training in family medicine, as well as projects for cooperative interdisciplinary training for the use of the team approach to the delivery of health services.

The new purposes also include assistance in projects to identify persons whose background and interest make it reasonable to assume that they will engage in the practice of their professions in rural or other areas having severe shortages, and to encourage them to undertake training in the health professions. To maintain their interest and to enhance their preparation for service in such areas, a companion authority will allow traineeships for these medical students to serve under preceptors in rural communities or other shortage areas.

The capitation grant levels proposed in the bill should go far in alleviating the financial distress of the health professions schools. However, we recognize that some schools may need additional emergency assistance. Therefore, the bill provides separate authority for financial distress grants which would be made on special terms and conditions directed toward the identification of the factors that have led to the financial difficulties and the determination of appropriate means for remedying them.

Mr. Chairman, the provisions of the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971, if enacted and implemented at the recommended appropriation levels, would within this decade drastically reduce the shortages of physicians and other critically needed health professionals and effect essential changes in the distribution of health services.

Decisions made today can markedly improve the health of our Nation tomorrow and in the years ahead.

I strongly urge the enactment of this important legislation.

For the first time, I think, this legislation sets the goal of closing the shortage in health personnel in the Nation.

This is the most significant step this Congress will have taken in the whole health field, I think, in its entire history.

I hope that the House will overwhelmingly support this bill, and I would recommend it to you most highly.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Florida, his subcommittee, and the full committee, for their diligent work on this bill. It is a badly needed measure, as I know, due to the fact that a great many of our medical and other professional health schools are in poor shape, and this will provide a means of assistance which they can depend upon, and I am sure that we shall continue this aid in the future, and I know that as we consider the results of the bill that are obtained that it will be improved upon later.

But I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) the basis upon which you determine the amount of money for students in the various categories.

Of course, what I have reference to is where you have, say, $800 for particular students such as those in optometry, and of course I know they would like to know why they did not get $1,500, such as the veterinarian students receive, or $2,500, the minimum set for medical students.

Mr. ROGERS. I will be glad to tell the gentleman from Texas that we went into this very, very carefully. We compared what the schools are presently getting, what the actual costs are, and also what the need for that particular profession in the whole medical field was. In other words, how many do we need to produce? What is the current demand? What would be the projected demand? What are the costs? And what are the schools presently getting from the Federal Government?

These factors were the ones that were involved in determining the figures.

Now, it is true, of course, that everyone would like to have more, naturally.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I understand that.

Mr. ROGERS. I am sure the gentleman from Texas, being a member of the Committee on Appropriations, understands that.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I am well aware of that.

Mr. ROGERS. But I am also confident that all of the schools are agreed that they have all been treated fairly, and I know of no one who is not favorable to the bill.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. In other words, you based your determination as to the demand in a particular field as well as the type of education required, and the incentive needed to increase the numbers that are needed in that field. Is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman from Texas is correct.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. And through your hearings you are confident that this is an equitable allocation for each of the professions?

Mr. ROGERS. I think it is a correct and equitable one.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, it is well known that the United States today faces a crisis in the field of health care delivery. Of particular importance is the critical shortage in health manpower. Today's demand for health services and for health manpower far exceeds the existing supply in our Nation. It is of vital importance that we take steps to ease the shortage by insuring that more students will be graduated from all our health professions institutions. I submit that if passed, H.R. 8629, the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971, will serve this purpose.

H.R. 8629 proposes to continue for 3 years, with major modifications, the health professions educational assistance programs. It is designed to alleviate our critical health manpower shortages in terms of: First, the need for increases in total numbers; second, the need for altering the distribution of the various types of skills; third, the need to alleviate geographical maldistribution; and fourth, the need to broaden opportunities for larger segements of our population to obtain adequate health services.

In attempting to address these problems, H.R. 8629 provides for various types of Federal financial assistance to support the training of different kinds of professional health manpower—other than nursing, which is covered in H.R. 8630, the Nurse Training Act of 1971. It is divided into two titles. The first deals with the major revisions made by the subcommittee in the health professions educational assistance programs, while the second makes minor technical changes. My remarks will be directed to a discussion of title I.

The Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act contains numerous provisions to ease the financial difficulties faced by educational institutions as well as by interested students. The first section deals with project grants to educational institutions for training, traineeships, and fellowships for health professions training personnel in the fields of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, podiatry, optometry, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine. A separate provision included under project grants is directed at increasing health personnel in the field of family medicine. I am pleased to note that this section eliminates the objections raised by the administration to the Family Medicine Act passed at the end of the last Congress. Family physicians are needed in increasing numbers today and yet we find that more and more medical students choose to specialize in other fields. It is my hope that this portion of H.R. 8629 will make the practice of family medicine more attractive to future medical students.

A second section provides grants and loan guarantees for construction, with which institutions may construct new facilities, replace and rehabilitate existing facilities, acquire existing buildings—which is a new provision—and may establish interim teaching facilities for up to 10 years. The percentage of Federal grants for such construction has been raised from 66⅔ to 75 percent for new facilities and for construction in unusual circumstances, that is for a school located in geographical areas of the United States where a critial shortage of health manpower exists. For other construction, the Federal Governments' share has been increased from 50 to 67 percent.

This section also provides for interest subsidies and loan guarantees in instances in which such loans would not otherwise be available at reasonable terms and conditions.

Another section of the bill increases the limit on student loans to $3,500—it was previously $2,500. It further adds a provision for the forgiveness of a loan in two instances: first, for those willing to practice in areas of critical shortage: and second, for those who fail to complete their schooling and are in exceptionally needy circumstances.

Section four includes grants to improve the quality of educational institutions. Through a system of capitation grants, it is hoped that the institutions training health personnel will be able to increase their enrollment levels and will be able to begin innovative projects, improve their facilities and strengthen their training personnel. These grants will also assist schools which are in financial straits in attempting to maintain quality standards.

In the past, because of the limited funds available under this provision, most schools have had to use such funds for meeting their financial commitments. By increasing the amounts available under this section, it is hoped that more innovative projects and improvements will be possible.

The capitation grants have been allocated according to the type of institution by which it will be used. For schools of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry, $2,500 is provided for each full-time first-, second-, and third-year student, $1,000 is provided for each student representing an increase in enrollment, and $4,000 is provided per graduate. For schools of medicine with a 2-year course of study, these same amounts apply, except the $4,000 per graduate.

Veterinary schools would receive $1,500 per full-time student. Schools of optometry, pharmacy, and podiatry would receive $800 per full-time student.

A fifth section of the bill under consideration is intended to encourage the establishment of new schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy. It requires that such a school have 23 students during its first year of operation and would provide $7,500 per full-time student in the first year of operation, $5,000 per full-time student in the second year of operation, and $2,500 per full-time student in the third year of operation.

In order to improve the distribution, supply, quality, utilization, and efficiency of health personnel and of the health services delivery system, a sixth section authorizes funds for a new program entitled "The health manpower education initiative awards." It would do so by training and retraining personnel in

shortage areas, by providing training programs leading to the more efficient use of personnel by establishing area health education centers and other units to assist in the training of health personnel, and by training personnel in the use of the team approach.

The next section provides for scholarship grants to full-time students in good standing, in an amount not to exceed $3,500 per year per student. A formula has been established which provides each school with $3,000 multiplied by one-tenth of the number of students in fiscal year 1972. In fiscal years 1973 and 1974, $3,000 would be provided for each full-time, low-income student. For fiscal years 1975 through 1977, amounts are provided as necessary to continue scholarships made before 1974.

A final section would create a national advisory council on health professions education to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the preparation of regulations. Each year, a report is to be submitted to Congress. The council would be made up of the Secretary and 20 members, four from the general public and two from full-time students.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following:

HEALTH MANPOWER LEGISLATION

I. *Project grants* for training, traineeships, and fellowships for health professions training personnel

A. Authorization

1. FY 1972—$10 million
2. FY 1973—$15 million
3. FY 1974—$20 million

B. Fields included: medical, dental, osteopathic, podiatric, optometric, pharmaceutical or vetarinary medicine

C. Provides grants for training, traineeships, and fellowships in family medicine

1. Authorization

a. FY 1972—$25 million
b. FY 1973—$35 million
c. FY 1974—$40 million

2. to plan, develop and operate a professional training program

3. to provide financial assistance to medical students

II. *Grants & Loan Guarantees* for construction

A. Authorization

1. FY 1972—$225 million
2. FY 1973—$250 million
3. FY 1974—$275 million

B. Includes construction of new buildings as well as replacement & rehabilitation of existing facilities

C. For physicians, dentists, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, veterinarians, or professional public health personnel

D. Approval of application by Sec'y. of HEW rather than Surgeon General

E. Federal Share

1. for new school or new facilities—not to exceed 75% (was 66⅔%)

2. for any other construction grant—may not exceed 67% (was 50%)

3. in unusual circumstances (i.e. school located in geographical areas of U.S. w/critical shortage of health profession manpower)—may not exceed 75% (was 66⅔%)

4. in determining cost of construction, must exclude amts. rec'd. under other Federal grants & amts. of non-Federal funds required to be spent as condition of such other Federal grant

F. Definitions

1. present definition of "construction": construction of new bldgs., expansion, remodeling, replacement, renovation, major repair or alteration.

2. includes *acquisition* of existing buildings

3. includes provision for "interim facilities": teaching facilities for short-term basis (less than 10 yrs.)

G. Loan Guarantees

1. Authorization

a. FY 1972—$8 million
b. FY 1973—$16 million
c. FY 1974—$24 million

2. Authorizes Federal govt. to make loan guarantees for non-Federal loans for construction; not to exceed 90% of construction costs

3. provides for interest subsidy up to 3%

4. application approved only if loan not available on reasonable terms & conditions w/out guarantee

5. provides for recovery of loan

6. loan guarantee & interest subsidy fund to be established at Treasury w/no fiscal yr. limitation

III. *Student loans*

A. Authorization

1. FY 1972—$40 million
2. FY 1973—$45 milion
3. FY 1974—$50 million

B. $3,500 per student for a loan fund

C. Forgiveness provision (up to $15,000 or 75%) for those willing to practice in areas of critical shortage

D. Repayment of loan by HEW if student failed to complete studies & is in exceptionally needy circumstance & does not resume such studies within 2 years

IV. *Grants to improve quality* of schools

A. Authorization

1. for institutional grants

a. FY 1972—$245 million
b. FY 1973—$284 million
c. FY 1974—$343 million

2. for payments under grants & contracts

a. FY 1972—$118 million
b. FY 1973—$138 million
c. FY 1974—$156 million

B. Capitation grants

1. Medical, osteopathy & dentistry schools

a. $2,500/full-time student; 1st, 2nd, & 3rd year student

b. $1,000/full-time student representing increase in enrollment

c. $4,000/graduate

2. Schools of medicine w/2 year course of study

a. $2,500/full-time student

b. $1,000/full-time student representing an increase in enrollment

3. Veterinary schools

a. $1,500/full-time student

4. Optometry, pharmacy, podiatry schools

a. $800/full-time student

C. Enrollment Increase

1. required to increase by at least 5%, or by 10 students (was by at least 2½ or by 5 students)

D. Special project grants

1. includes schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, & veterinary medicine

2. grants for innovative projects, for improvement of schools, to strengthen training personnel

3. provisions for schools in financial straits to meet operational costs required to maintain quality education.

V. *Grants for new schools*

A. Authorization

1. FY 1972—$10 million
2. FY 1973—$10 million
3. FY 1974—$10 million

B. To meet cost of operation during 1st 3 years during which school is in operation.

C. School must have more than 23 students in 1st year.

D. Formula:

1. 1st academic year—$7,500 X number of full-time students.

2. 2nd academic year—$5,000 X number of full-time students.

3. 3rd academic year—$2,500 X number of full-time students.

VI. *Health Manpower Education Initiative Awards.*

A. Authorization.

1. FY 1972—$45 million.
2. FY 1973—$90 million.
3. FY 1974—$135 million.

B. grants & contracts to improve distribution, supply, quality, utilization & efficiency of health personnel & health services delivery system.

C. not more than 10% or $5 million to be used for grants.

VII. *Scholarship Grants.*

A. Authorization (HEW estimate).

1. FY 1972—$20 million.
2. FY 1973—$31 million.
3. FY 1974—$43 million.

B. Formula.

1. FY 1972: $3,000 X 1/10th of no. of students.

2. FY 1973–74: $3,000 X full-time low-income students.

3. FY 1975–FY 1977—amounts necessary to continue scholarships made before 1974.

C. Requirements.

1. students enrolled on full-time basis & in good standing.

2. only individuals enrolled & in good standing as full-time students who initially rec'd. scholarship awards out of such grants.

3. not to exceed $3,500 per year per student.

VIII. *National Advisory Council* on Health Professions Education.

A. Advise Secretary on preparation of regulations.

B. Report to be submitted to Congress.

C. To be made up of Secretary (serving as Chairman) and 20 members, at least 4 from general public and 2 from full-time students.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. SHOUP), a member of the committee.

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 8629, Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971, as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I believe this legislation to be critically needed and I strongly favor its passage.

The United States is currently in the midst of a health care crisis. Health costs are spiraling. Demands for health services increase rapidly. Medical manpower is in short supply and poorly distributed throughout the Nation. When combined, these factors prevent the efficient and effective delivery of health care to large segments of our population—in particular, the residents of our rural communities and of our inner city neighborhoods.

I believe many of the provisions proposed in the legislation we are considering today are aimed at alleviating these serious obstacles confronting our Nation's health care system. H.R. 8629 is designed to improve the supply and distribution of this country's health professionals and to aid our system of health professions education.

Briefly, the bill would extend and expand the existing program of construction costs for new school construction projects, for major expansions of existing schools, and for schools in unusual circumstances such as a school located in a health manpower shortage area would be increased to 75 percent. In addition, the legislation would authorize a new program of loan guarantees and interest subsidies to assist nonprofit private health professions schools to construct teaching facilities.

The existing institutional—formula—grant program would be replaced with a new program of capitation grants based

on student enrollment. This is significant change in traditional pattern of Federal support to health professions schools. As the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce put it:

The capitation levels proposed in this bill are designed to significantly alleviate the financial distress of those schools which are in serious financial straits. . . . The capitation grants are designed to provide a dependable support base for the educational programs of the health professions schools without having to go through the "back door" of research to support education.

H.R. 8629, if enacted, would significantly amend the current special project grant program to improve, for example, the curriculums of the health professions schools, to encourage the use of the team approach to the delivery of health services, and to develop new types of health personnel such as the physicians' assistant.

The bill would authorize a particularly innovative program known as health manpower initiative awards which are designed to provide targeted support for health manpower training activities that will improve the supply and distribution of health personnel.

The student aid amendments contained in H.R. 8629 are designed to enable increasing numbers of students to undertake and complete health professions education. The provisions proposed in both the student loan program and the scholarship program represent the best efforts of the Members of this body to assure that lack of financial means will not prevent capable young people from entering the health professions.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot reiterate too strongly the need for this legislation. According to recent statistics published by the American Medical Association, there are 134 counties across the United States without a private practicing physician. It saddens me to say that six of those counties, with a total population of more than 10,000, are located in the State of Montana.

In addition, the AMA's figures clearly show the uneven distribution of physicians in the United States. About 53 percent of the Nation's doctors are located in our highly populated urban areas and serve the needs of about 39 percent of the civilian population. In sharp contrast, only 4 percent of the doctors are practicing in rural areas to serve 10.6 percent of the population.

I believe that a number of provisions proposed in H.R. 8629 will provide incentives to young doctors and other health professionals to practice in these shortage areas. The loan cancellation provisions contained in H.R. 8629 provide an excellent example of one such program designed to provide greater incentives to health professionals to practice in areas where they are most needed. Under these provisions, if a physician agrees to practice in a designated shortage area for at least 3 years he may have 75 percent or $15,000—whichever is less—of his outstanding educational loan and interest repaid by the Federal Government upon completion of such service.

Perhaps the most serious aspect of the doctor shortage is the continuing decline of the supply of general practitioners. The traditional country doctor so much a part of rural life is disappearing rapidly. He is not being replaced. Between 1963 and 1969, the percentage of practicing GP's fell more than 20 percent. My own State lost 17 percent of its general practitioners during that period. Many experts believe that the shortage of physicians who provide primary health care is reaching critical proportions.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation we are considering today aims to deal with these serious problems. H.R. 8629 is a vitally needed, important piece of legislation. I strongly favor its passage.

Thank you.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SCHMITZ).

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Chairman, the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN) commented that we ought to go all the way since we have embarked upon this program. I suppose there are many who would agree with him. But, I would like to ask all of you a question—which way are we going?

This bill does help take us all the way. As I have stated in the closing statements of my minority report, H.R. 8629 is "in the spirit of the time." Socialized medicine requires a socialized medical corps. This bill is a massive move toward such a goal.

If you want socialized medicine—if you want to go all the way in that direction, then vote for this bill—it will do it. I am intending to vote against it. I am going to ask for a rollcall vote and be recorded in opposition.

HEW Secretary Richardson testified before our subcommittee regarding the subject matter of this bill. I asked a question, "Mr Secretary, has our party—referring to the Republican Party—become like the British Conservative Party has become—a party which believes that its role as the more conservative of the two major parties is to run socialism more efficiently than the other party?"

Dr. Egeberg who was with him answered my rhetorical question saying in effect, "Oh, yes, yes, I would agree with that."

That is the point I am making here. This is what is happening.

We have stopped fighting socialism and now only argue about the form it will take.

I am opposed to this bill on several grounds. I am not offering any amendments today, although I did offer some amendments in committee some of which were accepted while some were not. But I am of the opinion that you cannot amend a bad bill. My reasons for feeling thus are as follows: First of all, turning to page 4 of the committee report, it points out that this legislation proposes to continue a present program for 3 years—should we call it a 3-year plan?—with major modifications. And it is the "major modifications" to which I would direct your attention. The major "modification" must be the $2.8 billion expenditure over 3 years. Even the proponents of this bill admit that this is no small amount. It is all justified on the grounds of a shortage of doctors. As a member of the subcommittee, I sat through most of the testimony and heard much that seemed to raise serious doubt as to the validity of the basis of the presumed "doctor shortage" problem. For example: In 1963, the ratio of physicians to patients in the United States was 140 per 100,000 and in 1970 had risen to 156 per 100,000.

Dr. Endicott, of HEW, pointed out that by 1985, if the present trends continue, without this bill there would be 190 physicians per 100,000 population.

As a matter of fact, it was pointed out in the committee that the doctor population was growing at the rate of 12 percent a year whereas the population in general was growing at the rate of 3 percent a year.

If there is a shortage, it is either temporary, in which case this legislation would serve as an "overkill," or it is a shortage in certain areas, and it is a matter of geographic distribution rather than an overall doctor shortage. Admittedly, the bill tries to get to this latter problem. The other major reason for my opposition to this bill pertains to what might best be described as the "implied," and even at times "explicit" reverse discrimination in the bill.

On page 38 of the bill the following language appears:

(b) The amount of the grant under subsection (a) to each such school for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, shall be equal to $3,000 multiplied by one-tenth of the number of full-time students of such school and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and the next fiscal year shall be equal to $3,000 multiplied by the number of full-time students of such school who are from low-income backgrounds as determined under regulations of the Secretary.

What that line 19 says is that if the school has all of its students from low-income backgrounds—"low-income" as determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is a little too much bureaucratic leeway for me—they can get $3,000 for every student they have enrolled. That means medical schools are herein given a financial incentive to discriminate. That is reverse discrimination—pure and simple. Then, again, turning to page 30 of the bill you will see that a school will get a special grant if they, as shown on line 11—

(9) establish and operate projects designed to increase admissions to and enrollment in such schools of qualified individuals from minority or low-income groups;

I am opposed to keeping someone out of college, any college, because he is a member of a minority group. But I feel it is just as insulting, and far worse for overall race relations, if you discriminate in favor of a minority member over a nonminority member who is refused admission to a medical school, which he or she would have gotten into except for this program of going out and actually seeking minority members so that the schools will get the money. I do not think it does race relations in this country any good to have this kind of reverse race discrimination. We have been phony on this in the past. We have not been treating people equally. We have been engaged, not only in this field, but in other fields of importance, in reverse discrimination.

If you have a copy of the bill, I refer

you to page 30, section (8), starting at line 3, which covers the area, for example, of ghetto shortages, because these people will get a special grant as defined by the bill to bring in students—

Whose background and interests make it reasonable to assume that they will engage in the practice of their health profession in rural or other areas having a severe shortage of personnel in such health profession.

You cannot bring up the argument that there is a shortage in minority areas. That is covered in the previous section. It is wrong to go out and make a speciality of the minority groups and engage in reverse discrimination as the bill provides.

For those two reasons I oppose the bill and I ask for a "No" vote. The facts as to a doctor shortage are disputable by evidence submitted to our committee and also noted by the National Advisory Commission on Health and Manpower in November 1967, which reported that the supply of physicians will, in the 1965–75 decade, run ahead of the population increase by at least 4 to 5 percent.

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

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Chairman, at this point I submit my minority views as printed in the committee report:

MINORITY VIEWS OF MR. SCHMITZ—SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT OF THE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE—TO THE BILL, H.R. 8629, THE COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH MANPOWER TRAINING ACT OF 1971

H.R. 8629, the proposed "Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971," constitutes a quantum escalation in the trend toward nationalization and socialization of medicine and health services in the United States. For advocates of such a trend the bill represents salutary progress—for opponents it signifies another, and serious, step into the kind of self-induced disaster which has brought countries as disparate as Great Britain and Uruguay to their knees.

From whichever perspective the proposed legislation is presently viewed, however, it stands in great need of more thoughtful and incisive examination than has so far been afforded it. Considerations of several specific and general questions hereinafter treated have been the objects of an all too superficial perusal.

H.R. 8629—the substance of it as contained in Title I, i.e. Sections 101–110—provides, in essence, a crash program for training of medical personnel and for construction of facilities for such training.

* * * * *

One of the basic assumptions upon which this program is predicated is the contention that there exists a shortage of doctors—as high as 50,000 claims Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Dr. Roger Egeberg. A closer examination reveals that such a flat statement does not adequately or correctly reflect the facts.

For example, one argument for a crash program maintains that many more medical personnel are needed to offset what has been referred to as the "dramatic" increase in population. What is little noted, however, is that while the 1970 census revealed a "plateauing" of the population increase—approximately 3 percent—the actual percentage increase in doctors was some 12 percent.

Furthermore, in the Health Manpower hearings before the Subcommittee on Health and Environment of April 29, 1971, testimony by HEW officials revealed that in 1963 the ratio of physicians to patients in the United States was 140 per 100,000. Moreover, the goal at that time was to maintain that level. It turns out that in 1970 the ratio had risen to 156 per 100,000 and many health officials are calling this "inadequate."

It would seem that we are faced with a situation in which even such increases as a 16 figure jump in the ratio in just 7 years is termed unsatisfactory—that is to say, even if the numbers required are "over-projected," then exceeded, there are some who merely revise the estimated requirements automatically upward. This situation raises the prospect that physicians may be overadequate—much as aerospace engineers in many parts of the country are. Given the amount of time, money and effort expended in the training of a physician, this would surely be a tragedy.

It would seem quite possible, on the other hand, to meet short-term shortages or inadequacies in distribution with foreign doctors. The May 24, 1971, issue of Time magazine, as a matter of fact, reports that "U.S. hospitals are relying on a foreign 'brain gain' to get by: non-Americans," Time says, "now hold about a fourth of the Nation's internships and residencies."

Parenthetically, the rise in medical costs attributed to the scarcity of doctors may therefore be less due to a doctor shortage than to an over-supply of money from sources much like the bill under consideration.

One HEW spokesman at the April 29 hearings admitted that "we have a lot of difficulty in establishing what number of physicians we really want by 1980."

Another testified that "to keep up with what we presently have we could turn out less than we are turning out now." Additionally, it was revealed that the system presently devised contains a built-in escalation (Dr. Endicott: ". . . we have already built this kind of escalation into the system.") which will increase the pre-100,000 ratio to 166.7 by just 1976. The ratio will have jumped 16 from 1963 to 1970 and almost 11 from 1970 to 1976. Dr. Endicott of HEW observes that "on the present trend lines we could reach a level of approximately 190 physicians per 100,000 by 1985."

It must be kept in mind, of course, that one of the most appetizing inducements to the increase in the number of patients is the increased availability of "free" medical care. Socialized medicine has as one of its prime traits the ability to produce hypochondriacs.

But as a study done for the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress by Glenn R. Markus (July 2, 1968) points out: "Despite their frequent use, physician-population ratios are usually thought of, even by the authors who use them, as inadequate indicators of the relationship of the physician manpower pool to the population served by the pool."

Dealing with this same question, the National Advisory Commission on Health Manpower, in a November, 1967, Report, employed what they consider the more accurate "Type of Service Shortage" approach and concluded that a shortage does indeed exist, but that none of the reasons for the existence of the shortage (in health care) appear to be related to shortages in doctors. Instead, the Commission sees as the problem increasing medical specialization, non-medical responsibilities of physicians, increasing utilization of hospital services and the general state of health care delivery. The report also notes that the supply of physicians will, in the 1965–1975 decade, run ahead of population increase by at least 4–5 percent.

Another index of delivered health care is the "physician visits" measure. However, with improved treatment techniques (such as drug therapies), the need for the patient to return to the doctor's office at frequent intervals is diminished. Thus, the number of visits may decline while the quality of the care actually goes up.

In addition to these considerations, there is the current advent of programs (such as the one at the University of Colorado medical school) devised to train "paramedics"—doctors' assistants who assume many of the more routine and timeconsuming of the physicians' chores. This development will ease the case load of doctors everywhere—but most especially in rural areas where such help is needed. Also pointing to the situation's ability to resolve itself without massive, "crash" governmental intervention is the changing attitudes of many young medical school graduates. Time (May 24, 1971) quotes Dr. David Tormey of the University of Vermont medical school to the effect that more graduates are seeking jobs in public health and in many less lucrative areas. In proposing an act to bribe people into less *financially* rewarding sections of the country or areas of practice it would seem the natural concern and idealism of many of our young graduates is being totally overlooked. This is a resource to be exploited naturally rather than set upon with bureaucratic machinery.

With the Nation's medical schools besieged by a record number of applications from college seniors and Ph. D. candidates switching from science and engineering—11,800 out of 26,000 were accepted and at least half of the rejects were qualified—there seems to be little reason for Government inducement of enrollment if indeed the problems of health care delivery do not lie in doctor shortages.

There is reason to believe that H.R. 8629, with respect to these related problems, is ill-considered.

* * * * *

Quite another question with regard to H.R. 8629 is that it contains provisions fostering a "reverse discrimination."

A subsection of section 772, the $412,000,000-authorized "Special Projects Grants and Contracts" section, provides the establishment and operation of "projects designed to increase admissions to and enrollment in such schools of qualified individuals from minority or low-income groups."

Section 775, "Health Manpower Education Initiative Awards," is designed "to increase admissions to end enrollment . . ." of "qualified individuals from minority or low-income groups."

Perhaps one of the most startling provisions in the proposed Act is contained in Section 780(b). It provides grants for scholarships to schools (in FY 1974) according to the formula of $3,000 "multiplied by the number of full-time students of such school who are from low-income backgrounds. * * *"

Furthermore, "scholarships from grants" under this section "shall be awarded only to students of exceptional financial need who are from low income backgrounds. * * *"

To say that this iron-clad bias for low-income applicants will lower the standards of the particular school involved is true—but does not, of course, suggest that all low-income people are of low qualification. It simply means that a school, faced with pressing financial needs, will recruit from and admit many more people from this one category in order to get on the gravy train. This tendency will be reinforced by the realization that, even if the newly-admitted do not make it, the government will more than likely insure payment not only of the grant money but of the student's expenses, tuition, fees, etc., also through assumption of the student's loan as guaranteed in this same proposed act.

In light of the fact that the proportion of blacks in the next freshman medical school class is on the rise (from 2.8 percent in 1969 to 6 percent in 1971), this legislation represents patronizing of the worst sort. The "reverse discrimination" practices with hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money is simply unconscionable.

A more conventional, straight loan to students without discrimination would be much more advisable and understandable than this arrangement especially given the high probability that these particular students will, no

matter what their backgrounds, be more than able to repay the loan after their graduation.

HEW Secretary Elliot Richardson, in testimony before the subcommittee on April 20, 1971, presented statistics which indicated a continuing increase in health expenditures related to this act: fiscal year 1972, $421,000,000; fiscal year 1973—$560,000,000; fiscal year 1974—$676,000,000; fiscal year 1975—$785,000,000; fiscal year 1976—$895,000,000. This, he stated, was "exclusive of construction" costs (which is provided in the proposed act, are enormous). It hardly needs to be said that these projections show little indication of leveling off. From the other experiences we have encountered in our forays into socialized medicine it looks as if the taxpayers (whose public health someone had better start soliciting) are about to be saddled with another enormity, subject to the same abuses, the same breakdowns, the same incredible but predictable diseconomies and waste. It is becoming more and more difficult, as has been pointed out, to blame skyrocketing health care costs on increases in population. Population growth is getting less but these health costs continue to soar.

H.R. 8629 will lift these costs into the fiscal stratosphere. Secretary Richardson is already referring to "the total role of the Federal government in health" and to "our total national health strategy." Part of the total strategy—and part of the reason for the increasing costs—is the built-in allowance for the deployment of 126 "area health education centers around the country." Even more frightening than the costs and the impetus towards socialism which these centers represent is the kind of "education" on a uniform, national policy level these outposts of the government health bureaucracy are likely to be promulgating.

With the President presently urging a stop to the spiral in health costs, it is odd that legislation of this sort can be enthusiastically welcomed at this time. Secretary Richardson has acknowledged that he thinks it "quite clear there was a correlation between the initiation of the Medicare and Medicaid programs and the inflationary push in health care costs." There is no serious reason to believe that the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971 would differ substantially in effect from its ill-begotten predecessors.

As part of Secretary Richardson's "total Federal health role," H.R. 8629 joins the legion of legislation for socialized medicine and health programming. It is reminiscent—as are the arguments which accompany it—of the Beveridge Report made public by the Labourites in Great Britain in 1942. It covers most of the known causes of the "big Want." As Sidney Pollar remarked some years ago in *The Development of the British Economy*. ". . . the Report was also based on the assumption that a comprehensive health and rehabilitation service was to be established, its full resources available to all. . . ." We can learn from the British.

Experience must teach us, before H.R. 8629 makes its tragic entry into our corpus of laws, that a precipitous plunge (such as this one) by government into any area is likely to complicate matters simply by the fact that the bureaucracy attendant upon such a co-option of private sector initiative will tend to load down the effort in much needless red tape (due to the accountability procedures and levels of administration necessary whenever tax monies are allocated.)

The expenses of the bureaucracy siphon off funds which otherwise could be applied directly to cure and prevention of (as the Public Health Service Act says) "many crippling and killing diseases."

The "Nation's economy, welfare and security" which concern the authors of the preamble to the bill which H.R. 8629 would amend is also affected adversely as such enormous expenditures end by penalizing the taxpayer further by increasing his already staggering burden.

Involving the Federal Government in such delicate areas as health care on a massive scale can lead (as it has in other areas) to increase political pressures and maneuvering vis-a-vis such programs. This tends to further vitiate the effort. Additionally, with HEW administrators determining which individuals and institutions receive grants, there is a greater probability that a particular mind-set or set of predispositions will be sought in applicants, bringing about, conceivably, a situation in which an unwise or even tyrannical social policy might be more easily taught and implemented. Of course, with federal standardization, it would be possible for any seemingly benign and salubrious (but actually pernicious) set of priorities to gain immediate currency throughout the subsidized or controlled profession—without the beneficial and ameliorating necessity of having the individual states accept any such decisions. The control and the mistakes of the Federal Food and Drug Administration should tell us something about what we may be letting ourselves in for in this field.

It cannot be denied that Federal appropriations tend almost inexorably to be accompanied by a certain degree of Federal control. In the present instance this could prove disastrous—especially when the Secretary (section 703–c) is the final determiner of the recipients and the amounts of the grants. The Secretary is a political appointee.

Section 725 provides for a National Advisory Council on Health Professions Education which will advise the Secretary on preparations of regulations, policy matters and allow the Secretary use of members in administration of the act. The Council would have 20 members, appointed by the Secretary, with the Secretary (or his delegate) as chairman. A self-endorsing mechanism under the thumb of a political appointee directly susceptible to political pressure is not sufficient proscription for an organization engaged in so widespread a function.

The bill would also continue the present at times discriminatory accreditation prerequisites for recognition and aid. Aid would go to optometrists, podiatrists, veterinarians, public health officials, etc., but would exclude "less charmed" professions, e.g., chiropractic.

In short, there are many and varied reasons why the Comprehensive Health Manpower Act of 1971 must not be enacted into law. The inequities of the "reverse discrimination" portions of the bill can only be met by deletion of those provisions and, if anything must be substituted, replaced by a system of loans with ordinary repayment procedures and no racial or economic stipulations. But even if so odious a measure were corrected or removed, the central thrust of the measure—the impetus it gives to the trend of a nationalized, socialized health program—would remain.

H.R. 8029 is "in the Spirit of the Time". Socialized medicine requires a socialized medical corps. This bill is a massive move towards such a goal.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SATTERFIELD), a member of the committee.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and urge the House to consider it favorably.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8629 which I consider to be one of the most important bills to come before this Congress. There is at the present time a disturbing shortage in health manpower throughout this country not only in terms of numbers but with regard to distribution of health skills.

H.R. 8629 has as an objective, through the employment of incentives, increasing the total number of medical health professionals; altering the distribution of medical skills; correcting geographic mal-distribution and broadening the opportunity for a larger cross section of the total population to obtain adequate health services.

The shortage in physicians is currently estimated to be 50,000. H.R. 8629 is intended to provide the mechanism for closing by 1978 the gap between those available and those needed and to provide a national physician-population ratio which will be equal to the highest ratio now existing in the geographic division embracing the Middle Atlantic States.

Under this measure, the total number of practicing physicians would be increased from the current level of 332,000 to 436,000 by 1980. In fact, this measure will produce 17,000 more physicians by 1980 than are projected under existing law. Furthermore, by that date this bill will make possible an additional increase of 1,380 dentists, 120 optometrists, 280 pharmacists, 80 podiatrists, and 190 veterinarians.

Although these last figures may seem small, they represent additions to an already growing output. To more forcefully present the impact of this effort, permit me to point out that the graduating classes in optometry and podiatry in 1980 of 1,040 and 530, respectively, will represent a 100-percent increase over the size of their respective 1971 graduating classes.

The bill will provide $750 million over the next 3 years on matching funds by way of construction grants for new teaching facilities and for the replacement or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities. In addition, a similar sum will be available for loan guarantees, limited to 90 percent of the cost of construction along with an interest subsidy, not to exceed 3 percent per annum of the net effective interest on a construction loan. The total amount made available in the bill for loan interest subsidies is $48 million.

Perhaps the greatest single incentive in the bill is to be found in the fact that existing institutional grants will be replaced by capitation grants to schools training health professions in medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, optometry, pharmacy, podiatry, and veterinary medicine. This measure authorizes $872 million over the fiscal years 1972, 1973, and 1974 for capitation grants which would be made available only to such schools who increase their 1971–72 first-year enrollments by either 5 percent or 10 persons—whichever is greater. In the case of schools of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry, there is a further incentive of $1,000 for each first-year student in excess of the 5 percent or 10 new student requirement for basic capitation grant qualification.

Capitation grants provided to various disciplines by this bill were carefully considered by our subcommittee and were determined only after thorough consideration of first, the annual costs

to train an individual in each category and second, the relative need for more practitioners in each category. Recognizing that capitation grants per se might not always encourage graduation, the committee included a further monetary inducement in the bill by larger capitation grants in certain categories for those enrolled in their last year of study who graduate.

To help fill the need for more doctors this bill contains a new provision which will provide $30 million over the next 3 years to assist new medical schools not to exceed five in number to begin operation. This provision would provide grants to each approved new medical school in the amount of $7,500 times the estimated number of first year enrollments; $5,000 times the estimated number of students enrolled in the second academic year and $2,500 times the estimated number of students enrolled in the third academic year.

By way of direct aid to students in health professional training, the bill will provide a total of $135 million over the next 3 years for student loans. In essence, it continues the present student loan authority with one notable exception to repayment provisions. Any student who upon completion of this training who agrees to perform service in rural or other areas which the Secretary has determined have a shortage of medical manpower, may receive in exchange forgiveness of repayment of a part of his student loan up to 50 percent.

Furthermore the bill will make available a total of $94 million over the next 3 years for student scholarships with one notable substantive change. After fiscal year 1972, the formula now employed for computing grants to a health profession school will be changed from mutiplying $3,000 times one-tenth of the number of full-time students enrolled to multiplying $3,000 times the number of needy full-time students from a low-income background.

In addition to providing $412 million over the next 3 years to continue and strengthen current special project grant programs, the bill will provide $45 million to health professions schools for advanced training of individuals to enable them to teach or to improve their teaching skills in their respective professions. Furthermore, the bill will provide $100 million for training in specific areas where the shortage is particularly acute in family medicine.

Finally, the bill would provide $270 million over the next 3 years in health manpower education incentive awards designed to improve the targeting of health delivery. Ten percent of this money, but not less than $5 million annually, will be allocated to the support of special projects to encourage the enrollment of students who are likely to practice in rural areas or in other areas where shortage of health professional personnel is most acute, including encouragement of students from minority and low-income groups.

Mr. Chairman, no single goal is more important to the American people than to assure that they will have available the necessary health care personnel in the future. This bill will improve that prospect and I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I want to commend the chairman, Mr. STAGGERS, and the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

I also wish to make comment on the excellent support by all the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, in pushing forward this legislation which will help to cut the gap with respect to doctors and ultimately nurses.

Mr. Chairman, the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971 which we are considering today goes far to meet the critical health manpower needs of our Nation. We are faced with a current health manpower shortage of over 500,000. Our physician shortage is 50,000. The Soviet Union has 210 physicians per 100,000 population, while the United States has only 149 physicians per 100,000 persons. Over 130 counties in the United States have no private medical doctors at all. Since 1964, two dental schools have closed because of pressing financial need, and many of our schools of medicine and podiatric medicine have indicated that they, too, face closure unless remedial action is taken. In a country as affluent as ours, with a gross national product of over a trillion dollars, and standards of living which are among the highest in the world, these figures are disgraceful.

The Health Manpower Act of 1968 expired yesterday, and it is imperative that we enact H.R. 8629. This legislation authorizes a new program of project grants for advanced training to health professions schools, $750 million in construction grants, loan guarantees, a program of student loans with special forgiveness clauses, and capitation and special projects grants, all with an eye toward closing the gap between shortage and need. The bill also contains a program of incentives to those students specializing in family medicine, and the need for more general practitioners is great, as we all know.

Those of us who represent States which are predominantly rural will share my pleasure at the provision in the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act which grants loan forgiveness to doctors who will practice in rural areas. My State of Maine, with its population of just about a million, has only 1,200 practicing physicians, and many of its rural communities lack the services of a doctor altogether.

A second provision of special importance to Maine is that which would give aid to schools choosing to start new medical schools. Maine is one of five States lacking its own medical colleges, and this poses a double handicap in terms of retaining health manpower. H.R. 8629 gives special consideration to all grant applications for new schools, particularly those which assure use of existing medical facilities so as to accelerate the beginning of a teaching program.

The Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act directly affects each of us in Congress. Medical care is a national resource, and as such, must be protected and given the opportunity to grow. H.R. 8629 goes far to achieve that goal.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and I commend the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee for truly ground-breaking work in the health field.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of this bill. I thank the gentleman for his leadership, and also the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) who to my mind has conducted the hearings in an exemplary fashion. He brought before the committee all conceivable witnesses from various sectors of our national life whose testimony bears on the great need we have for doctors and for nurses.

I also want to add to this thanks to the minority leader of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN), who was very gracious to us.

This is a fine bill, an historic bill, but most importantly the right bill if the Nation's health is the measure. I hope it will receive the support of the House.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ROY), a member of the committee.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of this bill, and I should like to add my words of praise for Chairman STAGGERS and subcommittee chairman ROGERS.

I should also like to commend the other Members for the great deal of time and great deal of insight they have shown with regard to this bill. I respectfully wish to include those from both sides of the aisle.

The Congress is well aware that this country is today facing a health care crisis of major proportions. We are all familiar with the components of that crisis—rapidly increasing costs that the individual and Nation cannot afford; unavailability of care in our rural areas, in our innercities, and, now, even in some of our affluent suburbs.

Yes, the Congress is aware of the national health care crisis. This awareness is reflected in the many solutions to this crisis which have been proposed. The Nixon administration has proposed six points. The labor movement and the Committee for National Health Insurance has developed National Health Security. The health insurance industry has recommended health care. The American Hospital Association has presented Ameriplan. The American Medical Association has offered medicredit—and there are others. These proposals are all worthy of consideration. For within and among these provisions must lie a resolution to this crisis, for this is a crisis which deprives men, women, and

children of this Nation of what must be their most basic possession—health, and even life itself. This is a crisis that must be resolved.

But these proposals are incomplete, for unless we have the resources to provide care, any program which promises care rings hollow. For as the President has stated, we must balance supply and demand. We must insure that all our people receive the care they need.

We are considering here today a first and most important program to increase the supply of health care in this Nation. For health manpower is the sine qua non of health care. Without doctors, dentists, nurses, and other health workers, there is no health care.

The bill before us today is important for three major reasons: First. This bill, for the first time, recognizes the need for the support of health manpower per se; Second. This bill, for the first time, provides a rational program to eliminate the long-standing health manpower shortage in this country; and Third. This bill, for the first time, provides for priorities among the various types of health personnel. It provides that we will have not only adequate numbers of health personnel, but that we will have the right types of health personnel in order to provide care to every American.

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this point to comment on the process which produced this remarkable proposal. When I arrived in Washington in January, I was hesitant about what I might find. As a recently practicing physician, I was familiar with the medical press. And the medical press has not been kind to this body and its work. But, as a junior member of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, I have discovered my colleagues to be a knowledgeable and hardworking group of men. Led by a man of foresight and wisdom, we have spent untold hours considering the health problems of this country and the many possible ways in which additional health manpower might contribute to its resolution.

We traveled to Rochester, Minn., and to Topeka, Kans., where we talked with lay people and experts alike. We studied numerous volumes of facts, statistics, descriptions. And we considered extensively the promise of virtually every possible alternative proposal. And then, weeks later, we concurred that the bill which we have before us today, H.R. 8629, will provide the solution to our health manpower problems, and so to a large extent, the resolution of the health care crisis in tihs Nation today.

To return to the content of this proposal, the first reason this proposal is so important is that it for the first time deals adequately with health manpower, as a valuable resource to our Nation, in and of itself. For many years this Nation has provided money to our great academic health institutions for research into serious and esoteric biomedical problems. The results have been spectacular. Poliomyelitis has been banished. Hodgkin's disease is subject to therapy. Open heart surgery is an every day occurrence. Intrauterine exchange transfusions save unborn babies formerly destined to stillbirth. The list is long.

But while we have and must continue to provide our academic health institutions with the funds for research, one mission of these institutions, we have not provided adequate funds for their even more important mission, their very raison d'être, training of health personnel. As a consequence of that policy, education, the production of manpower, became a neglected stepchild, acknowedged, but not loved or nurtured. Some of our academicians became inhabitants of ivory towers, alienated from and even hostile to, the everyday delivery of health care to the people of this country. And the health crisis, reinforced by inadequate and inappropriate health manpower, festered and grew. So, it is of the utmost importance and significance that the proposal before us today firmly recognizes the primary responsibility of our academic health institutions to be that of providing this Nation with the health manpower that it needs. And this proposal rewards and supports institutions for accepting and enlarging their share of this responsibility.

The primary section that serves this purpose is the capitation grants section. This section provides $2,500 per student and $4,000 per graduate for schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, $1,500 per student for schools of veterinary medicine, and $800 per student for schools of pharmacy, podiatry, and optometry. A total of $872 million is provided for this purpose.

The second important feature of this proposal is that in addition to supporting the training of health manpower, as such, it does so to the extent that will, again for the first time, provide this Nation with the health manpower that it needs—all the health manpower it needs. In 1948, the National Health Assembly stated the need for additional physicians, dentists, nurses, and other health personnel. In 1952, the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation called attention to the health manpower shortage. In 1958, the Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Education was appointed and urged a 50-percent increase in the output of medical schools by 1975. And in 1967, the National Advisory Commission on Health Manpower cited important shortages in health manpower. But in the past we have lacked the courage of our convictions. We have studied the problem, but thereafter we have been unwilling to provide schools with adequate funds, with adequate incentives to produce the health manpower to alleviate these shortages. State and private sources have also failed to provide such funds. But the proposal which we have before us today provides the funds, provides the incentives, to eliminate those shortages. There are several sections of the bill which speak to this question.

The first provision of the bill which is important in this regard is construction funds, for without adequate facilities, increases in enrollment are impossible. Over $750 million have been provided over 3 years for this purpose, and in order that increased facilities may be developed on a short-term basis, interim facilities may now be acquired with Federal funds. The second part of the proposal which is important to increasing manpower is in the institutional grant section, where it is provided that in order to receive its institutional funds, every school must increase its enrollment by 5 percent or by 10 students. Additionally, this section provides $1,000 for every full-time student enrolled, which represents an additional increase above the 5 percent or 10 students. The third section which will significantly help increase the number of students in the medical schools is the special project grants and contracts sections which provide funds to schools which propose projects which "assist in increasing the supply of trained personnel in professions needed to meet the health needs of the Nation." And a final section which will increase significantly the number of students in health professions schools across the country is grants for new schools. This section provides additional Federal support for new schools in their first three, or most financially difficult, years.

Mr. Chairman, in anticipation of and supported by the provisions of this proposal, health education schools across the country are announcing their plans to increase vastly their enrollments. The University of Kansas School of Medicine, most familiar to me, has agreed to increase its enrollment, given adequate funding, from 125 students per year to over 200 students per year. Thereafter, the Wichita State University will be considered for the establishment of a medical school—such a school was recommended by the Carnegie Commission. This increased and new enrollment will provide vitally needed doctors for Kansas, the Midwest, and the Nation. Similar increases can be expected throughout the Nation.

The third reason why this proposal is so important is that it provides not only manpower, and adequate numbers of manpower, it provides the right types of manpower. Provisions in the bill will provide funding and support for programs which provide increased emphasis on: the training of health professions in family medicine; the training of individuals in interdisciplinary teams; the training of new roles, types, levels of health personnel, including physicians' assistants; improved distribution by geographic area; and increased enrollment by disadvantaged and minority students. Programs in all of these areas will provide this Nation with the manpower appropriate to its needs.

Many sections of the bill deal with these various goals. The question of primary and family medicine is considered by the sections on family practice, special project grants, and initiative awards. The goal of all these provisions is to assist institutions to train additional professions concerned with front-line, everyday health problems—to train men and women to assume the place traditionally occupied by the revered GP.

The second goal, that of increased use of team and group practice by health professionals, is addressed in the special project grants and initiative awards sections. These sections provide funds for programs which encourage cooperative interdisciplinary training among various health professions schools, especially training in the use of team approach. In

a day of complex technology, team approach is a more efficient and practical way of providing quality care.

A third goal, that of training new types and levels of health personnel, is encouraged in the special project grants and initiative awards sections. These new personnel will work with and extend the traditional professional services. They will provide greatly increased amounts of care efficiently and relatively inexpensively.

A fourth goal, that of encouraging increased care in scarcity areas, especially our inner-cities and rural areas, is addressed by provisions in construction grants, student loans, special project grants, and initiative awards sections. All of these provisions encourage institutions and professionals to begin to provide care to people in areas currently with inadequate health personnel.

And finally, special project grants, initiative awards, and scholarship programs all provide impetus for programs for our health professions schools to recruit and enroll students from minority and other disadvantaged backgrounds.

In conclusion, then, Mr. Chairman, our committee has fashioned a bill which emphasizes the training of manpower, which provides for the training of adequate numbers of manpower, and which provides for the training of precisely the kinds of manpower that we need.

This Nation is now faced with a health care crisis of major proportions. This bill takes cognizance of this crisis, and it represents the beginning of the end to that crisis.

Mr. Chairman, I urge approval, swiftly and without amendment, of H.R. 8629, and thereafter full funding of the provisions contained therein. Thank you.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK).

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Chairman, I want to support the bill and commend the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee especially for their recognition of the needs of the rural areas for an increase in medical practitioners in those areas.

It is a well-recognized fact that our society as a whole has an acute shortage of medical personnel. In rural States such as South Dakota this problem is compounded by maldistribution in terms of location of these too few doctors and nurses.

In 1966, for example, there were 125 doctors in patient care per 100,000 population for the country as a whole. In isolated rural areas there were 43 per 100,000. Nearly 150 counties in this country have no doctors at all and another 150 have only one. This problem is getting worse. The number of physicians serving isolated rural areas has declined about six times as fast as the population has decreased in those areas.

Further, those doctors who do serve rural areas tend to be older than their urban counterparts. In my own State of South Dakota, for example, the median age of physicians is one-physician towns is 54. For the rest of the State it is 41.

Compounding the problem created by this heightened shortage of doctors is the fact that medical needs in rural areas tend to be higher because the median age of the rural population is higher. But incomes are lower. Rural people must travel long distances to health centers. There are areas in South Dakota that are more than 50 miles from the nearest doctor. Rural citizens have nearly twice the amount of chronic illnesses as their urban brothers.

When one sees the results of high need coupled with low capacity to meet that need, the statistics become oppressive. For example, in 1964 the rate of maternal deaths per 100,000 live births in the Nation at large was 33. In rural areas it was 40.9. Simple injury is more likely to die if they have an accident in rural rather than in urban areas.

It is for all of these reasons that I support the two pieces of health manpower legislation that are before us today. Americans have a right to adequate health care and these bills will go a long way toward achieving the goal of providing an adequate number of doctors and nurses and other health personnel to meet the increasing demand. We have a shortage of personnel that can be overcome. But to do so, we must be willing to make the kind of national commitment that is found in this legislation. I know of no other statement to the American public that will more clearly indicate the priorities of this Congress than the passage of these two bills.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. GRASSO).

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to join my colleagues in support of this outstanding legislation and to urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, our national goal must be the best possible health care for all the American people.

I strongly support H.R. 8629, the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971, and urge House passage of this important legislation.

H.R. 8629 would authorize a total of $2.8 billion for a 3-year period. It serves as an extension of landmark legislation enacted by the 88th Congress establishing the first Federal program directed to meeting the critical needs for physicians, dentists, and other professional manpower. That legislation also provided assistance to schools for the construction of facilities and to students in the form of loans.

Other amendments which have followed have broadened the scope of assistance to health care needs. The legislation we are considering today would add important new authority to increase the supply and improve the distribution of critically needed practitioners of the health professions. The strength and stability of the Nation's medical institutions, so essential for the preparation of qualified medical personnel, will also be enhanced by passage of this act.

Specific highlights of this vital bill are: $100 million over the next 3 years for grants to hospitals, and public or nonprofit private health or educational institutions to encourage the practice of family medicine; $750 million over 3 years for grants to construct new teaching facilities and for the rehabilitation of existing facilities; $94 million over 3 years for scholarship grants, with emphasis on low-income students; $135 million over 3 years to provide loans to students of the health professions; $270 million over 3 years to support health manpower initiative awards to improve the distribution, supply and quality of health personnel and services; and the establishment of a National Advisory Council on Health Professions.

Mr. Chairman, there are difficult challenges and great debates ahead on the future direction of national health care programs. However, the care and treatment of illness cannot wait; neither can the education of medical personnel nor the improvement of medical facilities. The Comprehensive Manpower Training Act of 1971 will serve the important, immediate function of rendering many needed health services our people require.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to a member of the full committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I certainly rise in support of this legislation today. I, too, would like to commend the chairman of our very distinguished Committee on Interstate and Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the very distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

In this bill today are two measures I originally sponsored.

One advocates additional funds for the training of nurses. This bill was authorized back in 1968, but unfortunately was never funded. I hope Congress will see fit to fund this bill, because there is today a shortage of something like 150,000 nurses.

In 1970 I introduced the original bill dealing with the Family Practice Act. The bill was passed by the Senate by a vote of 64 to 1 and it was passed by the House by a vote of 346 to 2. On Christmas Eve of last year it was pocket vetoed by the President of the United States while we were in recess. I thought this was an illegal veto of a very important bill.

I am very glad to know that the chairman of this distinguished committee and the chairman of the subcommittee and the very distinguished committee have incorporated this in the Manpower Act of 1971.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for the Health Manpower and Nurse Training Acts.

In July of 1969, President Nixon warned that we faced a massive health care crisis, and "unless action is taken . . . to meet the crisis within the next 2 or 3 years, we will have a breakdown in our medical care system which could have consequences affecting millions of people throughout this country." This is June of 1971, and 2 years have all but passed. In the interim we have seen drastic administrative cutbacks of funding for health research, for health manpower training, a call for the elimination of Public Health Service hospitals, a proposal to curtail regional medical pro-

grams, and vetoes of health appropriations and Hill-Burton funds.

In January, I listened with anticipation to the President's state of the Union message for words of encouragement about administration response to the health crisis. Weeks later, I listened with the same hopeful anticipation to his health care message to learn the details of the long-publicized assault on that crisis. What I heard was disappointing and inadequate.

I believe that the bills before us today present an opportunity for Congress to once again take the initiative in providing the personnel necessary to insure high quality medical care for all Americans.

I am particularly gratified that the bills include funds for training in two fields whose special needs I have sponsored legislation to meet—family medicine and hospital schools of nursing.

Included under the Health Manpower Act is an authorization of $100 million in grants to hospitals for training in the field of family medicine. I was original House sponsor last year of the "Family Practice of Medicine Act." The bill passed both the House and Senate overwhelmingly, but was pocket vetoed by the President during the brief congressional Christmas recess. As I have stated here on the floor on several previous occasions, I strongly contend that this was an inappropriate use of the pocket veto, and that the bill became law as a result of the President's failure to return it to the Senate with a veto message. Since my recent attempt to have funds appropriated for the act was blocked, I am grateful that the committee saw fit to include a special authorization for family practitioners in the health manpower bill. The $100 million will be made available over 3 fiscal years for grants to hospitals for planning, developing, or operating training programs in the field of family medicine, and for providing financial assistance to medical personnel who are participants in a hospital providing professional training in family medicine.

I am also gratified by the inclusion of $169 million in the Nurse Training Act for capitation grants to nursing schools. As the result of legislation which I introduced, the Health Manpower Act of 1968 authorized funds for both institutional and project grants to all schools of nursing. The primary beneficiaries of institutional grants are hospital diploma schools of nursing, which have traditionally produced over 75 percent of our Nation's nursing corps. Unfortunately, the guidelines established several years ago by the Bureau of Health Professions in HEW, which for some time has been downgrading diploma schools and favoring the associate degree and baccalaureate nursing programs, give priority to the funding of project grants, and leave nothing for institutional grants and consequently diploma schools. The number of diploma schools in the United States, due to the severe shortage of funds, has dropped from 821 in 1965 to 641 in 1970. Under the bill we are considering today, all nursing schools will receive $200 times the number of enrolled students other than those who will graduate, and $500 times the number of enrolled students who will graduate.

In a recent letter, the executive director of the hospital of the University of Pennsylvania pointedly summarized the problem:

> Our country needs nurses, hospitals do an excellent job training them, and unless additional funds are made available from other than patients many schools including ours must close. The situation is desperate. We need your support.

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. SPRINGER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in recent months, I have been working closely with the leaders in one of the communities in my district in attempting to provide better health facilities for the communities and to train physicians to live and practice in the area. As a result of this and similar experiences, I have personal knowledge of the limited number of trained physicians who are available today and the growing needs for trained medical personnel to serve not only in our smaller communities, but also in the urban inner cities. That is why I strongly support this legislation.

The Health Manpower Training Act of 1971 is a proposal to continue for 3 years, with some vital additions and revisions, the health professions educational assistance programs. As was so vividly documented in the committee hearings, there is an extreme shortage in health personnel. In order to do something about this shortage, the act seeks to provide financial backing directly to schools, directly to students, and for the construction of necessary institutions. The goals of this legislation would increase the number of those in the health professions, provide for more even distribution of physicians, both in types of medical skills and geographically, and give the opportunity for decent health services to as many people as possible, regardless of income.

I have been concerned with this problem since my early days in the House of Representatives. During the 88th Congress, it was my privilege to participate in pioneer legislation in this field. If it had not been for this program and continuing support for this kind of legislation, we would have an even more dire shortage than we do now.

According to information provided the committee by HEW, there is now a shortage of 50,000 physicians in the country. With continued population growth, the shortage will not decrease. This legislation enables the shortage to be alleviated by 1977–78. Hopefully, by 1980, the ratio of physicians to population would be the same as in those areas which now have the highest ratio.

There are other pressures for increased numbers of health personnel. Consumer income is increasing, resulting in wider consumer health insurance coverage. The average person is demanding more and better health services. The demands are further increased because more attention has been given to the needs of the poor and the elderly and this trend is expected to grow. Finally, since medical science has become so complex and so much specialization has been required, there has been a smaller and smaller proportion of family physicians who are able to give basic services.

The key feature of the act that gives it a change in direction is the capitation grant. In the past, medical schools have been dependent on research grants for the support of the faculty. So often these grants are subject to change or there is much redtape i ngetting them approved. The schools are dependent on uncertainties of appropriations and availabilities of funds. The result is that it is difficult for schools to plan and look ahead. To be realistic and to meet the goals already established, we must have Federal financial support that is dependable. A capitation grant, a grant proportionate to the number of graduates and students enrolled, will help the schools make better plans for their medical education program. There is no need for schools to be dependent on research programs for the remuneration of faculty.

In schools of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry, the bill authorizes $2,500 for each full-time first-, second-, and third-year student, plus $4,000 for each graduate and $1,000 for each first-year student beyond that already required for the expansion of enrollment. For schools of veterinary medicine, the bill authorrizes $1,500 for each full-time student; for schools of podiatory and optometry $800 for each full-time student; for schools of pharmacy $800 for each full-time student in the last 4 professional years.

I want to comment on the amendment in the bill that requires medical schools to expand enrollment in order to receive Federal assistance. As one member of the committee, I am seriously concerned that if we are to authorize new and additional sums for the education of physicians, we should have some assurance that the number of graduates is increased.

Under the loan section of the bill, the most needy students have priority for loans and scholarships. There is also a forgiveness section whereby students are forgiven their loans if they choose to practice in general, family, internal, or pediatric medicine in an area where the need for medical service is highest. Loans could be canceled at the rate of $5,000 per year if the student practices in such an area as designated by the Secretary. Although this loan forgiveness feature of the bill is not the answer to the whole problem of a shortage of medical services in rural or urban areas, it is a step forward. Also, as the President has stated:

> No qualified student who wants to go to college should be barred by lack of money.

Many of the minority students and students from underprivileged and disadvantaged families come from the same areas in which the shortage of health manpower is the most extreme and are more likely to practice there.

The bill also provides for startup grants to help new schools meet their initial costs. There is also a provision for

training personnel. Also in the bill, we continue authorization of project grants to modernize the educational programs so that they meet the demands of the rapidly changing patterns in health services. Under the special projects, institutions are given aid individually, in relation to their individual problems.

I know that this bill authorizes a large amount of money, but in my opinion, it is a necessary expenditure if we are to meet the health needs of our Nation in years to come. Other legislation will necessarily come later. We still have to provide programs for seeing people are given health insurance, for making certain that an illness does not mean financial catastrophe, and for putting additional medical services in rural areas.

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us contains new programs to help meet the serious medical profession shortage found in many areas of the country. These areas comprise both ends of the population spectrum—the rural sparsely populated areas and the heavily populated ghettos of America's urban centers.

Significant among the new Federal initiatives in this bill are start-up grants for new medical schools, new capitation grants for the support of medical professional schools, new authority for training teachers in health professions, new incentives for training in family medicine, and initiative awards for solution of critical medical problems.

While total numbers of doctors have increased in this country, as well as the ratio of physicians per 100,000 population in recent decades, there has been a precipitous drop in the ratio of general practitioners to the population. In 1931, there were 101 general practitioners per 100,000 population, and by 1970, the number had plummeted to 28 general practitioners per 100,000 population. This situation must be rectified as quickly as possible so that this trend will be reversed. Without immediate action, the doctor shortage in rural areas and ghettos will become calamitous.

It is expected that the number of graduates from the various types of professional medical schools in 1971 will be as follows: 9,500 physicians; 3,800 dentists; 530 optometrists; 4,800 pharmacists; 240 podiatrists; and 1,220 veterinarians. Enactment of the pending bill will increase these numbers to better serve the medical needs of America.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of pride that I call the attention of the House to the fact that the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee held field hearings in Rochester, Minn., at the famed Mayo Clinic in order to get valued testimony which helped the subcommittee write today's bill. For years, Mayo Clinic has beckoned people from all around the world who are seeking the best in patient care.

The Mayo Foundation, established by Charles and William Mayo, is responsible for the operation of the clinic, the research programs, and the graduate school of medicine. The clinic provides more outpatient care than inpatient care. Inpatient care is provided in the 560-bed Methodist Hospital and the 1,000-bed St. Mary's Hospital.

The Mayo brothers and their successors have been noted for innovation in patient care. They have been forerunners in many fields and are quick to adopt new techniques and methods which result in improved patient care.

Recognizing a need for medical specialists, the Mayo Graduate School was founded as a branch division of the University of Minnesota in 1915. Some 6,000 physicians have received training in medical and surgical specialties and are practicing around the world.

Today, facing the challenge of a shortage of general practitioners, the Mayo Clinic is ready to step into the breach and establish a medical school. This is a fairly unique situation since the clinic and related institutions already have 80 percent of the facilities, personnel, programs, and buildings found in existing medical schools.

There are 500 physicians at the clinic, a majority of whom teach at the graduate school. There are 700 residents and interns who can assist in the teaching of medical students. Buildings are already in existence valued at $150,000,000. Facilities include a $140,000 volume Mayo Medical Library.

With Federal and State assistance filling the gap, the Mayo Foundation proposes to establish a Mayo Medical School which will enroll 40 students in the fall of 1972, moving as rapidly as possible to a class of 100 students.

Contained in this bill are two essential aspects of the proposed medical school—start-up grants and capitation support. The bill authorizes grants amounting to $2,500 for each first, second and third year student enrolled in schools of medicine, osteopathy and dentistry, plus $4,000 for each graduating student. This capitation grant is the minimum amount required to keep many existing medical schools from going under financially and to encourage the establishment of new medical schools.

The start-up grants will be figured according to a formula allocating $7,500 for each first-year enrollment, $5,000 for each second-year student enrollment and $2,500 for each third-year enrollment.

It is planned that primary emphasis will be given in the new Mayo Medical School to training of doctors for family medicine. The practice of family medicine today includes those doctors who provide primary patient care as opposed to those who are specialists, whose patients are referred to them by the former practitioners. Providers of primary care include obstetricians, pediatricians, internists, as well as general practitioners.

The Mayo Clinic is experimenting with several proposals to expand their expertise to the surrounding geographical area. The Clinic has developed affiliations with smaller clinics in Minnesota whereby patients are referred from the smaller clinics when they need consultation which can be provided only by a large clinic.

The Mayo Clinic also is attempting to establish a regional laboratory which will be available to physicians and clinics in Minnesota and Wisconsin. Joint use of the Mayo laboratory facilities will be more economical and efficient as well as provide higher quality laboratory work. A uniform laboratory result recording system will also provide patients with a comprehensive and reliable medical history.

Mr. Chairman, special credit belongs to the chairman of the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee (Mr. ROGERS) and the ranking minority member (Mr. NELSEN) for their untiring efforts to make better medical care available to every American. I commend the committee for bringing such a comprehensive and responsive bill to the House and urge its approval.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Chairman, today's consideration of H.R. 8629, the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971, marks a milestone in congressional action to meet the health needs of our Nation. During the 91st and 92d Congress, we have been confronted with the dimensions of a nationwide doctor shortage, a poor distribution of health care personnel, and a startling inadequacy in medical teaching facilities throughout the country. From medical experts, educators, and Government spokesmen we have heard unanimous agreement that we in this Congress must act now to provide the resources and the means for planning so desperately needed to bring our Nation's health manpower capabilities in line with the growing needs of Americans.

The bill before us today provides the comprehensive approach which we must adopt if we are to take the first step in bringing adequate medical care to all Americans. This Nation's health care crisis has many elements, but the problem which must be confronted before all others is that of providing enough trained medical personnel so that their services will be within reach of everyone. Even stepped-up research and greatly increased health insurance will be of little use if there are not enough health professionals to bring medical care to the people. Clearly then, Congress cannot provide for the health and welfare of Americans unless we begin with manpower training.

I hardly need to emphasize the scope of the personnel shortage the United States is currently experiencing. Those of us in this body who are privileged to afford good medical care know what it is to wait for hours in the office of an overworked physician. But we must remember that there are 134 counties in the country which do not even have a doctor, where the waiting room of any doctor's office would indeed be a welcomed sight. Likewise, the rural and urban ghetto areas of the United States are shocking testimony to the problem. In these areas where accident and disease are most probable, doctors and nurses are more often than not out of reach. With a population increase of 27 million expected by 1980, nothing short of a national commitment can provide relief. The bill before us today will add a predicted 7,110 physicians to the number already projected to graduate from medical schools by 1980. We cannot afford anything less than this concentrated effort to meet growing demands.

This Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act reminds us that the problems of health care are not limited to politics or to regionalism. The medical crisis is as critical today in New York City as it is in the plains of South Dakota, or a small town in North Carolina. It is a problem of vast proportions, but it is as close to each of us as our own sense of well-being.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8629 is major national legislation. It will guide this Nation's health manpower effort toward a quantitative and a qualitative impact on the health services of the Nation. It is based on the principle that the health of the people is the foundation upon which their happiness and their power as a State depend.

Mr. Chairman, I commend H.R. 8629 to the Members of the House. There could be no legislation more befitting the birthday of our Nation than this one which will insure better health to all Americans.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, our country's need for skilled personnel, trained in the medical field, has never been more urgent than it is today. Our hospitals, clinics, and extended care facilities are dangerously understaffed. The demand for personnel to fill these positions is rising at a rate that cannot possibly be met by the present supply of men and women graduating from our medical schools.

Today, I am asking my colleagues for their support of H.R. 8629, the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971, and H.R. 8630, the Nurse Training Act of 1971.

It is my belief that the passage of these two bills would greatly alleviate the manpower shortage in the field of professional health services.

The public not only expects adequate health service, but has a right to it. Unfortunately, this expectation and right has been thwarted because of the serious shortage of health care personnel. In addition, what few medical professionals we have are unevenly distributed throughout the Nation. Remote areas of our country are virtually without any type of medical care.

This critical shortage and ever increasing demand for health care personnel is made more acute by the threatened discontinuance of professional training programs in many institutions. Inadequate financing is forcing these institutions to close their doors to those aspiring to help their fellow man.

Presently, our universities can give student applicants no assurance that they will receive either scholarship, traineeship, or loan funds for the upcoming fall semester.

This situation forces many students into other fields and places medical schools themselves in jeopardy.

Approval for capitation grants on a per-student basis is an especially vital part of H.R. 8629 and H.R. 8630 if schools are to continue and expand their education of both undergraduate and graduate practitioners.

In addition to the purely academic problems faced in this area, we face many other needs.

The population will increase during this decade by about 27 million. This greater number of people in our country will add substantially to our need of professionals in the field of health manpower.

Also, as per capita personal income increases, a greater percentage of each family's income will be allocated for medical services. This too will add to the demand for health manpower.

The demand for nurses is the most universal need in the entire field of health manpower.

The rising population will consequently have greater numbers of old and young people requiring care. This will further broaden an area where nurses' services are necessary. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has estimated the need for 1980 as better than 1 million registered nurses.

We are all aware of what America needs to keep itself healthy. Today, we have the opportunity to help supply those demands for better health services.

I cannot urge too strongly the passage of the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971 and the Nurse Training Act of 1971.

The passage of these two pieces of legislation is in the best interest of the future well-being of the American public.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN). In a country where there is only one doctor for every 720 citizens the need for more qualified physicians is great. Such is the case in the United States. Yet, according to the testimony of Dr. Frances Norris before the Special Subcommittee on Education looking into discrimination against women, the discriminatory admissions practices of our medical schools are keeping a vital source of potential physicians, women, out of a profession which has urgent need of them. Over 50 percent of our population consists of women, but only a mere 7 percent of the doctors in this country are women.

The figures set forth in Dr. Norris' testimony makes it clear that discrimination does exist. Women applicants to medical schools have increased by over 300 percent in 36 years, while the number of male applicants has increased only 29 percent. But the proportion of women accepted over these years has fallen. According to the American Medical Association's figures for 1968, 51 of our 91 medical schools accepted fewer than 10 percent women in entering classes. Eleven of these schools accepted 3 percent or less.

One of the reasons for such an imbalance between men and women accepted is the practice of separating applicants into separate categories based on sex. An equal percentage from each category is then rejected and an equal percentage is accepted. There is no justification for judging the qualifications of applicants by separating them in such a manner. In most cases the smaller number of women applying are as qualified if not more qualified than the men who are accepted. Yet because of a "sex quota," many of these women are rejected. Because of these barriers fewer women than men apply.

Interviews of admissions officers in 25 Northeastern medical schools indicated that women are required to have a higher grade point average and greater ability. Nineteen of these officers admitted they accepted men in preference to women unless the women could show "special justification" for admission.

Arguments used by medical schools against the enrollment of women are often based on popular myths. One of these myths is that women who enter medical school do not graduate, and therefore waste the time and money of the school. However, according to the figures in Dr. Norris' testimony 84 percent of the women who enter medical school do graduate.

It is also argued that once a woman has been educated as a physician, she wastes valuable training by leaving her practice to bear children and raise a family. The figures indicate that though half of the inactive physicians between 30 to 49 years were women, women physicians tend to practice longer past 60 years of age than men. Though several years of practice are taken out to raise children, the fact is that fewer than 7 percent of women medical school graduates since 1933 are not employed.

This amendment attempts to reverse this pattern of discrimination. The mandate to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is an active one. It requires the Secretary to take a central role in guaranteeing unbiased and nondiscriminatory admissions policies in the schools, projects and programs assisting in the training, distribution and improved efficiency of those in the health professions field.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to make known my support and appreciation of the work done by the Honorable PAUL ROGERS and the other members of the Public Health Subcommittee in the area of health manpower bills. These men have spent many weeks trying to work out legislation that would move us a long way down the road toward meeting the growing health needs of this country. I am proud to be a sponsor of this bill.

Although we have Federal aid programs on the books now they have not been sufficient to help our medical schools keep up with the increasing cost of education and the need for health professionals. Many of our finest medical schools are having trouble keeping their doors open because of financial problems. Many of these schools have asked for special grants to keep operating.

When people are expecting and demanding the highest equality of health care, and rightly so, we cannot allow our medical education system to falter.

Incorporated into the health manpower bill are two separate bills which I have sponsored. One of these bills is directed toward filling the need for doctors in many of our rural areas. Up to 75 percent or $15,000 of any outstanding professional educational loan shall be repaid by the Secretary for practice in a shortage area for a period of at least 3 years.

The other provision of this bill that I sponsored as separate legislation was the Family Medicine Act. This provision will

provide $100 million over the next 3 years for programs to train doctors for the broad speciality of family medicine. In recent years there has been an increasing trend of doctors to limit themselves to a narrow speciality. There is a great need for doctors who are specially trained to work with the broad and various health problems of the family unit.

The subcommittee has tried to reach all the medical fields with the aid contained in this bill. There is money for schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, veterinary, optometry, podiatry, and pharmacy.

We are authorizing the spending of $2.756 billion over the next 3 years for construction and operation of a medical educational facilities and teaching programs. Included in the bill is a student loan and scholarship program.

In my book the authorization of these programs is a sound and necessary investment for tomorrow's health.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the United States is currently experiencing a health care crisis. To a large extent this situation has arisen from the insufficient number of people who are qualified to deliver health services to the population. The fact that we have too few medical personnel is not due to a lack of the type of interest, intelligence, and motivation required for such fields among our people. Rather, a shortage of doctors and nurses exists in America today, because there are not enough medical training facilities and the cost of a medical education is excessively high for the majority of qualified Americans. The Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971 and the Nurse Training Act of 1971 are tailored to substantially increase the number of medical personnel so that America can become a healthier country.

The critical shortage of nurses and doctors is an indisputable fact. Due to such factors as population growth, rising consumer incomes, increasing insurance coverage, greater public attention to the health needs of the disadvantaged, and intensified concern among the general population for health, our need for medical personnel will augment in the future. Although there are presently 700,000 nurses in active practice, 150,000 more are needed. By 1980 it is estimated that 1,100,000 nurses will be required. The ratio of active physicians which increased only slightly from 141 physicians per 100,000 people in 1950 to 155 in 1970 must be raised substantially if we are to cope with our future health needs.

The Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act and the Nurse Training Act propose to combat the medical personnel shortage from three fronts. Both of these bills authorize grants and loan guarantees be made over 3 fiscal years for the construction of new teaching facilities and the rehabilitation of old ones. In addition, capitation grants for schools of nursing and health professions are provided for the maintenance of quality education. In recognition of the increased number of teachers which will be required by physical expansion, these bills appropriate moneys for grants for training, traineeship, and fellowship programs in the health teaching field. Most significantly, these bills will help insure that qualified individuals will not be barred from pursuing careers in the health professions, because of an inability to finance the required training. It will increase the maximum amount of a loan that a student may receive for any academic year and extend scholarship grant programs.

Although a health crisis exists throughout America, its severity is greatest in the ghettos of our cities and rural areas. To counteract the prevailing movement of medical professionals away from the sections of our Nation where they are most desperately needed, these bills permit loan forgiveness for service in shortage areas.

The proliferation of medical specialists and the concomitant reduction of general practitioners have resulted in a worsening of the health index of the American population in general. Section 786 of the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act adds new authority for grants to public or private nonprofit hospitals or other health or educational institutions to initiate and carry out training programs in family medicine. It is hoped that this provision will help change the orientation of the American health system from emergency to preventive care.

I hope that both the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act and the Nurse Training Act warrant passage because of the substantial contribution which they will make toward the resolution of the current health dilemma. If these bills are not passed. I recommend passage of H.R. 7736, health professions student loan and scholarship extension. This bill is a stopgap measure to continue funding of present loan and scholarship programs in the medical professions for the next fiscal year. We cannot continue, however, to merely deal with our medical system on a short-term, piecemeal basis. The medical crisis in America is now of such magnitude that only coordinated, substantial, and sustained effort can remedy the situation. The Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act and the Nurse Training Act represent major attempts to improve the health status of all Americans.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 8629, the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971. The legislation we are considering today would amend and extend title VII of the Public Health Service Act. This bill would authorize a variety of programs to provide assistance to our Nation's health professions schools.

Much has been said of the critical shortages of health manpower that now exists in our Nation. We know that the Nation lacks 50,000 doctors and almost 18,000 dentists. If we are to provide the citizens of this Nation with an effective and efficient system of health care, we must end the "doctors shortage."

H.R. 8629 aims to do just this. The provisions of the legislation would extend the current construction assistance program to schools of the health profession. The Federal share of construction costs would be increased to 75 percent for new school construction, for the expansion of existing facilities, and for schools that are in health manpower shortage areas. In addition, private nonprofit schools would be eligible to receive Federal loan guarantees and interest subsidies.

Perhaps the most important amendment contained in H.R. 8629 is the authorization of a new program of capitation grants to help professions schools based on enrollments. I believe this will be a great improvement over the existing formula grant program. If this provision is enacted, health professions schools will be able to know in advance the amount of Federal support they will be eligible to receive. It will provide them with greater ability to plan how these funds will be used and to use the funds more efficiently.

The special project grant section will also be significantly amended by H.R. 8629. Grants under this program could be used for a variety of purposes such as shortening the length of time that is required to receive a medical degree or for developing training programs for new kinds of health personnel such as physicians' assistance.

H.R. 8629 would also authorize a new program of health manpower educational initiative awards. As the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce put it:

> Special initiatives must be taken to improve the distribution, supply, utilization, and efficiency of health personnel. The most effective use must be made of existing as well as new health manpower training resources, and the distribution and availability of training opportunities must be improved. The Health Manpower Educational Initiative Awards authorized is designed to achieve these ends.

This new program would provide, for example, assistance for cooperative arrangements among health service and health education institutions to improve the distribution, supply, utilization, and training of health manpower.

The existing student loan and scholarship programs would also be extended and expanded by H.R. 8629. The maximum loan amount or scholarship award that a health professions student could receive would each be raised to $3,500. Both programs are designed to insure that all capable young people will be able to enter the health professions, not only those from affluent families.

The loan forgiveness program authorized by H.R. 8629 would provide great incentives for young doctors or other health professionals to practice in health manpower shortage areas—where they are most needed. Under the provisions contained in H.R. 8629, a student who agrees to practice his profession in a designated health manpower shortage area for at least 3 years may have 75 percent or $15,000—whichever is less—of his outstanding educational loan canceled. I am positive that many young men and women will be anxious to participate in this program.

Mr. Chairman, as you can see H.R. 8629 proposes a variety of programs to improve, strengthen and expand this Nation's system of health professions education. The increased Federal assistance authorized by this bill would enable our

health professions schools to expand their enrollments, to shorten and improve their curriculum, to increase the number of graduates, to train new kinds of health personnel, and to maintain their financial stability.

I believe that the programs proposed by H.R. 8629 are both innovative and vital. I strongly recommend their passage.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8629, the Health Manpower and Training Act.

With the estimated shortage in this country of 50,000 doctors and over 150,000 nurses, we are faced with a national health crisis. The shortage of doctors, nurses, and other health workers in this country is growing by leaps and bounds.

What good does it do us to have cures to all the illnesses in medical history—if we have no qualified persons to administer them? What good does it do us to have the most advanced technical equipment, if we have no qualified personnel to operate it?

In the past decade, since the Federal Government began its program to encourage the training of medical personnel, great progress has been made.

The number of graduating physicians has increased over 23 percent since 1963; the number of graduating nurses has increased over 24 percent since 1964.

Yet according to recently published statistics, there are 134 counties in the United States, containing about a half a million people, without a practicing physician. This is especially true of the rural areas of our Nation, which are disproportionately neglected. The shortage of trained medical personnel is one reason why people in 17 other countries have longer life expectancies than Americans, and why the United States has a higher infant mortality rate than 13 other countries.

The education of a medical student is expensive. We are the recipients of their costly education. We should help these students financially. The legislation we are discussing will help cut down their costs.

I cannot support this legislation too emphatically. I urge my colleagues to support its passage. The costs of the extended financing we are proposing are miniscule in comparison with the benefits which the people of our Nation will reap as its result.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, our Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the vital importance of adequate health care. As the richest Nation in the world, we have a responsibility to see that our citizens have access to the best health services.

The health manpower situation will deteriorate rather than improve, if we do not take action. This Nation now faces a shortage of approximately 50,000 doctors. As our population increases, this need will become even greater if our recruitment and training of health manpower is not improved.

I, therefore, urge this body to support H.R. 8629, the Health Manpower Training Act.

The Congress will soon be debating the relative merits of a number of proposals for a system of national health insurance. If such a plan is adopted, it is obvious that greater numbers of people will be taking advantage of health care facilities and personnel. We must make preparations now for the requirements of the future.

In addition, we must encourage people to take advantage of preventative medicine. This is a subject which is too often neglected today. The high costs of medical care discourage most people from making use of preventative medicine even though health care in this form is often more of a saving in the end. If preventative medicine is practiced more often, however, the great increase in the number of patient visits will necessitate an increase in manpower.

This bill will give tuition loans and assistance to those who cannot fully afford the costs of an expensive medical education. The provision, therefore, helps to insure that the best qualified can attend.

Second, the bill provides assistance to medical schools to expand their student bodies. Schools which increase their enrollment beyond the requisite figure will be aided with larger grants.

Third, the bill encourages "new starts" for medical schools. New schools as well as the expansion of facilities at existing schools will further enlarge our capabilities for training students by giving them access to the most modern equipment, and, therefore, the best education.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation is long overdue in making a commitment to train the women as well as the men who desire a medical education. Stringent quotas on the number of women students are in effect at some medical schools, while other schools fail to admit any women at all.

I, therefore, support the adoption of an amendment that would prevent sex discrimination and which would insure that schools receiving moneys under this title would give impartial treatment to all applicants for admission.

I commend the language of the report for encouraging the admittance of low-income and minority students into health manpower professions. I also urge this same commitment to women.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8629, the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act.

There is no shortage which is more critically obvious to the majority of citizens than that of qualified health-trained personnel. While medical services have increased dramatically in the past decade, this improvement has taken place mainly in the various fields of specialized health care. The great strength of this act is that it places strong emphasis on the construction of teaching facilities and development of programs for the teaching of family medicine.

Such action is necessary at the present time for two reasons. First, family health care can be the most effective means of preventive medicine since its practitioners are in a better position to treat health problems at their inception when they are likely to be curable at a minimum of expense. Second, the demand for medical services is likely to continue to increase at an even greater rate than in the past. Such a requirement necessitates an increased number of practitioners who operate at the basic levels of health care in order that all who seek health care may have an opportunity to obtain it.

The sections of this act providing appropriations to pay up to 75 percent of the construction costs of health training facilities as well as moneys for capitation grants to schools and for special teacher training programs will enable our health training facilities to at least make a start in meeting the needs of the near future. Moreover, these same provisions will help to accommodate the large numbers of qualified people who seek health training. As the experience of Case-Western Reserve Medical School, which is located in my district, indicates, the shortage of health care personnel is not due to any lack of interest on the part of people who could serve in the medical profession. This year the school had over 1,400 more applicants than in 1970. Yet, despite construction expenditures of over $25 million, the school was only able to provide eight more places for new students. Overall its acceptance-to-application ratio, like that of most other medical schools, is only one in 40.

While it is undoubtedly true that not all those who apply are qualified, it is nevertheless obvious that the present training capacities of Case-Western Reserve and other medical schools are incapable of making full use of the available talent. The $2½ billion which are available through this act as aid to health training facilities, should enable these schools to reach the planned increase of 4,050 more graduating physicians by 1980.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentlewoman from Oregon on her important amendment to prevent sex discrimination in health manpower training program.

It is of critical importance that this body realize that we cannot seriously and honestly discuss the question of equality and freedom in this country while over 51 percent of the Nation's population, comprised of females, are victims of sex discrimination. Not only are the majority of the Nation's population female, but a large percentage of them are also breadwinners. Unless we are to be content with the notion that women must continue to accept low skilled, low paying jobs in order to placate oversized male egos, then the Green amendment must receive our unanimous approval.

I support the Green amendment, not only because numerous State and Federal laws prohibit sex discrimination, but because I sincerely and firmly believe that no group should be denied rights and opportunities available to any other group in this society. The day must pass when age, sex, race, religion, or national origin becomes a criteria for benefits which accrue to citizens of a society which prides itself with being in a citadel of freedom and democracy.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be supporting H.R. 8629, the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971, and I am especially gratified that the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from Oregon (Mrs.

GREEN), has been accepted. That amendment would prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex in the admission of individuals to training programs conducted by schools receiving Federal assistance under sections 785 or 786 of this bill. These two sections authorize grants for training, traineeships, and fellowships in family medicine and for health professions teaching personnel.

On every possible occasion in the future, we must insert into legislation language banning sex discrimination in any program funded by the Federal Government. As necessary as this action is, however, it is only a piecemeal approach to the problem. What we really need to do is to pass the Women's Equality Act of 1971, which among other things will prohibit discrimination on acount of sex in any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. This bill, of which I am a cosponsor, also prohibits sex discrimination in public facilities, in public accommodations, in the sale and rental of housing, and in employment opportunities. Most important, the equal rights amendment, removing in a single stroke sex discrimination in State and Federal laws, must be passed; this constitutional amendment must be adopted as originally introduced—without any restrictions.

The need for today's amendment to H.R. 8629, as well as a constitutional amendment, is abundantly clear. Examples of sex discrimination serving unjust hardships on women are found every day. Just on Tuesday a number of New York City Members of this House met with representatives of Columbia University, City University of New York, and New York University. The meeting had been called at the request of these universities who were protesting the proceedings instituted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which resulted in a finding that Brooklyn College—part of City University of New York—had discriminated against a particular faculty member on the basis of sex; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recommended that she immediately be promoted to the rank of full professor with a commensurate salary increase retroactive to October 13, 1968.

Briefly, the universities' position expounded by President John W. Kneller of Brooklyn College was that the methods used by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in establishing an alleged pattern of discrimination and in making a finding of discrimination in the case of Dr. Anna Babey Brooks were violative of academic freedom. In particular, the universities' representatives were distressed that the individual faculty members responsible for faculty promotions were questioned on the criteria they used in making the determination in her case.

A number of members of the delegation, including myself, made it clear that we were not going to intercede with the Contract Compliance Division of HEW on behalf of the universities seeking a delay in carrying out its recommendations concerning Dr. Anna Babey Brooks' promotion and pay raise. Furthermore, we refused to support the university's efforts to obtain a change in the procedures so as to bar the kind of detailed investigation undertaken by HEW.

Much was said by the representatives of the universities to the effect that in some way Federal oversight of the universities' promotion practices violated academic freedom and that their fears that Federal control would follow Federal moneys had been fulfilled.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that academic freedom does not include freedom to discriminate on the grounds of race, creed, national origin, or sex. What I think we have on the part of the universities in this case is the same reaction that we had when legislation and regulations barring discrimination in the first three areas were enacted and enforced. Surely the universities would never come forward to protest an investigation of this kind had it involved a question of race, creed, or national origin. But, because the subject of sex discrimination and the legislative bars thereto are new, there is resistance. I for one urged HEW to move ahead in this area and not to be restrained. Surely, there can be no question by those familiar with the subject matter that in every area of endeavor, including the universities, there has been a pattern involving discrimination which resulted in not elevating women to high positions with commensurate salaries. I can think of no better place to stop this than at the university level where they ought to know better.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8629, the bill "to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to provide increased manpower for the health professions, and for other purposes," is another example of the linking together of dangerous provisions with popular programs that the people cry out for and that nearly every Member must support. This puts the Member in the position of weighing the possible good that might result from the entire bill against the evident danger of more and more Federal control.

I refer especially to section 772(a) providing that the Secretary may make grants to assist medical schools to—

"(8) establish and operate projects designed to identify, and increase admissions to and enrollment in schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine of, individuals whose background and interests make it reasonable to assume that they will engage in the practice of their health profession in rural or other areas having a severe shortage of personnel in such health profession;

"(9) establish and operate projects designed to increase admissions to and enrollment in such schools of qualified individuals from minority or low-income groups;

And section 108(a) having to do with scholarship grants which reads:

"(b) The amount of the grant under subsection (a) to each such school for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, shall be equal to $3,000 multiplied by one-tenth of the number of full-time students of such school and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and the next fiscal year shall be equal to $3,000 multiplied by the number of full-time students of such school who are from low-income backgrounds as determined under regulations of the secretary. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the grant under subsection (a) shall be such amount as may be necessary to enable such school to continue making payments under scholarship awards to students who initially received such awards out of grants made to the school for fiscal years ending before July 1, 1974.";

I clearly recognize the dangers inherent in this bill and the fact that it can, if unchecked, lead to fully socialized—"political"—medicine; but there are provisions included that would provide programs to increase the number of doctors available to rural areas and give assistance to the various programs that are being developed in the field of veterinary medicine. The AMA has reportedly indicated their acceptance of the risk involved in this bill as have various other outspoken people and organizations. This is clearly a calculated risk.

I intend to cast my people's vote for the bill, but I want to go on record as saying that I am aware of the dangers inherent in it and intend to watch the programs that will be developed pursuant to its enactment very carefully.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8629 which would amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act. This bill would provide increased manpower and teaching facilities for the health related professions.

I would like at this time to commend my distinguished colleague, PAUL G. ROGERS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health, and the entire committee for their diligent efforts in behalf of this vital legislation.

We are all becoming increasingly aware of the growing crisis that surrounds our health delivery system. One of the major problems lies in the shortage of health personnel and teaching facilities. This is particularly true in our large urban centers. The U.S. Public Health Service estimates that the country currently faces health manpower shortages totalling 481,000 including 48,000 doctors and 17,000 dentists. By 1980, this health manpower shortage will reach 725,000.

H.R. 8629 seeks to meet this shortage. The bill, if enacted, will provide $135 million in student loans for the next 3 fiscal years. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to pay part of the loan if the student subsequently practiced in an area of shortage for at least 3 years.

In addition, the bill provides $94 million over the next 3 fiscal years in scholarship funds and $30 million to assist new schools of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry. H.R. 8629 also appropriates funds for construction of new teaching facilities, project grants for advanced training of teachers, and family medicine training.

This Nation vitally needs an increase in the supply of health service personnel before medical costs can be reduced. The Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act is a step in this direction. I heartily endorse this legislation.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VII OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES TO ACT

SEC. 101. (a) This title may be cited as the "Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971".

(b) Whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Public Health Service Act.

PROJECT GRANTS FOR TRAINING, TRAINEESHIPS, AND FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 102. (a) Part A of title VII (42 U.S.C. 292–292j) is amended to read as follows:

"PART A—PROJECT GRANTS FOR TRAINING, TRAINEESHIPS, AND FELLOWSHIPS IN THE MEDICAL, DENTAL, OSTEOPATHIC, PODIATRIC, OPTOMETRIC, PHARMACEUTICAL, AND VETERINARY MEDICAL FIELDS

"GRANTS FOR TRAINING, TRAINEESHIPS, AND FELLOWSHIPS FOR HEALTH PROFESSIONS TEACHING PERSONNEL

"SEC. 701. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for grants under this section.

"(b) The Secretary may make grants under this section to public and nonprofit private schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, podiatry, optometry, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine (as such schools are defined in section 724) for training (at such schools or elsewhere), and traineeships and fellowships for the advanced training, of individuals to enable them to teach, or improve their teaching skills, in the medical, dental, osteopathic, podiatric, optometric, pharmaceutical, or veterinary medicine fields.

"(c) Not less than 75 per centum of any grant under this section to any school shall be used by the school for traineeships and fellowships.

"GRANTS TO HOSPITALS FOR TRAINING, TRAINEESHIPS, AND FELLOWSHIPS IN FAMILY MEDICINE

"SEC. 702. There are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for grants by the Secretary to any public or private nonprofit hospital—

"(1) to plan, develop, and operate a professional training program (including continuing education in the field of family medicine) for medical students, interns, residents, or practicing physicians;

"(2) to provide financial assistance (in the form of traineeships and fellowships) to medical students, interns, residents, practicing physicians, or other medical personnel, who are in need thereof, who are participants in a program of such hospital which provides professional training in the field of family medicine and who plan to specialize or work in the practice of family medicine; and

"(3) to plan, develop, and operate, or participate in, other training programs in the field of family medicine.

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 703. (a) No grant may be made under this part unless an application therefor has been submitted to, and approved by, the Secretary. Such application shall be in such form, submitted in such manner, and contain such information, as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe.

"(b) Payments by recipients of grants under this part for (1) traineeships shall be limited to such amounts as the Secretary finds necessary to cover the cost of tuition and fees of, and stipens and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses and dependency allowances) for, the trainees; and (2) fellowships shall be limited to such amounts as the Secretary finds necessary to cover the cost of advanced study by, and stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses and dependency allowances) for, the fellows.

"(c) The amount of any grant under this part shall be determined by the Secretary. Payments under such grants may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals and on such conditions, as the Secretary finds necessary."

(b) Notwithstanding the amendment made by subsection (a), on and after the date of enactment of this title section 707 of the Public Health Service Act, as in effect immediately before such date, shall continue to apply with respect to any project constructed with funds provided under part A of such Act before such date.

GRANTS AND LOAN GUARANTEES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TEACHING FACILITIES FOR MEDICAL, DENTAL, AND OTHER HEALTH PROFESSIONS PERSONNEL

SEC. 103. (a) AUTHORIZATION LEVEL.—Section 720 (42 U.S.C. 293) is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 720. There are authorized to be appropriated $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $275,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for grants to assist in the construction of new teaching facilities, and for grants to assist in the replacement or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities, for the training of physicians, dentists, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, veterinarians, or professional public health personnel."

(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—Clause (A) of section 722(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 293b(a)(1)) is amended by striking out "66⅔ per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "75 per centum"; and clause (B) of such section is amended (1) by striking out "66⅔ per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "75 per centum", (2) by striking out "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "67 per centum", and (3) by inserting after "unusual circumstances" the following: "(such as a school located in a geographical area of the United States with a critical shortage of health profession manpower)".

(c) FACILITIES INCLUDED.—

(1) Section 724(1) (42 U.S.C. 293d(1)) is amended by inserting after "existing buildings, and" the following: "the acquisition,", and by striking out the semicolon at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a period and the following: "For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'buildings' includes interim facilities."

(2) Section 724(5) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) The term 'interim facilities' means teaching facilities designed to provide teaching space on a short-term (less than ten years) basis while facilities of a more permanent nature are being planned and constructed."

(3) Section 724 is further amended by striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a period and by striking out "; and" at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(4) Section 723 (42 U.S.C. 293c) is amended by inserting "(or in the case of interim facilities, within such shorter period as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe)" immediately after "twenty years".

(d) LOAN GUARANTEES.—Part B is amended by adding after section 728 (42 U.S.C. 293h) the following new section:

"LOAN GUARANTEES

"SEC. 729. (a) In order to assist nonprofit private schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, veterinary medicine, or public health to carry out construction projects for teaching facilities, the Secretary may, during the period beginning July 1, 1971, and ending with the close of June 30, 1974, guarantee (in accordance with this section and subject to subsection (f)) to non-Federal lenders making loans to such schools for such construction projects payment when due of the principal of and interest on any loan for construction of such facilities if the loan was made to a school which is eligible (as determined under regulations of the Secretary) for a grant under this part to assist a construction project for such facilities. The Secretary may make commitments, on behalf of the United States, to make such loan guarantees prior to the making of such loans. No such loan guarantee (1) may, except under such special circumstances and under such conditions as are prescribed by regulations, apply to any amount which, when added to any grant under this part or any other law of the United States, exceeds 90 per centum of the cost of construction of the project, or (2) may apply to more than 90 per centum of the loss of principal of and interest on the loan.

"(b) In the case of any nonprofit private school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, veterinary medicine, or public health, which is eligible (as determined under regulations of the Secretary) for a grant under this part to assist a construction project for teaching facilities, and to whom a loan has been made by a non-Federal lender to assist it in carrying out such project, the Secretary, during the period beginning July 1, 1971, and ending with the close of June 30, 1974, may, subject to subsection (f), pay to the holder of such loan (and for and on behalf of the school which received such loan) amounts sufficient to reduce by not to exceed 3 per centum per annum the net effective interest rate otherwise payable on such loan.

"(c) A loan guarantee or interest subsidy payment may be made under this section only upon an application (submitted in such manner and containing such information as the Secretary may be regulations require) approved by the Secretary. The Secretary may not approve an application for a loan guarantee or interest subsidy payment unless he determines that the terms, conditions, security (if any), and schedule and amount of repayments with respect to the loan are sufficient to protect the financial interests of the United States and are otherwise reasonable, including a determination that the rate of interest does not exceed such per centum per annum on the principal obligation outstanding as the Secretary determines to be reasonable, taking into account the range of interest rates prevailing in the private market for similar loans and the risks assumed by the United States. The Secretary may not approve an application for a loan guarantee, unless he determines that the loan would not be available on reasonable terms and conditions without the guarantee under this section.

"(d)(1) The United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant for a loan guarantee under this section the amount of any payment made pursuant to such guarantee, unless the Secretary for good cause waives such right of recovery; and, upon making any such payment, the United States shall be subrogated to all of the rights of the recipient of the payments with respect to which the guarantee was made.

"(2) To the extent permitted by paragraph (3), any terms and conditions applicable to a loan guarantee under this section may be modified by the Secretary to the extent he determines it to be consistent with the financial interest of the United States.

"(3) Any loan guarantee made by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be incontestable in the hands of an applicant on whose behalf such guarantee is made, and as to any person who makes or contracts to make a loan to such applicant in reliance thereon, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such applicant or such other person.

"(e) There is established in the Treasury a loan guarantee and interest subsidy fund (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the 'fund') which shall be available to the Secretary without fiscal year limitation, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts, (1) to enable him to discharge his responsibilities under guarantees issued by him under this section, and (2) for interest subsidy payments authorized by this section. There are authorized to be appropriated from time to time such amounts as may be necessary to provide the sums required for the fund; except that the amount appropriated for interest subsidy payments may not exceed $8,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $16,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $24,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. There shall also be deposited in the fund amounts received by the Secretary or other property or assets derived by him from his operations under this section, including any money derived from the sale of assets. If at any time the sums in the fund are insufficient to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities under guarantees issued by him under this section or to make interest subsidy payments authorized by this section, he is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but only in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase any notes and other obligations issued hereunder and for that purpose he may use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which the securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include any purchase of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this subsection. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Sums borrowed under this subsection shall be deposited in the fund and redemption of such notes and obligations shall be made by the Secretary from the fund.

"(f)(1) The cumulative total of the principal of the loans outstanding at any time with respect to which guarantees have been issued under this section may not exceed such limitations as may be specified in appropriation Acts.

"(2) In any fiscal year no loan guarantee may be made under subsection (a) and no agreement to make interest subsidy payments may be entered into under subsection (b) if the making of such guarantee or the entering into of such agreement would cause the cumulative total of—

"(A) the principal of the loans guaranteed under subsection (a) in such fiscal year, and

"(B) the principal of the loans for which no guarantee has been made under subsection (a) and with respect to which an agreement to make interest subsidy payments is entered into under subsection (b) in such fiscal year,

to exceed the amount of grant funds obligated under this part in such fiscal year; except that this paragraph shall not apply if the amount of grant funds obligated under this part in such fiscal year equals the sums appropriated for such fiscal year under section 720."

(e) APPLICATION PRIORITIES.—Section 721 (42 U.S.C. 293a) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(e) In the case of applications to aid in the construction of new schools of medicine, osteopathy, or dentistry, the Secretary shall give priority to those applications which contain or are reasonably supported by assurances that, because of the use that will be made of existing facilities (including Federal medical or dental facilities), the school will be able to accelerate the date on which it will begin its teaching program."

(f) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Sections 721(b)(2) and 723(a) (42 U.S.C. 293a(b)(2), 293c(a)) are each amended by striking out "625" and inserting in lieu thereof "605".

(2) Sections 721(b)(3) and 724(3) (42 U.S.C. 293a(b)(3), 293d(3)) are each amended by striking out "631" and inserting in lieu thereof "645".

(3) Section 721(c)(3) (42 U.S.C. 293a(c)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3)(A) in the case of an application for a grant to assist in the construction of new teaching facilities, such application is for aid in the construction of a new school of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, veterinary medicine, or public health, or construction which will expand the training capacity of an existing school of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, veterinary medicine, or public health, or (B) in the case of an application for a grant to assist in the replacement or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities, such application is for aid in construction which will replace or rehabilitate facilities of, or used by, an existing school of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, veterinary medicine, or public health, which facilities are so obsolete as to require the school to curtail substantially either its enrollment or the quality of the training provided (and, for purposes of this part, expansion or curtailment of capacity for continuing education shall also be considered expansion and curtailment, respectively, of training capacity);".

(4) Section 721(c)(6) (42 U.S.C. 293a(c)(6)) is amended by striking out "which is a hospital or diagnostic or treatment center, as defined in section 631" and inserting in lieu thereof "which is a hospital or outpatient facility, as defined in section 645".

(5) Section 722(d) (42 U.S.C. 293b(d)) is amended by striking out "(within the meaning of part A of this title) or for medical library purposes (within the meaning of part I of title III)" and inserting in lieu thereof "or for medical library purposes (within the meaning of part J of title III)".

(6) Section 723 (42 U.S.C. 293c) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively, and by inserting "or" at the end of paragraph (2) (as so redesignated).

(7) The heading for part B of title VII is amended by inserting "AND LOAN GUARANTEES" immediately after "GRANTS".

(8)(A) Part B (other than section 727 thereof) of title VII is amended by striking out "Surgeon General" each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(B) Section 722(b) (42 U.S.C. 293b(b)) is amended by striking out "Surgeon General's" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary's"; section 727(a) (42 U.S.C. 293g(a)) is amended by striking out "The Surgeon General, after consultation with the Council and with the approval of the Secretary" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary, after consultation with the Council"; and section 727(b) (42 U.S.C. 293g(b)) is amended by striking out "The Surgeon General is authorized to make, with the aprpoval of the Secretary" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary may make".

STUDENT LOANS

SEC. 104. (a) AUTHORIZATION LEVEL.—Subsection (a) of section 742 (42 U.S.C. 294b(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 742. (a) To enable the Secretary—

"(1) to make Federal capital contributions into the loan funds of schools which have established loan funds under this part,

"(2) to make payments into the fund established by sectiton 744(d), and

"(3) to make transfers under section 746, there are authorized to be appropriated $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan under this part for any academic year ending before July 1, 1974, to continue or complete their education."

(b) LOAN REPAYMENT AND FORGIVENESS.—

(1) Section 741(f) (42 U.S.C. 294a(f)) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) In the case of any individual—

"(1) who has received a degree of doctor of medicine, doctor of osteopathy, doctor of dentistry or an equivalent degree, doctor of veterinary medicine or an equivalent degree, doctor of optometry or an equivalent degree, bachelor of science in pharmacy or an equivalent degree, or doctor of podiatry or an equivalent degree;

"(2) who obtained (A) one or more loans from a loan fund established under this part, or (B) any other educational loan for his costs at a school of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, pharmacy, or podiatry for tuition, fees, books, supplies, and other related education expenses included under regulations of the Secretary; and

"(3) who enters into an agreement with the Secretary to practice his profession for a period of at least three years in an area in a State determined by the Secretary, after consultation with the appropriate State health authority, to have a shortage of and need for persons trained in his profession; the Secretary shall pay whichever is the least, $15,000, or up to 75 per centum of the outstanding principal and interest on the total of such loans upon completion by that individual of the practice specified in such agreement. The Secretary shall, on or before the due date thereof, pay any loan or loan installment which may fall due within the three-year period with respect to which the borrower has entered into an agreement with the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3), upon the declaration of such borrower, at such times and in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe (and supported by such other evidence as the Secretary may reasonably require), that the borrower is then engaged as described by paragraph (3), and that he will continue to be so engaged for the period required (in the absence of this sentence) to entitle him to have made the payments provided by this subsection for such period. A borrower who fails to fulfill an agreement with the Secretary entered into pursuant to paragraph (3) shall be liable to reimburse the Secretary for any payments made pursuant to the preceding sentence in consideration of such agreement."

(2) Section 741 of such Act is amended by

adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Upon application by a person who received, and is under an obligation to repay, any loan made to such person as a health professions student to enable him to study medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, pharmacy, or podiatry, the Secretary may undertake to repay (without liability to the applicant) all or any part of such loan, and any interest or portion thereof outstanding thereon, upon his determination, pursuant to regulations establishing criteria therefor, that the applicant—

"(1) failed to complete such studies leading to his first professional degree;

"(2) is in exceptionally needy circumstances;

"(3) is from a low-income background as that term may be defined by such regulations; and

"(4) has not resumed, or cannot reasonably be expected to resume, the study of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, pharmacy or podiatry within two years following the date upon which he terminated such studies."

(3) Notwithstanding the amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection to such section 741(f)—

(A) any person who obtained one or more loans from a loan fund estabilsed under part C of title VII of the Public Health Service Act, who before the date of the enactment of this title became eligible for cancellation of all or part of such loans (including accrued interest) under such section 741 (f) (as in effect on the day before such date), and who on such date was not engaged in a practice for which loan cancellation was authorized under such section (as so in effect), may at any time receive such cancellation in accordance with such section (as so in effect); and

(B) in the case of any person who obtained one or more loans from a loan fund established under such part C and who on such date was engaged in a practice for which cancellation of all or part of such loans (including accrued interest) was authorized under such section (as so in effect), such section (as so in effect) shall continue to apply to such person for purposes of providing such loan cancellation until he terminates such practice.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent any person from entering into an agreement for loan cancellation under section 741(f) of the Public Health Service Act (as amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection).

(c) LOAN CEILING.—Section 741(a) (42 U.S.C. 294a(a)) is amended by sriking out "$2,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,500".

(d) REPAYMENT AFTER TRAINING.—Section 741(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 294a(c)(2)) is amended by striking out "(up to five years").

(e) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 740(b)(4) (42 U.S.C. 294(b)(4)) is amended by striking out "1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1974".

(2) Section 743 (42 U.S.C. 294c) is amended by striking out "1974" each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "1977".

GRANTS TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE, DENTISTRY, OSTEOPATHY, PHARMACY, OPTOMETRY, PODIATRY, AND VETERINARY MEDICINE

SEC. 105. (a) AUTHORIZATION LEVEL.—Section 770 (42 U.S.C. 295f) is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 770. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated $245,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $284,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $343,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for institutional grants under section 771.

"(b) For the purpose of making payments under grants and contracts under section 772, there are authorized to be appropriated $118,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $138,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 and $156,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

(b) CAPITATION GRANTS.—Effective with respect to grants from appropriations under section 770(a) of the Public Health Service Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1971, section 771(a) (42 U.S.C. 295f–1(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 771. (a) From sums appropriated under section 770(a) for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall make grants to schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, veterinary medicine, and podiatry, with approved applications, computed as follows:

"(1) Each school of medicine (other than a school of medicine with a two-year course of study), osteopathy, and dentistry shall receive (A) $2,500 for each full-time first-year, second-year, and third-year student enrolled in such school in such year; (B) $1,000 for each full-time first-year student enrolled in such school in such year who represents an increase in the enrollment of first-year students in such school in such year over the enrollment of such students required by the first sentence of subsection (b)(1) and, if applicable, by section 721(c)(2)(D); and (C) $4,000 for each student enrolled in such school who will graduate (as determined by the Secretary in accordance with subsection (c)(1)) from such school in such year. Each school of medicine with a two-year course of study shall receive $2,500 for each full-time student enrolled in such school in such year and $1,000 for each full-time first-year student enrolled in such school in such year who represents an increase in the enrollment of first-year students in such school in such year over the enrollment of such students required by the first sentence of subsection (b)(1) and, if applicable, by section 721(c)(2)(D). No grant may be made on account of any student pursuant to clause (B) of this paragraph if a grant is made on account of him under section 774.

"(2) Each school of veterinary medicine shall receive $1,500 for each full-time student enrolled in such school in such year.

"(3) Each school of optometry shall receive $800 for each full-time student enrolled in such school in such year.

"(4) Each school of pharmacy (other than a school of pharmacy with a course of study of more than four years) shall receive $800 for each full-time student enrolled in such school in such year. Each school of pharmacy with more than a four-year course of study shall receive $800 for each full-time student enrolled in the last four years of such school.

"(5) Each school of podiatry shall receive $800 for each full-time student enrolled in such school in such year.

If the total of the grants to be made under this subsection for any fiscal year to schools with approved applications exceeds the amounts appropriated under section 770(a) for such grants, the amount of the grant for that fiscal year to each such school shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount determined for the school for that fiscal year under the applicable formula in this subsection as the total of the amounts appropriated under such section for that year bears to the amount required to make grants in accordance with the applicable formula to each school with an approved application."

(c) ENROLLMENT INCREASE.—Effective with respect to grants made under section 771 (42 U.S.C. 295f–1) for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1971, the first sentence of subsection (b)(1) of such section is amended by striking out "July 1, 1963, through June 30, 1968, by at least 2½ per centum of such average first year enrollment, or by five students" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1966, through June 30, 1971, by at least 5 per centum of such average first year enrollment, or by ten students".

(d) SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS.—Effective with respect to appropriations under section 770(b) of the Public Health Service Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1971, section 772 (42 U.S.C. 295f–2) is amended to read as follows:

"SPECIAL PROJECTS GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

"SEC. 772. (a) From appropriations made under section 770(b) the Secretary may make grants to assist schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, and veterinary medicine in meeting the costs of special projects to—

"(1) effect significant improvements in the curriculums of any such schools (including shortening the length of time required for training in such schools, with particular emphasis, in the case of schools of medicine or osteopathy, upon the establishment of new, or expansion of existing, programs for training in family medicine;

"(2) develop programs for cooperative interdisciplinary training among schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, nursing, public health, and allied health, including training for the use of the team approach to the delivery of health services;

"(3) develop and operate training programs, and train, for new roles, types, or levels of health personnel, including programs for the training of physicians' assistants and other health professions' assistants;

"(4) plan, develop, or establish new programs, or innovative modifications of existing programs, of education in such health professions, including the teaching of the organization, delivery, financing, or evaluation of health care;

"(5) research, develop, or demonstrate advances in the various fields related to education in such health professions;

"(6) assist in increasing the supply, or improving the distribution, by geographic area or specialty group, of adequately trained personnel in such health professions needed to meet the health needs of the Nation;

"(7) establish and operate programs at schools of medicine, osteopathy, or dentistry providing increased emphasis on, and training in, the science of clinical pharmacology, drug use and abuse, the assessment of the efficacy of various therapeutic regiments, and (in the case of schools of medicine and osteopathy) the science of nutrition;

"(8) establish and operate projects designed to identify, and increase admissions to and enrollment in schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine of, individuals whose background and interests make it reasonable to assume that they will engage in the practice of their health profession in rural or other areas having a severe shortage of personnel in such health profession;

"(9) establish and operate projects designed to increase admissions to and enrollment in such schools of qualified individuals from minority or low-income groups;

"(10) plan experimental teaching programs or facilities; or

"(11) provide traineeships (including costs of training and fees, stipends, and allowances for the students (including travel and subsistence expenses and dependency allowances)) for full-time students to secure part of their education under a preceptor in family practice, pediatrics, internal medicine, or other health fields designated by the Secretary, or in rural or other areas having a severe shortage of physicians.

The Secretary may also enter into contracts with public or private health or educational entities to carry out any project described in this subsection. Contracts may

be entered into under this subsection without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5).

"(b) For any fiscal year grants (not exceeding in the aggregate one-half of the amount appropriated under section 770(b) for such fiscal year) may be made to assist schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, and veterinary medicine which are in serious financial straits to meet operational costs required to maintain quality educational programs or which have special need for financial assistance to meet accreditation requirements. Any such grant may be made upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be reasonable and necessary, including requirements that the school agree (1) to disclose any financial information or data deemed by the Secretary to be necessary to determine the sources or causes of that school's financial distress, (2) to conduct a comprehensive cost analysis study in cooperation with the Secretary, and (3) to implement any operational and financial reforms recommended by the Secretary on the basis of information obtained in the course of the comprehensive cost analysis study or on the basis of other relevant information."

(e) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—Section 773 (d)(2) (42 U.S.C. 295f–3(d)(2)) is amended by striking out "or podiatry" and inserting in lieu thereof "pharmacy, podiatry, or veterinary medicine".

(f) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) (2) Section 773(e) (42 U.S.C. 295f–3(e)) is repealed.

(2) (3) The heading for part E of title VII is amended by striking out "AND PODIATRY" and inserting in lieu thereof "PHARMACY, PODIATRY, AND VETERINARY MEDICINE".

GRANTS FOR NEW SCHOOLS

SEC. 106. Part E of title VII is amended by inserting after section 773 the following new section:

"START-UP ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 774. (a) In the case of any new school of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry which begins instruction after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary may, after taking into account—

"(1) the ability of such school to use a grant under this section to (A) accelerate the date it will begin instruction, or (B) increase the number of students in its entering class, and

"(2) the other resources available to such school, make grants to such school to assist it in meeting the costs of providing instruction in each of its first three academic years of operation. No school may receive a grant under this section unless the Secretary estimates (on the basis of assurances provided by the school) that the number of full-time students enrolled in its first academic year of operation will exceed twenty-three.

"(b) The Secretary shall determine the amount of any grant under this section; but no grant to any school may exceed—

"(1) in the case of the school's first academic year of operation, an amount equal to the product of $7,500 and the number of full-time students which the Secretary estimates will be enrolled in such school in such year,

"(2) in the case of the school's second academic year of operation, an amount equal to the product of $5,000 and the number of full-time students which the Secretary estimates will be enrolled in such school in such year, and

"(3) in the case of the school's third academic year of operation, an amount equal to the product of $2,500 and the number of full-time students which the Secretary estimates will be enrolled in such school in such year.

Estimates by the Secretary under this subsection of the number of full-time students enrolled in a school may be made on the basis of assurances provided by the school.

"(c) The Secretary shall give special consideration to each application for grant assistance under this section for a school of medicine which contains or is reasonably supported by assurances that, because of the use that the school will make of existing facilities (including Federal medical or dental facilities), it will be able to accelerate the date on which it will begin its teaching program.

"(d) No grant may be made under this section unless an application therefor has been submitted to, and approved by, the Secretary. Such application shall be in such form, submitted in such manner, and contain such information, as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe. Payments under grants under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals and on such conditions, as the Secretary finds necessary.

"(e) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not to exceed $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and a like amount for each of the next two fiscal years. Sums appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended."

HEALTH MANPOWER EDUCATION INITIATIVE AWARDS

SEC. 107. (a) AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.—Part E of title VII is amended by inserting after the section 774 of such title added by section 106 the following new section:

"HEALTH MANPOWER EDUCATION INITIATIVE AWARDS

"SEC. 775. (a) In order to improve the distribution, supply, quality, utilization, and efficiency of health personnel and the health services delivery system, the Secretary may make grants to public or nonprofit private health or educational entities, and may enter into contracts with public or private health or educational entities, for programs or projects (including programs or projects to assist State, local, or other regional arrangements among schools and related organizations and institutions to carry out the objectives of this section)—

"(1) to encourage the establishment or maintenance of programs to alleviate shortages of health personnel in areas designated by the Secretary through training or retraining such personnel in facilities located in such areas or to otherwise improve the distribution of health personnel by area or by specialty group;

"(2) to provide training programs leading to more efficient utilization of health personnel;

"(3) to initiate new types and patterns or improve existing patterns of training, retraining, continuing education, and advanced training of health personnel, including teachers, administrators, specialists, and paraprofessionals (particularly physician's and dentist's assistants and pediatric nurse practitioners), and including establishment of area health education centers and other new organizational units for this purpose; and

"(4) to encourage new or more effective approaches to the organization and delivery of health services through training individuals in the use of the team approach to delivery of health services and otherwise.

Grants and contracts may also be made by the Secretary under this section for the discovery, collection, development, or confirmation of information for the planning, development, demonstration, establishment, or maintenance of any of such programs or projects. Contracts may be entered into under this subsection without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5). Each grant or contract under this section must be coordinated with the regional medical program for the area in which the grant or contract is carried out.

"(b) The Secretary may also make grants to public or nonprofit private health or educational entities to assist in meeting the costs of special projects to—

"(1) establish or operate projects designed to identify, and increase admissions to and enrollment in schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, and public health of, individuals whose background and interests make it reasonable to assume that they will engage in the practice of their health profession in rural or other areas having a severe shortage of personnel in such health profession; and

"(2) establish or operate projects designed to increase the admissions to and enrollment in such schools of qualified individuals from minority or low-income groups.

Of the sums appropriated to carry out this section, not more than 10 per centum, but in no event less than $5,000,000, shall be used to make grants under this subsection.

"(c) The Secretary may also make grants to public or nonprofit private entities for the alteration or renovation of existing facilities for any of the programs or projects described in subsection (a).

"(d) The amount of any grant under this section shall be determined by the Secretary. Payments under grants and contracts under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals and on such conditions, as the Secretary finds necessary.

"(e) For the purpose of making payments pursuant to grants and contracts under this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $135,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Sections 773 (b) 773(c), and 773(d) (42 U.S.C. 295f–3) are each amended by striking out "grant under this part" and inserting in lieu thereof "grant under section 771 or 772".

SCHOLARSHIP GRANTS TO SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE, OSTEOPATHY, DENTISTRY, OPTOMETRY, PODIATRY, PHARMACY, AND VETERINARY MEDICINE

SEC. 108. (a) Effective with respect to scholarship grants made under subsection (a) of section 780 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 295g) for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1971—

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

"(b) The amount of the grant under subsection (a) to each such school for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, shall be equal to $3,000 multiplied by one-tenth of the number of full-time students of such school and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and the next fiscal year shall be equal to $3,000 multiplied by the number of full-time students of such school who are from low-income backgrounds as determined under regulations of the Secretary. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the grant under subsection (a) shall be such amount as may be necessary to enable such school to continue making payments under scholarship awards to students who initially received such awards out of grants made to the school for fiscal years ending before July 1, 1974.";

(2) subsection (c)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) Scholarships may be awarded by schools from grants under subsection (a)—

"(A) only to individuals who have been accepted by them for enrollment as full-time first-year students and to individuals enrolled and in good standing as full-time students, in the case of awards from such grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and each of the next two fiscal years; and

"(B) only to individuals enrolled and in good standing as full-time students who ini-

tially received scholarship awards out of such grants for a fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1974, in the case of awards from such grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, or the two succeeding fiscal years."; and

(3) subsection (c)(2) is amended by striking out "$2,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,500".

(b) Effective July 1, 1972, the first sentence of subsection (c)(2) of such section 780 is amended to read as follows: "Scholarships from grants under subsection (a) for any school year shall be awarded only to students of exceptional financial need who are from low-income backgrounds as determined under regulations of the Secretary, and who need such financial assistance to pursue a course of study at the school for such year, except that scholarships from such grants may be awarded to any student of exceptional need to enable him to pursue such course of study if he has received such a scholarship for a school year ending prior to July 1, 1972."

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATION

SEC. 109. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL.—Section 725 (42 U.S.C. 293e) is amended to read as follows:

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATION

"SEC. 725. (a) There is established in the Public Health Service a National Advisory Council on Health Professions Education (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Council'), consisting of the Secretary (or his delegate), who shall be Chairman of the Council, and twenty members appointed by the Secretary (without regard to the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code relating to appointments in the competitive service) from persons who because of their education, experience, or training are particularly qualified to advise the Secretary with respect to the programs of assistance authorized by parts A, B, C, E, and F of this title. At least four of the appointed members shall be selected from the general public and two shall be selected from among full-time students enrolled in health professions schools.

"(b) The Council shall advise the Secretary in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title (other than part G thereof).

"(c) The Secretary may use the services of any member or members of the Council in connection with matters related to the administration of this title (other than part G thereof), for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The last sentence of section 721(c) (42 U.S.C. 293a(c)) is amended by striking out "on Education for Health Professions" and inserting in lieu thereof "on Health Professions Education".

(2)(A) Section 774 (42 U.S.C. 295f–4), as in effect immediately before the date of enactment of this title, is repealed.

(B) Section 773(c) (42 U.S.C. 295f–3(c)) is amended by striking out "National Advisory Council on Health Professions Educational Assistance (established by section 774)" and inserting in lieu thereof "National Advisory Council on Health Professions Education (established by section 725)".

(C) Section 780(d) (42 U.S.C. 295g(d)) is amended by striking out "National Advisory Council on Health Professions Educational Assistance" and inserting in lieu thereof "National Advisory Council on Health Professions Education (established by section 725)".

REPORT

SEC. 110. The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Congress, prior to June 30, 1974, a final report on the administration of title VII of the Public Health Service Act which shall include an estimate of increases in the number of persons entering the health professions effected under such title prior to the enactment under such title prior to the enactment of this Act; an estimate of such increases effected in consequence of the enactment of this Act; an estimate of the numbers of practitioners of such professions in relation to the need of the public therefor; and an appraisal of title VII, as amended by this Act, to meet long-term national needs for health professionals. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a first interim report prior to June 30, 1973, and a second interim report prior to January 31, 1974, describing his preliminary findings in the preparation of his final report.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

JOINT FUNDING

SEC. 201. Section 310A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242i) is amended by striking out "title IX" and inserting in lieu thereof "titles VII, VIII, and IX".

ADVANCE FUNDING

SEC. 202. Section 799 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 295h–8) is amended by striking out "this part" and inserting in lieu thereof "this title".

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 203. (a) Subsection (f) of section 208 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "section 207(f)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (g)".

(b) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 217 of such Act is amended by striking out "Council on Alcoholic Abuse" and inserting in lieu thereof "Council on Alcohol Abuse".

(c) The section 223 of such Act (added by section 4 of Public Law 91–623) is redesignated as section 224.

(d) (1) Section 382 of such Act is amended by inserting "Secretary" before ", through the Library" in subsection (a) thereof; by inserting "Secretary" before "may exchange" in subsection (b) thereof; and by inserting "Secretary" before "is authorized" in subsection (c) thereof.

(2)(A) Section 383 of such Act is amended by inserting "Secretary" after "The" in the last sentence of subsection (a) thereof; by inserting "Secretary" after "recommendations to the" in the first sentence of subsection (b) thereof; by inserting "Secretary" after "users, and the" in such sentence; by inserting "Secretary" after "The" in the last sentence of such subsection; and by striking out subsection (d) thereof.

(3) Section 386 of such Act is amended by inserting "Secretary" after "selected by the".

(4) Subsection (a) of section 388 of such Act is amended by inserting "Secretary" after "Whenever the" and by striking out "section 398" in paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 397".

(e) Subsection (d) of section 722 of such Act is amended by striking out "part I of title III" and inserting in lieu thereof "part J of title III".

(f) Section 794(a)(2)(D) of such Act is amended by striking out "or pursuant to part B of the title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965" after "1958".

(g) Section 795(1) of such Act is amended by inserting "and" at the end of clause (C); by striking out "and" at the end of clause (D); and by striking out clause (E).

(h) Parts E and F of title VII of such Act are each amended by striking out "Surgeon General" each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE CLEAN AIR ACT

SEC. 204. (a) Section 307(a)(1) of the Clean Air Act is amended by striking out "210(c)(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "211(c)(3)".

(b) Section 113(b)(2) of such Act is amended by inserting "(A)" before "during", and by inserting ", or (B)" after "assumed enforcement".

(c) Section 113(c)(1)(A) of such Act is amended by inserting "(i)" before "during" and by inserting ", or (ii)" after "assumed enforcement".

(d) Section 211(c)(3)(A) of such Act is amended by inserting "obtaining" after "purpose of".

(e) Section 211(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "under subsection (c)" at the second place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "under subsection (b)".

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO OTHER ACTS

SEC. 205. (a) The fourth sentence of section 408(g) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by striking out ", which the Secretary shall by rules and regulations prescribe,".

(b) Paragraph (c) of section 136 of the Development Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act is amended by striking out "section 134" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 135".

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

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, beginning in line 6, strike out "Part A of title VII" and all that follows down through and including line 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

AUTHORIZATION OF PROJECT GRANTS.—Part F of title VII is amended by adding after section 781 (42 U.S.C. 295g–1) the following new sections:

Page 2, line 14, strike out "701" and insert in lieu thereof "785".

Page 3, line 6, strike out "TO HOSPITALS".

Page 3, line 8, strike out "702" and insert in lieu thereof "786".

Page 3, line 13, insert "or other health or educational entity" after "hospital".

Page 3, line 14, strike out "a" and insert in lieu thereof "an approved".

Page 3, line 16, insert immediately before the closed parentheses the following: "and approved residency programs in family practice".

Page 3, beginning in line 22, strike out "a program of such hospital which provides professional training in the field of family medicine" and insert in lieu thereof "any such program".

Page 4, line 2, insert "approved" after "other".

Page 4, insert at the end of line 4 the following: "RELATING TO SECTIONS 785 AND 786".

Page 4, line 5, strike out "703" and insert in lieu thereof "787".

Page 4, strike out "this part" in lines 5, 10, and 20 and insert in lieu thereof "section 785 or 786".

Page 4, strike out line 25 and all that follows down through and including line 5 on page 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

"(1) Section 780(a) (42 U.S.C. 295g(a)) is amended by striking out 'this part' and inserting in lieu thereof 'this section'; and section 781 (42 U.S.C. 295g–1) is amended

by striking out 'this part' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 780.'

"(2) Section 746 (42 U.S.C. 294f) is amended by striking out 'under part F of this title' and inserting in lieu thereof 'under section 780'.

"(3) The heading for part F of title VII is amended by adding at the end the following: '; GRANTS FOR TRAINING, TRAINEESHIPS, AND FELLOWSHIPS'."

Page 5, insert at the end of line 8 the following: "; EXTENSION OF PART A".

Page 5, insert at the end of line 15 the following: "for grants under part A of this title,".

Page 15, beginning in line 1, strike out "(within the meaning of part A of this title)".

Page 16, insert after line 4 the following:

"(g) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO PART A.—

"(1) Section 705(a) (42 U.S.C. 292d(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 705. (a) The Secretary may from time to time set dates (not earlier than in the fiscal year preceding the year for which a grant is sought) by which applications for grants under this part for any fiscal year must be filed.

"'(2)(A) Part A of title VII (other than sections 703(a) and 709 thereof) is amended by striking out "Surgeon General" each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

"'(B) The first sentence of section 703(a) (42 U.S.C. 292b(a)) is amended by striking out "Surgeon General of the Public Health Service" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary (or his delegate)".

"'(C) Section 706(b) (42 U.S.C. 292e(b)) is amended by striking out "Surgeon General's" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary's".

"'(D) Section 709(a) (42 U.S.C. 292h(a)) is amended by striking out "Surgeon General, after consultation with the Council and with the approval of the Secretary," and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and section 709(b) (42 U.S.C. 292h(b)) is amended by striking out 'Surgeon General is authorized to make, with the approval of "the Secretary," and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary may make".'"

Page 17, strike out line 24 and all that follows down through and including line 3 on page 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the Secretary shall upon completion by that individual of the practice specified in such agreement pay, for and on his behalf, the principal of and interest on any loan of his described in paragraph (2) which is outstanding on the date he begins such practice; except that the total amount of principal of loans of any such individual which the Secretary may repay under this subsection may not exceed the lesser of $15,000 or 75 per centum of the total amount of principal of such individual's loans outstanding on such date. Notwithstanding the requirement of completion of practice, the Secretary".

Page 23, line 9, insert "or pursuant to the corresponding provision of the preceding sentence" immediately after "paragraph".

Page 24, strike out lines 14 through 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) ENROLLMENT INCREASE.—Effective with respect to grants made under section 771 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 295f–1) for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1971—

"(1) the first sentence of subsection (b)(1) of such section is amended by striking out 'will exceed the average of the first-year enrollments' and all that follows in that sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'will exceed the first-year enrollment of such students in such school in the school year beginning during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, by at least 5 per centum of such enrollment, or by ten students, whichever is greater.', and

"(2) subsection (b)(1) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In those instances where enrollment increases proposed exceed the requirements of this paragraph, the Secretary shall satisfy himself, after consultation with the appropriate accreditation body or bodies (as defined in section 721(b)(1)), that there is reasonable assurance that such expanded program will meet the accreditation standards of such body or bodies.'"

Page 28, insert after line 21 the following:

"(1) Section 771(d) (42 U.S.C. 295f–1(d)) is amended by striking out 'subparagraph (a)(1)(A)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsection (a)'."

Page 28, line 22, strike out "(1)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

Page 28, line 24, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)".

Page 30, line 21, strike out "of medicine".

Page 37, line 14, strike out "A,".

Page 37, strike out "part" in lines 21 and 24 and insert in lieu thereof "parts A and".

Page 38, insert after line 10 the following:

"(B) Section 771(b)(1) (42 U.S.C. 295f–1(b)(1)) is amended by striking out 'on Health Professions Educational Assistance' and inserting in lieu thereof 'on Health Professions Education'."

Page 38, line 11, strike out "(B)" and insert in lieu thereof "(C)".

Page 38, line 17, strike out "(C)" and insert in lieu thereof "(D)".

Page 41, strike out lines 1 through 3.

Page 41, line 4, strike out "(f)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

Page 41, line 7, strike out "(g)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

Page 41, line 10, strike out "(h)" and insert in lieu thereof "(g)".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. GREEN OF OREGON

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

Page 5, line 7, strike out the quotation marks and add after that line the following:

DISCRIMINATION ON BASIS OF SEX PROHIBITED

"SEC. 788. The Secretary may not make a grant, loan guarantee, or interest subsidy payment under this title to, or for the benefit of, any school of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, pharmacy, podiatry, or public health or any training center for allied health personnel unless the application for the grant, loan guarantee, or interest subsidy payment contains assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the school or training center will not discriminate on the basis of sex in the admission of individuals to its training programs. The Secretary may not enter into a contract under this title with any such school or training center unless the school or training center furnishes assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that it will not discriminate on the basis of sex in the admission of individuals to its training programs."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her amendment.

Mr. STAGGERS. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I will be very happy to yield to the very distinguished chairman of this committee.

Mr. STAGGERS. The committee on this side of the aisle and I assume on the other side is willing to accept this amendment.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, the minority accepts the amendment.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen very much.

Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted a moment, I want to commend the committee for its remarkable work in bringing out this bill. I want to pay my deepest respects not only to the very distinguished chairman of the committee (Mr. STAGGERS) but also the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) who has done such yeoman work in this area over a long period of time.

This is legislation that we can all support wholeheartedly, and I think the Nation itself is in debt to these gentlemen and the other members of the committee on a bipartisan basis for bringing this legislation to the floor to provide the necessary health personnel.

Mr. Chairman, since the amendment has been accepted by the very able chairman, Mr. STAGGERS and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER), I will not take the committee's time now, but ask to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

In previous discussions with the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee, I said I hoped to offer this amendment so that the doors of the medical, dental, and other health professions could and would be opened wider to those women who want to enter these professions.

In hearings last year before the Special Subcommittee on Education on the subject of discrimination against women, testimony and evidence was gathered which showed clearly the patterns of discrimination against women in various segments of our society. Some of the strongest and most conclusive evidence was presented in regard to discriminatory practices in higher education and the professions. Within this general categeory, a comparison was offered showing the increase in the number of degrees earned by women at all levels and those earned by women in selected health professions between 1956 and 1965. Although the number of doctoral degrees in all fields awarded to women doubled in this period, the number of degrees in medicine and osteopathy earned by women rose by only about one-third—34.8 percent—one of the smallest growths in any field. In the other health fields indicated, the results were generally similar or worse, with pharmacy showing an increase of 37.9 percent, optometry showing no change, and dentistry showing a decrease of 32.4 percent. Only the field of veterinary medicine showed a significant increase, 150 percent.

For the sake of brevity, let me turn to just one of these fields, the practice of medicine, to describe briefly a case in support of this amendment.

It is widely accepted by women and men physicians alike that medicine is a profession well suited to the skills and temperament of women. Indeed, as long ago as the 16th century, John Halle described among the properties of the surgeon that he have a—

Heart as the heart of a lion, eyes like the eyes of the hawk, and his hands the hands of a woman.

In spite of this natural suitability, only 9 percent of American physicians are women. This is not due to lack of interest as indicated in applications from women to schools of medicine. Indeed, over the past 36 years, women applicants to medical schools have increased over 300 percent, while men applicants have increased only 29 percent. Nevertheless, the proportion of women accepted has fallen from 66 percent in 1929–30 to 48 percent in 1965–66.

Faced with evidence of this nature, one must ask whether the admissions policies of medical schools across the country are, in fact, discriminatory against women—whether a persistence of limited admission of women to medical schools stems from discriminatory medical school admissions policies.

Evidence to substantiate such a charge is not overly difficult to find. For example, one study, made by an assistant dean of one medical school, covering 25 Northeastern medical schools, found that 19 of the 25 readily admitted that they accepted men in preference to women unless the women were demonstrably superior—that women are not judged on an equal competiitve basis, but are placed in a disadvantageous sex category requiring special justification for acceptance. Further evidence can be found in the 1968–69 edition of "Medical School Admission Requirements," published by the Association of American Medical Colleges. Among the medical schools listing their admission requirements, none admitted to racial prejudice, although some have never had a Negro graduate, but four openly expressed discrimination against women.

In most of the others, while not openly admittiing discrimination, their enrollment statistics would indicate otherwise. For if, as the enforcement division of civil rights has, time after time ruled, that the absence or significant under-representation of minority groups is, in itself proof of discrimination, then one must accept the existence of a conscious and deliberate practice of discrimination against the admission of women to medical schools across the country.

But in addition to the injustice to women, there is perhaps a greater, more serious injustice to be taken into account. This is an injustice to every person—one based on the desperate shortage of physicians and other health professionals—a shortage to which this legislation is most ably addressed.

In its report, "Facts on Prospective and Practicing Women in Medicine," the Department of Labor said in 1968:

The need for larger numbers of well-trained and able men and women in the health professions is of great national concern. . . . This is an area in which we need to make maximum use of all our human resources, to urge that an increasing number of boys and girls with the ability to qualify as physicians be encouraged to pursue such a career, to make it possible both educationally and financially for those with the potential to qualify in this demanding profession, so that all our people may have the professional services they seek.

To ignore, in the face of this crisis, half our population, women, representing a brainpower virtually untapped by the medical schools, and to increase the number of medical students, but in doing so, limit ourselves to drawing on the male applicant pool that would have been rejected by medical schools under current standards, we will be guilty of not only supporting discrimination, but of jeopardizing the quality of medical care in this country and the very lives of those requiring that care. This, gentlemen, is clearly and totally inexcusable and unacceptable.

In closing, let me quote from a NIH study which raises one further aspect of the problem, the relative position of the United States among the nations of the world in offering opportunities for women in the medical professions:

The fact is that education conditions and climate appear to be considerably more humane, intelligent and flexible outside the United States for the woman medical student or doctor. . . . Since America is the leader in so many areas of education, its "backwardness" in this area becomes all the more startling, disturbing, and troublesome.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I join with Mrs. GREEN in supporting this amendment and in complimenting Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. ROGERS, and all members of the committee for accepting it.

This amendment recognizes that under-representation of women in the medical and health professions is a serious problem. Women now make up only about 7 percent of the Nation's doctors. Few young women are encouraged in grade school, high school, or college to go into medicine. Many of them believe the admissions deck at medical schools is stacked against them and, I believe they are right. Certainly, most schools accept a certain percentage of the women who are brave enough to apply, but it is also true—as Dr. Harold I. Kaplan, professor of psychiatry at New York Medical College recently revealed in a study of medical school attitudes toward women—that most schools impose an unofficial quota on the number of women, no matter how qualified, they will agree to accept.

But whatever the reason for discrimination against women, a nation facing a shortage of qualified health personnel can ill afford to waste its womanpower. We need positive encouragement for women to enter all aspects of the health profession, and positive recognition of the contribution they can make. That is what Mr. ROGERS' amendment will provide.

The amendment provides that no medical school will receive a Federal grant under this program unless it assures the Secretary of HEW that it does not discriminate against women. It is my understanding that "assurances satisfactory to the Secretary" means that the school must provide some kind of affirmative action plan—that is, some assurance that the school is making a positive effort to end its under-representation of women. I would assume, of course, that requirements for such a positive program would be more fully outlined by the Secretary—so that medical schools would know, with some degree of certainty, what the Secretary would expect of them in terms of an affirmative plan.

I am delighted to see this kind of amendment, with this kind of mandate for action, being recommended here today. Women across the Nation will be encouraged to see that positive steps are being taken to eradicate discrimination in one of the professions traditionally closed to many of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAY, 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. 8629) to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to provide increased manpower for the health professions, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 481, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 343, nays 3, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

YEAS—343

Abbitt	Betts	Byron
Abernethy	Bevill	Cabell
Abourezk	Biaggi	Camp
Abzug	Biester	Carey, N.Y.
Addabbo	Blackburn	Carney
Anderson, Calif.	Blanton	Carter
	Blatnik	Casey, Tex.
Anderson, Ill.	Boggs	Chamberlain
Anderson, Tenn.	Boland	Chappell
	Bolling	Chisholm
Andrews, Ala.	Brademas	Clancy
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brinkley	Clark
	Brooks	Clausen, Don H.
Annunzio	Broomfield	
Archer	Brotzman	Clawson, Del
Arends	Brown, Mich.	Clay
Ashbrook	Brown, Ohio	Cleveland
Ashley	Broyhill, N.C.	Collins, Ill.
Aspin	Burke, Fla.	Colmer
Aspinall	Burke, Mass.	Conte
Badillo	Burleson, Tex.	Conyers
Begich	Burlison, Mo.	Coughlin
Belcher	Burton	Culver
Bennett	Byrne, Pa.	Daniel, Va.
Bergland	Byrnes, Wis.	Daniels, N.J.

Danielson	Jones, N.C.	Roberts
Davis, S.C.	Karth	Robinson, Va.
Davis, Wis.	Kastenmeier	Robison, N.Y.
Delaney	Kazen	Rodino
Dellenback	Keating	Rogers
Dellums	Kee	Roncalio
Denholm	King	Rooney, N.Y.
Dennis	Koch	Rooney, Pa.
Derwinski	Kyl	Rosenthal
Dickinson	Kyros	Rostenkowski
Dingell	Leggett	Roush
Dorn	Lent	Roy
Dow	Link	Roybal
Downing	Lloyd	Ruth
Drinan	McClory	Ryan
Dulski	McCloskey	St Germain
Duncan	McCollister	Sarbanes
du Pont	McCormack	Satterfield
Dwyer	McDade	Scherle
Eckhardt	McEwen	Scheuer
Edmondson	McFall	Schneebeli
Edwards, Ala.	McKay	Schwengel
Edwards, Calif.	McKevitt	Scott
Eilberg	McKinney	Sebelius
Esch	Macdonald, Mass.	Seiberling
Eshleman	Madden	Shipley
Evans, Colo.	Mahon	Shoup
Evins, Tenn.	Mailliard	Shriver
Fascell	Mann	Sisk
Findley	Mathias, Calif.	Skubitz
Fish	Mathis, Ga.	Slack
Fisher	Matsunaga	Smith, Calif.
Flood	Mayne	Smith, Iowa
Flowers	Mazzoli	Smith, N.Y.
Ford, Gerald R.	Meeds	Snyder
Ford, William D.	Metcalfe	Spence
Forsythe	Michel	Springer
Fountain	Mikva	Stafford
Fraser	Miller, Calif.	Staggers
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Ohio	Stanton, J. William
Frenzel	Mills, Md.	Stanton, James V.
Frey	Minish	Steed
Fulton, Pa.	Mink	Steele
Fulton, Tenn.	Minshall	Steiger, Wis.
Fuqua	Mitchell	Stokes
Galifianakis	Mizell	Stubblefield
Gallagher	Mollohan	Stuckey
Garmatz	Monagan	Sullivan
Gaydos	Montgomery	Symington
Gettys	Morgan	Talcott
Giaimo	Morse	Teague, Calif.
Gibbons	Mosher	Teague, Tex.
Goldwater	Moss	Terry
Gonzalez	Murphy, Ill.	Thompson, Ga.
Goodling	Murphy, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.
Grasso	Myers	Thomson, Wis.
Gray	Natcher	Thone
Green, Oreg.	Nedzi	Tiernan
Green, Pa.	Nelsen	Udall
Griffin	Nichols	Ullman
Gross	Nix	Van Deerlin
Grover	Obey	Vander Jagt
Gubser	O'Hara	Vanik
Gude	O'Konski	Veysey
Haley	O'Neill	Vigorito
Halpern	Patman	Waggonner
Hammer-schmidt	Patten	Waldie
Hanley	Pelly	Ware
Hanna	Pepper	Whalen
Harrington	Perkins	Whalley
Harsha	Peyser	White
Harvey	Pickle	Whitehurst
Hastings	Pike	Whitten
Hays	Pirnie	Widnall
Hechler, W. Va.	Poage	Wiggins
Helstoski	Podell	Williams
Henderson	Powell	Winn
Hicks, Mass.	Preyer, N.C.	Wolff
Hicks, Wash.	Price, Ill.	Wright
Hillis	Price, Tex.	Wyatt
Hogan	Pryor, Ark.	Wylie
Holifield	Pucinski	Wyman
Horton	Quie	Yates
Hosmer	Quillen	Yatron
Howard	Railsback	Young, Fla.
Hungate	Rangel	Young, Tex.
Hunt	Rarick	Zablocki
Hutchinson	Rees	Zion
Jacobs	Reid, Ill.	Zwach
Johnson, Pa.	Reid, N.Y.	
Jones, Ala.	Reuss	
	Riegle	

NAYS—3

Crane	Landgrebe	Schmitz

NOT VOTING—87

Adams	Brasco	Collins, Tex.
Alexander	Bray	Conable
Baker	Broyhill, Va.	Corman
Baring	Buchanan	Cotter
Barrett	Caffery	Davis, Ga.
Bell	Cederberg	de la Garza
Bingham	Celler	Dent
Bow	Collier	Devine
Diggs	Jones, Tenn.	Poff
Donohue	Keith	Purcell
Dowdy	Kemp	Randall
Edwards, La.	Kluczynski	Rhodes
Erlenborn	Kuykendall	Roe
Flynt	Landrum	Rousselot
Foley	Latta	Runnels
Griffiths	Lennon	Ruppe
Hagan	Long, La.	Sandman
Hall	Long, Md.	Saylor
Hamilton	Lujan	Sikes
Hansen, Idaho	McClure	Steiger, Ariz.
Hansen, Wash.	McCulloch	Stephens
Hathaway	McDonald, Mich.	Stratton
Hawkins	McMillan	Taylor
Hébert	Martin	Wampler
Heckler, Mass.	Melcher	Watts
Hull	Mills, Ark.	Wilson, Bob
Ichord	Moorhead	Wilson, Charles H.
Jarman	Passman	Wydler
Johnson, Calif.	Pettis	
Jonas		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Roe with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Collins of Texas.
Mr. Donohue with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Kemp.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Devine.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. McClure.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Foley.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Long of Indiana.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Diggs.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Adams.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Poff.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN PUNCTUATION, SPELLING, AND CROSS REFERENCES IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 8629

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill H.R. 8629 the Clerk be authorized to make corrections in punctuation, spelling, and cross references.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, during the last vote I was on official business at the White House. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

NURSE TRAINING ACT OF 1971

Mr. STAGGERS. 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. 8630) to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to provide training increased numbers of nurses.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

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. 8630, with Mr. GRAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8630, the proposed Nurse Training Act of 1971.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides a 3-year extension, with modifications of the existing programs under the Nurse Training Act. The bill authorizes a total of $710 million over a 3-year period for continuation of existing programs of assistance to schools of nursing and to students at those schools.

A new feature has been added to the programs under existing law by this bill. The committee established a similar program in 1964, but because of lack of funds, and restrictions on the program, it was not successful in preventing the closing of diploma schools of nursing. As set forth in this year's bill, this pro-

gram, which would provide capitation grants to all schools of nursing in the amount of $200 for each student, plus $500 for each graduate, would provide assistance to schools in amounts sufficient, we believe, to continue existing schools in operation which might otherwise have to close because of lack of funds. This program would cost $169 million over a 3-year period. In addition, the legislation provides specific authority for startup grants to new schools of nursing authorizing $24 million for this program.

Existing law authorizes matching grants for construction of teaching facilities, and grants for special projects at schools of nursing plus traineeships to train teachers, and loans and scholarships for students. All these programs are continued by the legislation reported by the committee, with modifications to improve and expand the authority which they contain.

It is estimated, Mr. Chairman, that there are 700,000 nurses in active practice today, and that 150,000 more are needed. By 1980 it is expected that we will need 1,100,000 nurses. We believe that if this legislation is passed, and is funded at the levels authorized, we will meet these goals.

I know of no opposition to the legislation and recommend its approval, and I hope it will receive an affirmative vote from every Member of the House of Representatives.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the committee, the chairman of the full committee, and the chairman of the subcommittee, for bringing forth this very important bill. I also wish to join with the gentleman from West Virginia in asking for unanimous approval of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8630, the Nurse Training Act of 1971.

This is a highly essential program not only for the students involved but also for the country as a whole. The passage of this legislation, continuing and expanding the present title VIII program under the Public Health Service Act, will provide for the education of 1 million nurses in the decade of the seventies. We all know of the critical shortage of nurses and medical personnel in hospitals and nursing homes across this country. My own State of Hawaii is no exception.

H.R. 8630 provides for funds to institutions as well as to the students in training; $105 million over the next 3 years are provided for construction grants for new facilities and for the replacement of obsolete ones—$7 million are also provided over the next 3 years for interest subsidies to assist nonprofit private schools of nursing. Together it is expected that an additional 5,800 first year spaces will be provided.

In addition, $169 million over 3 fiscal years will be provided to nursing schools on a per capita basis. Schools will be eligible for these grants if their first year enrollment increases by at least 5 percent or 10 students whichever is greater—$24 million are also provided for startup grants in the 3 fiscal years for new programs in nurse training. Each grant may not exceed $100,000—$66 million is provided over the 3 years for advanced traineeships. These funds will increase by 13,500 the number of nurses available to assist in the training of students.

The portion of the bill in which I am most interested deals with direct loans to the students—$75 million is provided over the 3-year period for loans. The maximum loan each year is presently $1,500. This bill increases this to $2,500 with the aggregate increased accordingly to $10,000 for the full period of training.

Up to $10,000 or 75 percent, whichever is higher, may be forgiven, if the nurse practices in a shortage area for a period of at least 3 years.

In addition, 50 percent of the total loan and its interest, at the rate of 10 percent of the loan each year, may be forgiven for each year of full-time employment as a nurse in a public or nonprofit institution.

The amount of loan money provided by this bill will allow 82,000 loans for students—$57 million is also provided for the 3 years for scholarships. Each grant to a student who qualifies may not exceed $2,000 per year. This money will provide for 102,000 scholarship grants.

The future health of our Nation is dependent upon the enactment of this bill. If we are to meet the growing demands for health care, we must approve this legislation today. I urge my colleagues to support this most vital bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that, as usual, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment considered the bill at great length and has done its usual good job under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS). All the members of that committee worked together on both sides of the aisle very harmoniously and I want to commend them and thank them on behalf of the people of America for the job they have done, not only on these two bills today, but on all previous bills and those I am sure they will bring to the floor of the House in the future.

As I mentioned in connection with the health manpower bill, I think the American people owe a great debt of gratitude to those gentlemen for the legislation they have brought to the full committee and through us to the House. Health is of vital concern to all of us, and the actions by this subcommittee, and its members, will help insure the achievement of the goal of adequate health care for all of our citizens.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The needs of this Nation for better medical care and for more available medical care depend entirely upon our ability to produce more and better health manpower. The nursing profession is critical to this effort, and it is hardly necessary to point out that despite determined efforts over the last few years to increase the numbers of nurses both relatively and absolutely, there still remains and will remain a shortage. The need is both qualitative and quantitative, and this bill now before us deals with both problems.

It has been true that nursing care is the most universally used of the health-care services. It is also used more intensively and over a longer period of time than any other single health service. As the number of citizens at each end of the life span increases in proportion to the entire population, the need for nurses will rise.

I do not intend to suggest that past efforts in the field of nurse training and present laws and programs have been ineffective. On the contrary. Since 1958 total admissions to nursing schools have nearly doubled. Although the numbers attending the traditional diploma schools have decreased, the number being taught in the associate degree programs in our community colleges has risen from the insignificant number of 953 in 1958 to a present enrollment of well over 25,000. Baccalaureate programs now accommodate more than three times as many students of nursing as in 1958. But the need keeps moving ahead. In 1980 we shall require about 1,100,000 nurses. Adequate solutions to the intricate problems of health care cannot be imagined without the presence of skilled nursing personnel.

The bill before us today is not a new idea. It is an extension and improvement upon an already proven good idea. As the Nurse Training Act has progressed, and as we have considered it over the years, new features have been added. Time has proven that the changes we have made have been helpful and productive. We can be thankful that we have made the progress to this date. If we had not done so, the problem of increasing the supply of nurses for the future might well be beyond solution. As it is we can expect to win the battle.

There have been 145 construction grants under the law and 6,000 additional first-year places in the schools have resulted. There are 34 construction projects awaiting funds, and these could give us 2,000 more places. Although this progress is most encouraging it can fairly be said that continued progress requires not only a continuation of the nurse training program but acceleration of it. So let us look at the basic provisions of the bill now under consideration.

Construction grants have always been a part of the nurse training program, but in the early versions they were available only for college facilities to produce nurses with baccalaureate degrees. It became obvious that the bulk of nurse manpower would be trained in the junior colleges and community colleges, and for some years to come in diploma schools. In view of the vital need for this profession, construction support was expanded to all three types of nursing schools.

As I have pointed out, it now appears that the best bet for the future lies in the programs being doubled for associate degrees wherein a community college supplies the academic courses and a hospital will supply practical training. The bill provides $30 million for fiscal 1972 for such grants and $75 million over the next 2 fiscal years.

There are very few schools that can be expected to develop without some funds in the way of construction grants. Many will need additional funds which cannot be obtained at the time of construction from ordinary sources. A school, because of its nonprofit characteristics, is not an ideal subject for a conventional bank loan. For this reason, a loan guarantee program is added to the grant program. Construction grants are restricted to 75 percent of total construction cost, and guaranteed loans may be negotiated for another 15 percent for a total of 90 percent of construction costs. The portion which is obtained from lending institutions with a Government guarantee is also subject to an interest subsidy up to 3 percent. The cost to the Government of keeping the interest down to practical limits for these projects is minimal. For the entire 3-year period of this program such subsidies are estimated at $7 million.

Schools once built are a long way from being strong and healthy going institutions, and the need for additional assistance has been clearly demonstrated. Some of this additional assistance included in the bill is pure Government help. Other sorts of additional assistance are in the form of incentives to innovation and improvement. In the first category are the capitation grants and the startup grants. Capitation grants will supply to each nursing school each year $200 times the number of students enrolled an $500 times the number who will graduate.

From the very beginning it has been a basic principle of assistance to health professions schools that more students must be enrolled and graduated if the expenditures of taxpayers' money are to be justified. This bill doubles the present requirement for student enrollment increases. A school must produce an increase of 5 percent or 10 students each year, and the base period upon which this percentage is figured has been updated to further tighten the requirement.

We have heard from some of the nursing schools that the capitation grants which I have just outlined are not nearly adequate. It was the considered judgment of the committee, however, that with the other types of assistance being made available by this bill the capitation grants at the $200 level are appropriate.

After construction is completed and before students can be enrolled to justify the capitation grants, there are many expenses which must be met especially in the form of equipment. The committee has found in the past in this program and in similar programs that schools have found it possible to establish their physical plant and then be held up by this need for initial equipment and other startup items. For this reason startup grants are provided in the amount of $24 million over the 3-year period.

In approving applications for such grants the Secretary is directed to consider several items and among these are the use which the school is making of existing facilities and the speedup which may be obtained by making the grant. No such grant may exceed $100,000.

If the supply of nurses is to continue to increase as dramatically and rapidly as we hope for and, indeed, require, the need for graduate training becomes more acute. Teachers, administrators and supervisors need postgraduate training. The law at the present time provides for traineeships of this sort, and the bill before us would continue this program, the cost of which is expected to be $66 million over the 3-year period.

Student loans are presently provided in amounts up to $1,500 in 1 year. This bill would make it possible for a student to borrow up to $2,500 in 1 year or an aggregate amount of $10,000. The $75 million included in this bill for student loans will provide nearly 82,000 loans. The committee has found that more than half of the nursing students come from families whose gross annual income is under $10,000. This means that in most instances the availability of loans is a necessity to the completion of a nursing education.

One of the difficulties with maintaining the necessary proportion of nurses to other health professions is the attrition which occurs. Many things have been tried, and this bill continues to try to induce graduate nurses to enter and continue the practice of their profession. This bill would allow a graduate nurse to be relieved from payment of up to 75 percent of an educational loan if she will agree to practice in a shortage area for a period of at least 3 years. If the graduate nurse does not wish to take advantage of this offer, she may still reduce her obligation to repay her educational loan at the rate of 10 percent for each year that she remains in full-time employment as a professional nurse in a public or nonprofit institution. This can continue for up to 5 years or 50 percent of the outstanding loan.

In the earlier days of the nurse training program it was felt that scholarships might not be necessary because the cost of nurse training is considerably less than that of many of the other health professions. Experience under the program indicated very early, however, that there were still many students willing to pursue education in the nursing field who could not do so without outright scholarships. They have been limited to cases of extreme need, but the nursing schools have found it necessary to have these scholarships at least available if they are to recruit and attract students from low-income backgrounds. Scholarships are limited to $2,000 per year, and it is estimated that there could be a need for $50 million over the 3-year period for this purpose.

There is one feature in this bill which is new at least in the direct form which it now takes. It is called a program to encourage full utilization of nursing educational talent. Simply stated it is a recruiting program. With the availability of the resources already outlined we should be able to produce the necessary number of nurses. We can, that is, if we attract the students and motivate them in the direction of nurse training. The purpose of this recruiting program is to find students who are potentially capable and encouraging them to underake nurse training. This can be done in many different ways, and it is anticipated that all methods will be employed.

This nurse training bill requires more money than we would like to authorize. It requires more money than Government would like to spend. Like so many things today, however, we must do it. We cannot throw away the progress of the past 7 years by failing to be realistic about the needs of the future. The programs included in this bill are basically tried and proven programs. I recommend that the House pass H.R. 8630.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN).

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to briefly state that enactment of H.R. 8630, the Nurses Training Act of 1971, is desperately needed to meet in both the quantitative and qualitative sense the critical nurse shortage which exists today.

I have a daughter who is a registered nurse. I well understand that nursing care is crucial in any health-care program. The nurse shortage which exists in all regions of the United States—in nearly all States and in many localities. As our committee report states, the shortage has been the cause of physical neglect among patients in many institutions.

The demand for nursing services has grown and will continue to grow. Our swelling population has strained the health care services out of proportion to the increased numbers of nurses because the very young and the very old have great need for their services.

I wholeheartedly endorse H.R. 8630 and urge its passage as a program to aid in nurses training which is absolutely necessary to meet the requirements of our Nation.

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Chairman. I would like to voice my support of H.R. 8630, the Nurse Training Act of 1971, a bill which will greatly assist this Nation in meeting the urgent need for increased nursing personnel. Approximately 700,000 nurses are actively practicing in this country today. But that figure is 150,000 short of the number of nurses needed just to meet current demands for health services. By 1980, our nurse manpower requirement will reach over 1 million, with an estimated 675,000 licensed practical nurses and 550,000 aides needed to perform services at varying levels of responsibility within the health delivery system.

None of us here question the vital role played by the professional nurse as part of the health-care team. The modern nurse has broadened her traditional role to assume new functions which have resulted from an increasing delegation of responsibilities from physicians to nurses. Today's nurse can specialize as a pediatric nurse practitioner, nurse midwife, or family health nurse. This greater specialization among nurses can lead not only to more challenging and satisfying careers but to a more efficient use of scarce manpower resources throughout the many health disciplines.

As medical knowledge and technology expand, more and more trained people will be needed to fill these new jobs requiring higher levels of skill and responsibility. At the present time, however,

we simply do not have sufficient nurse manpower to provide even traditional nursing care in hospitals, physicians' offices, schools, industry, extended care facilities, and neighborhood health centers. Many hospital wards have never opened or have been forced to close down due to lack of nurses. The growing need among our aged population for the kinds of treatment provided in extended-care facilities and skilled nursing homes is not being met, in great part as a result of inadequate numbers of qualified registered nurses. As we make a commitment to new federally supported health programs aimed at making health services available to greater numbers of people, we must not ignore the fact that, without adequate health manpower, the best of our intentions will fall short of the intended goal of good health for every American.

We have before us today an opportunity to make good on our commitment to that goal. The Nurse Training Act is designed to provide adequate nurse manpower through a balanced program of support to schools and to students. Grants of $105 million would be provided over 3 years for the construction of new facilities and expansion or rehabilitation of existing facilities. These grants will make possible an additional 5,800 first-year places and maintenance of 17,500 existing student places throughout the nurse training institutions in this country.

Special project grants of $83 million will be awarded over a 3-year period for support of approximately 1,030 projects designed to develop innovative nursing education programs, research in nursing education, improvement in nursing school curriculum, training of new kinds of nursing personnel, improvement in the supply or distribution of nursing personnel, mergers of nurse training programs or cooperative arrangements between hospitals or academic institutions.

Capitation grants amounting to $169 million will be made available over 3 years to encourage schools to expand student enrollment. Such grants would be tied to a requirement that a school increase its first year enrollments by at least 5 percent or 10 students—whichever is the greater—over an average of its two highest first year enrollments between 1966 and 1971. Startup grants totaling $24 million would also be authorized to assist in developing completely new nurse training programs in areas where there exists significant recruitment potential and adequate clinical and educational resources to support such programs.

The legislation would provide $66 million to train professional nurses to assume responsibilities as teachers in schools of nursing, and as supervisors, administrators, and nursing specialists. Nursing students loans would be increased so that a student could receive as much as $2,500 a year with up to $10,000 or 75 percent of that loan forgiven if the individual agreed to practice for at least 3 years in a specified manpower shortage area. Student scholarship grants providing an estimated $57 million would add an essential source of support to the loan program.

Finally, the proposed legislation would encourage full utilization of nursing educational talents by providing $8.5 million to identify financially, educationally, or culturally needy persons with a potential for nurse training who might need special encouragement to complete their secondary education and enter nurse training.

H.R. 8630 has received the serious consideration and final approval, as amended, of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am sincerely impressed with the fine work done by this committee in reporting out this bill for our consideration. I feel quite strongly that this legislation is deserving of our complete support and approval. Thank you.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the critical shortage of nurses in the United States is indisputable. There are 700,000 nurses in active practice; 150,000 more are needed. By 1980, 1,100,000 nurses will be needed. The provisions of H.R. 8630, the Nurse Training Act of 1971, are designed to meet these needs. In order to do so, this bill would revise the nurse training programs currently in existing law.

In the first section of H.R. 8630, a total of $105 million is provided over 3 years for construction grants and loan guarantees to schools of nursing for the construction of new facilities and for the replacement or rehabilitation of existing facilities. Funds provided by the Federal Government as construction grants may not exceed 75 percent for the construction of new schools or new facilities, while funds for other grants may not exceed 67 percent. In unusual circumstances, the Federal share of construction costs may go as high as 75 percent.

The loan guarantee and interest subsidy provision of this section makes available $7 million over 3 years for a loan guarantee fund. These funds would be used to assist private, nonprofit schools of nursing for the construction of training facilities in instances where a loan would not otherwise be available.

Another section provides $83 million over the next 3 years for special project grants and contracts to improve the quality of programs offered by nursing schools. Funds authorized in this section may also be used to assist schools which are in serious financial straits.

Institutional grants to be allocated according to the number of students at each school, are provided under section 4 of H.R. 8630. Capitation grants are calculated by multiplying $2,000 by the number of full-time students and $500 by the number of graduates. A provision is included in this section requiring nursing schools to increase their enrollment by 5 percent, or 10 students, each year in order to qualify for these grants.

In addition, another section provides for startup grants in the amount of $24 million over the next 3 years for the purpose of planning, development, or initiating new programs. Such grants may not exceed $100,000 per school, per year.

Section 5 authorizes $66 million over the next 3 years for the cost of advanced traineeships to train professional nurses or those to act in administrative and faculty positions.

For fiscal years 1972 through 1974, a total of $75 million is authorized to be used for loans to students. For fiscal 1975 and succeeding years, such sums will be made available as are necessary to continue loans approved before 1974. This section limits the amount of each loan per student to $2,500 per year, with the aggregate not to exceed $10,000. In order to ease the problem of maldistribution, the bill provides that amounts up to $10,000 or 75 percent, of an outstanding loan might be forgiven if the nurse practices in an area of shortage for at least 3 years.

H.R. 8630 further provides $57 million over the next 3 years for scholarship grants to schools. The maximum amount any student may receive in the form of a scholarship has been increased from the present $1,500 to $2,000.

In order to encourage the full utilization of nursing education talent, section 8 of H.R. 8630 authorizes a total of $8.5 million over 3 years for grants and contracts to nursing schools. These funds are designated to be used to identify potential nursing students, particularly those with financial, educational, or cultural need and to encourage them to study nursing.

Mr. Chairman, the demand for health services has been increasing in recent years, due to a number of factors: Population growth; rising consumer incomes; increasing insurance coverage; public policies giving increased attention to the disadvantaged; and development of medical science and growth of specialization. The supply, however, has not been keeping pace.

There is an urgent need for the development of plans and priorities to meet the shortages which now exist. I submit that the bill under consideration today will assist in meeting this need.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, recently I have been in contact with various nursing groups in my district concerning the desperate need existing in North Carolina, as well as the rest of the country, for qualified nursing personnel. I have been aware of this critcal situation since my early days in the House of Representatives. One of the first bills I was privileged to work on was H.R. 12, which came before the 88th Congress as pioneer legislation in this field, Today, 150,000 more nurses are needed and by 1980, the shortage will grow to 1,100,000. It is obvious that the problem is both critical and immediate.

The Nurse Training Act of 1971 is a proposal to continue for 3 additional years a section of the Public Health Service Act, with some changes which deal with increasing the number of nurses and improving their distribution. Nurses are perhaps the backbone of the medical system. Entire hospitals have had to close because of a nursing shortage. More and more people are realizing the importance of a large number of qualified nurses and are therefore becoming greatly concerned with the need in this area of health manpower. Nurses provide basic and essential health services which are continually in greater demand by more people and in more areas than any other single health service.

Our population is steadily increasing and has resulted in a greater number of people who are either very young or very

old, and these are the people who need medical services the most. Increased health insurance and education and higher income levels result in a demand for excellent medical attention and more of it. Due to the trend toward medical specialization, nurses have to take on more responsibilities and duties which formerly belonged to doctors. There is also a great need for better training facilities and personnel since this has much to do with the quality of nurses' abilities.

The keystone feature of the bill is the capitation grant which represents a change in direction in the method of allocating funds. Nursing schools would be required to increase their enrollment in order to receive capitation grants.

To be realistic and to meet our goals we must have Federal financial support that is dependable. A capitation grant, which is based on the number of graduates, would help schools of nursing make better plans for their educational programs. There is no need for schools to be dependent on research programs which could lead to the practice of using the funds appropriated for these programs for paying faculty.

The Nurse Training Act of 1971 includes grants for construction of teaching facilities, improvements in nursing schools, traineeships, loans, scholarships, and recruiting of nurses. There is under the special project grants authority to coordinate nurse training programs, or schools with hospitals; the training of special types of nurses; interdisciplinary programs so that facilities of different medical branches could be shared and the relation between the different subdivisions of the field could be utilized; putting nurses in scarcity areas such as rural areas or ghettos; improving school curricula; research; and improvement of educational programs.

If a nurse agrees to practice in a shortage area for 3 years or more, or works in a public or nonprofit private agency, organization or institution, a part of the loan or the entire loan can be waived. Rural areas and urban ghetto areas desperately need more medical services. The need for money is not the whole answer but it is a step forward.

The nursing profession, as I pointed out before, is a most important area of the medical personnel, and it is becoming even more of a basic necessity for public health because of increased population, higher income levels, increased education and medical insurance policies and the mounting specialization in medicine. An increase in the number of well-qualified nurses and their even geographic distribution would be a major advancement in the imperative need for more health manpower. I feel strongly that this bill is a necessary step if we are to meet our health needs in the years to come and I urge its passage by the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the objectives of this legislation and to ask a question. For years I have been concerned with the demise of nursing schools, particularly those identified with our hospitals. It has seemed that the requirements were being constantly raised, with greater emphasis upon technical instruction, than there was in general nursing skills, so that we were requiring nearly the level of medical competency that might attend the status of a physician. I wonder if we have been as objective and practical as we should be in the field of nursing education so as to make possible the entry into this very important field of those who would desire to do so.

Mr. SPRINGER. I may say to the gentleman, in answer to the first part of his question, it has not been that we have failed to supply funds even to local hospitals. The money problem has arisen at the local municipal level. They have been unable to support the local nursing school even with Federal funding. This has been the reason, more or less, for their demise in many instances. In my community two of the local nursing training schools at the hospital level have suffered from this.

May I say in reply to my distinguished colleague further, we now have the registered nurse program, which is 4 years. We have the associate, which is a 2-year program. We also still have the nurse training program at the hospital level, which is called the Diploma. So we have three types.

The one which certainly is going to grow and produce far more than either one or both of the others put together is the associate degree course. A lot of these young ladies want to go to college but do not want to go beyond 2 years. We can give them an associate degree at the end of 2 years.

In that way I believe we have lowered the requirement, if that is what the gentleman is asking. I do not believe we have lowered the training requirements, but we have lowered the time requirement for nursing from a 4-year level to a 2-year level if the young lady wants to qualify as an associate rather than as a baccalaureate nurse.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman. I am not desirous of lowering the standards, but I do desire to have the standards practical and objective.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) and of course the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) for what I believe is a milestone piece of legislation.

I have been interested in this, have watched it and followed it very closely for several reasons. One is I feel very close to the nursing profession, having married an RN, a former Navy nurse.

Second, when I was a State senator in Massachusetts, I worked very closely with my fellow colleagues and with nursing groups in the Commonwealth in effectuating the passage of the nursing registration law.

Third, contributions of the nursing profession in the field of medicine can hardly be overestimated. The many hours of service they so unselfishly give, their patience, and their good humor in many trying situations are recognized and appreciated by all of us, I am sure.

This legislation which provides for construction grants for teaching facilities, for capitation grants, and for funds for improvements in nurse training, as well as continuing authority for student loans and scholarships, seeks to increase the supply of nurses and improve the distribution of critically needed nursing personnel. Thus the act will benefit not only the nursing profession itself but also the people to whom they minister.

Since I am a member of the Appropriations Committee and serve on the subcommittee for HEW, I certainly will watch the appropriations and do all I can to make sure that this is fully funded when the time is right.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in looking over the committee report I find there is a new program calling for loan guarantees as well as interest subsidies on the construction of nonprofit private schools of nursing. Would the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) give us some additional information on that new program?

Mr. SPRINGER. I shall be glad to.

This follows the last time we renewed the Hill-Burton Act. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN) raised a question as to a problem in Minnesota. Under many circumstances the local municipal authorities, if they had a Federal guaranteed loan, could go to the bank and get the money and build the hospital immediately without the necessity of going through the Hill-Burton Capital Grant Act. That has worked so successfully we felt in this kind of program it would be easier in many instances for them to go directly to the bank and get a guaranteed Federal loan with an interest subsidy of 3 percent and construct the facilities needed under the guaranteed loan, and do it much faster than by way of the Hill-Burton Act.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I wish to commend the committee for making this recommendation. Several years ago I had been helpful in getting a provision in a housing bill which to some extent covered the same ground as the provision the gentleman mentioned a moment ago, which was FHA financing for hospital construction. That program has worked well. It is working well now. I am convinced this will be very helpful in the construction of essential nursing facilities.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty support of this legislation.

I rise in support of the Nurse Training

Act of 1971, which will increase the level of financial assistance to help facilitate the development of nurses by improving training facilities, increasing personnel, and providing new educational incentives.

The shortage of nurses today is reaching crisis proportions. Today 150,000 more nurses are needed than are actually in practice. By 1980, the demand will be for 1,100,000 registered nurses alone. This demand will not be met unless new facilities are built to accommodate more students, more nursing teachers are trained, and the doors are opened to those who need financial aid.

The rapidly growing population has created a disproportionate number of young Americans and older citizens. Infants and elderly require extensive medical attention, thus drastically increasing the need for nursing care. Nursing work is intense and time consuming—the present nursing personnel cannot be stretched any thinner—the areas of shortage or inadequate coverage are vast enough already. If the wider use of health programs for more Americans is to be encouraged, measures must be taken now to properly staff medical centers that handle these programs.

Potential nursing students are often discouraged by high costs of education. Over half our nursing students come from families of income less than $10,000. Unless incentives are given to these students and funds are made readily available, the nursing field will fail to find enough personnel. The future supply of nurses can only be met by relying on a larger supply of candidates. The Francis Bolton School of Nursing in my district has almost 99 percent of its enrollment on financial assistance and must have funds if these students are to be able to complete their education. The health professions student loan and scholarship extension would increase the levels of financial assistance to schools training health personnel. The Government must make efforts to match those efforts being made by the schools to attract and assist people in serious financial need.

The addition, loan funds and cancellation policies alone will not meet the problem. There must be facilities where young people can be educated. Many schools today use buildings that were designed for other purposes and can only serve as an inadequate environment for proper nurse training. A recent study showed that only 22 percent of the buildings now used were originally intended to house nursing schools. Present enrollments cannot be maintained in inadequate and unusable teaching space. Construction grants in the bill before us will allow for the construction of new facilities and for the replacement of inadequate ones.

The problem in the health field will not be solved just by more manpower. The people trained must have the highest quality education in order to properly serve in the increasingly advanced technology of the medical profession. Poorly prepared students cannot accept the increased responsibilities which nurses are increasingly being given by doctors. A high quality training program requires individualized programs, up-to-date equipment, and competent instructors. This bill contains a provision for special project grants which encourages innovations such as the merging of training programs, self-teaching devices, improvement of curriculums and other measures geared toward a higher quality education. In addition, high quality faculty can be attracted through the essential capitation grants.

The uneven distribution of nurses also adds to today's inefficient nursing care. The schools are not located evenly in all areas. Start-up grants for new schools are vitally needed to correct the situation. There are many medically unserved areas throughout the country. Rural areas and inner cities are a prime example of areas lacking adequate health care.

Mr. Chairman, the poor health record of our country needs to be improved, not only for today but to meet the demands of tomorrow. Quantitative and qualitative improvements are needed to keep hospitals from closing for lack of funds and help. The future health of the Nation will suffer greatly unless improvements in nurse training and health professions student loans are undertaken—there is no reason why medical need cannot be adequately met in a country such as ours. The bill before us will help meet our commitment to the health of all America.

The medicare program has provided an increased demand for the services of health professionals. The extension of medicare to the disabled of all ages will increase these demands. Some form of national health coverage will double the need for trained professionals in all health categories. This bill is essential to meet these needs.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time he may require to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

First of all, I would like to commend this legislation to the House and also publicly to express my appreciation to the members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment for the hard work which they have done on all of this legislation that has been presented to the House today.

The legislation that has been presented to you is the work of all the members of that committee. Each one has had specific input into this legislation. It has been done as a group. No one member has more credit than the other members in authoring these bills. It has been a subcommittee effort.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, which will finally get us on track in producing enough nurses for the Nation, is important when you realize that nursing care is probably the most intensely used sector of health care, for a longer period of time, than any other health service. That I think puts in perspective the need for this legislation.

The subcommittee held extensive hearings on legislation to meet health manpower needs and has heard indisputable evidence of the critical need for nurses and the difficulties that are being faced by schools of nursing in meeting the costs of education and in obtaining the teachers and the facilities for training increased numbers of nurses.

Nursing is a national resource and the critical shortage of nurses is an undisputed fact. At the current time, there are 700,000 nurses in active practice, 150,000 fewer than are needed. By 1980, 1,100,000 nurses will be needed to help meet the increased demands due to growth in population, expansion in duties and responsibilities, and growth in the complexity of health care. The interrelated provisions of the Nurse Training Act of 1971 are designed to achieve this goal through a balanced program of support to schools and to students. Support to schools includes grants for construction, special projects, institutional support and for the initiation of new nursing programs. In addition, the legislation will support recruitment efforts of agencies and institutions aimed at alerting young people of financial, educational, or cultural need to opportunities in nursing and attracting them into schools of nursing.

I shall now summarize the features of the bill:

CONSTRUCTION

One of the critical needs is for replacement and modernization of antiquated and obsolete teaching facilities, many of which were never intended for use as nursing schools. Nursing schools have had particular difficulty in raising the matching funds for construction. The bill would extend the construction grant authority with a much needed increase in the Federal share of costs of construction and would also add new authority for loan guarantees and interest subsidies. These amendments should make possible the maintenance of thousands of student places as well as the creation of places for expanded enrollments.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

The nursing special project authorities have made great contributions to improvement in nurse training. This program would be continued.

New emphasis would be given to programs for training of pediatric nurse practitioners, nurse midwives, and family health practitioners. Few programs have as much potential for increasing the availability of health care as those who prepare nurses to perform tasks which heretofore have been performed only by physicians.

This authority would also allow special assistance to be given, at a time of great transition in nursing education, to projects involving the mergers and other cooperative arrangements between hospital and academic training programs that would assist in orderly transition and enhance and strengthen both academic and clinical aspects of the teaching program.

This legislation would also support efforts to increase the supply of nurses and provide opportunities for career mobility, such as assisting licensed practical nurses and medical corpsmen to become nurses.

CAPITATION GRANTS

In 1964, the Congress authorized grants for partial reimbursement to diploma schools. Assistance under this program was available to hospital

schools until 1970. This support was replaced by new formula authority which was never funded.

H.R. 8630 will provide capitation grants for diploma, baccalaureate, and collegiate schools of nursing to help them meet the rising cost of education, attract and hold qualified faculty, and provide students with the clinical experiences to equip them for professional practice.

STARTUP GRANTS

One of the primary goals of this legislation is to increase as rapidly as possible the number of practicing nurses and to provide training resources where they are most needed.

The bill would add new authority giving incentives to new schools of nursing which, because of their use of existing facilities—including Federal medical facilities—can accelerate the date on which they can begin their teaching programs and can take larger numbers of students.

ADVANCED TRAINEESHIPS

There are severe shortages of nursing teachers, supervisors, and clinical specialists. One of the primary purposes of this legislation is to reduce these shortages as rapidly as possible. With the rapid increase in the number of nurse training programs, there is a critical need for more teachers. At the same time, the demand for specially trained nurses to staff such treatment areas as coronary care and intensive care units is mounting daily. The bill would extend the program of advanced traineeships for the preparation of these personnel, with increases in appropriation authorizations designed to make a major impact on the nurse training and patient care services without further delay.

STUDENT AID

The student aid amendments proposed in this are designed to assist increasing numbers of students to undertake and complete training in nursing and to assure that lack of financial means on the part of their families will not prevent them from becoming nurses.

The maximum amount of scholarship aid to a nursing student has been increased to $2,000 a year. The bill also extends the nursing student loan program and raises to $2,500 the maximum amount a student could borrow in any year.

The bill retains the present cancellation authority which provides incentives for nurses to remain in active practice. One of the most significant amendments is the new loan repayment authority designed to encourage nurses to practice in shortage areas where they are most needed. The bill would allow cancellation of 75 percent or $10,000, whichever is less, of nursing student loans and any other loan for nurse training, for 3 years of nursing practice in a shortage area.

If we are to move toward the goal of adequate health care for every American, we must have the skilled nursing personnel to provide essential health services.

The Nurse Training Act of 1971 represents a balanced program of assistance to overcome the critical shortage of nurses within this decade. I urge its immediate enactment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will my able colleague yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. I am very much gratified to have the assurance in the report and in the legislation and from the able chairman of the subcommittee that this bill has as its purpose providing the number of nurses needed by 1980 in this Nation.

I notice 150,000 more are needed. I presume that means now. How many new or additional nurses will be provided by this legislation in the coming year?

Mr. ROGERS. Of course, there will be new schools of nursing started, so that it is going to take more than just a 1-year period. Probably the shortest period of time it will take is 2 years before we will begin to feel the impact, and probably it will be 3 years before we completely feel it.

Mr. PEPPER. If my able colleague will forgive me—and I do not say this in an unkind way—is this like so many of these programs that are fine, where we are going to do a fine job but we are not going to do very much in the immediate future?

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman will permit me, let me straighten him out on that. We are doing a great deal immediately. What I said to the gentleman is it takes at least 2 years to train a nurse. Simply by passing this legislation we will not have 100,000 more nurses tomorrow, because they must be trained first. This legislation trains nurses, and it is going to close the gap, but it will not close the gap overnight. It takes at least 2 years to train nurses.

Mr. PEPPER. Making due allowance for the training period, will this bill approximately meet the need for nurses by 2 years from now.

Mr ROGERS. Yes. It will meet future needs. Of course, it will take a little longer than 2 years to close the gap of 150,000. That gap should be closed by 1980. Let me show you what has been going on. From 1963 to 1965 we had 52,000 nurses being trained. Now we are up to 75,000 being trained. This is really accelerating. So, I can assure the gentleman that if he will support this bill—and I feel confident he will—we will produce nurses under this bill. We have a goal of closing the gap, and this legislation will do it.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. ROGERS. I certainly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. I heard from the able chairman of your committee in the Rules Committee the other day about the training of practical nurses. I know that must be a matter of great concern to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS. This is not covered in this legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. I know; I was advised by the distinguished chairman that that comes under the manpower training program, but I am concerned about providing practical nurses as well as registered nurses. The important part that practical nurses play in a national nursing program is very vital. I wonder if the gentleman would have your staff check with the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as to the adequacy of the programs for providing practical nurses.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. I feel this is a matter of particular interest and within the knowledge of the gentleman's distinguished committee. I would certainly be grateful to the gentleman for urging and bringing to bear as much attention as can be focused on the subject of practical nursing and to bring about an increase in the number of practical nurses.

Mr. ROGERS. I agree with the gentleman on that and I am sure we will.

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

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. STAGGERS. We have requested the Department of Labor and HEW as to the number and the adequacy and the future training contemplated in this program so that it will be interrelated with our overall plans.

Mr. PEPPER. Do they have the money to train an adequate number of practical nurses in those programs?

Mr. ROGERS. This is, of course, not under the jurisdiction of this committee, as I am sure the gentleman knows. It is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor. I would doubt that they have sufficient money. That would be my guess. However, that is not under the jurisdiction of this committee but we would be glad to look into it.

Mr. PEPPER. I would greatly appreciate it if the gentleman's committee would do that and I realize that there is a dual jurisdiction involved here but I know the gentleman is very much interested in this phase of the nursing problem.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SATTERFIELD).

Mr. SATTERFIELD. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure and urge that it be considered favorably by the House.

There is no single issue of greater importance to the people of this Natior than an adequate supply of physicians, nurses, and other health professions personnel. H.R. 8630 is a comprehensive measure designed to provide the incentives and the funds necessary to overcome the critical nurse shortage so evident now and projected into the future.

At the present time, although there are 700,000 nurses in active practice, there is a shortage of 150,000. We are told that by 1980 there will be a need for 1,100,000 nurses to meet the demand. H.R. 8630 encompasses programs designed to provide new and additional support to schools of nursing for operation, construction, and for special project grants

for new nursing programs. It will also extend help to students by way of scholarship grants and scholarship loans.

Financial support to schools is predicated on need and more directly upon their ability to increase the number of students and graduates. Support is provided for diploma, associate degree and collegiate schools of nursing.

Perhaps the most important innovation in the bill is the provision of $169 million over the next 3 years to be used for capitation grants to such nursing schools at the rate of $200 for each enrolled student except those in their graduation year whose rate will be $500 for each such enrolled student.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this bill will contribute materially to fulfilling the health needs of this Nation and that it will make possible provision of the number of nurses so desperately needed. I urge my colleagues in the House to support this measure.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS).

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and urge its passage.

Mr. Chairman, as we consider H.R. 8630, the Nurse Training Act of 1971, it is important that we bear in mind that since 1964, over 160 hospital diploma nursing schools have closed because of inadequate financial aid, and that this country now has a nurse shortage of over 150,000. It is estimated that during the 1970's, our population will increase by 29 million persons, and by 1980, over a million nurses will be needed to give adequate care to our citizens. Although we now have about 700,000 practicing registered nurses, it is obvious that we must accelerate our nurse training programs if we are to keep pace with need.

It is, therefore, essential for the protection and well being of all Americans that we approve H.R. 8630, the Nurse Training Act. This important legislation continues for 3 years—title VIII of the Public Health Service Act—and authorizes Federal assistance for a variety of programs which support the training of nurses.

Our hospitals, clinics, and other medical facilities are faced with many more patients than there are skilled nurses to care for them. This can be attributed in part to the medicare program, which though enacted with the best of intentions, brought 17,000,000 people into health coverage, causing a great burden in terms of overworked hospitals and medical manpower. The well-publicized inadequate care to our aged given by many nursing homes is caused in great part by too few registered nurses on their staffs.

My own State of Maine presently has 7,551 practicing registered nurses, to serve a population of slightly under a million. An indication of the need of more nurse manpower is evidenced by a situation in Aroostok County, where at Jackman Station, a 14-bed hospital closes periodically throughout the year because of lack of health personnel. This hospital has tried to seek the services of nurses from religious orders in Canada, in order to have a full staff.

In light of the serious need for additional professional nurses to care for our expanding population, and the rising costs of education, it is imperative that we provide the financial assistance necessary to encourage more people to enter the nursing field. This can be accomplished by immediate passage of H.R. 8630, the Nurse Training Act.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. GRASSO).

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 8630, the Nurses Training Act of 1971.

There is a serious shortage of nurses in every part of our Nation. The demand for nursing services increases yearly as our population grows and new and broader nursing roles are developed. Today, the estimate of need for 1980 stands at 1,100,000 registered nurses, 675,000 licensed practical nurses, and 550,000 aides. Not nearly enough nurses are being trained to fill this need. Moreover, large numbers of qualified teachers, supervisors, administrators, and clinical specialists are required as our health care programs are extended.

H.R. 8630 would extend the nurse training provisions of title VIII of the Public Health Service Act for 3 years with some modifications. I strongly support enactment of this bill and its provisions for recruitment and training of increased numbers of nurses at diploma, associate degree, and collegiate schools of nursing.

The extension of title VIII and the expansion of its coverage is a step toward increasing the supply and improving the geographic distribution of critically needed nursing personnel. Total admissions per year in State approved schools of nursing have increased by over 25,000 during the past decade, and total enrollment per year has climbed by over 45,000 during the same time. The urgent need for corresponding increases in funds for construction of new teaching facilities is recognized by the bill's extension of the present authority for grants for construction, its increase in the maximum Federal share of total construction costs, and its provisions for the construction of interim facilities to provide teaching space on a short-term basis while facilities of a more permanent nature are being planned and constructed.

The bill also permits loan guarantees and interest subsidies to assist in financing construction projects. Special project grants will assist schools of nursing in serious financial straits to meet operational costs required to maintain quality programs or to meet accreditation requirements.

To assist in the development of new nurse training programs, especially through the cooperation of existing academic and service institutions, the bill provides special authority for "start-up" grants. Capitation grants, requiring schools to actively seek expansion of enrollment, will help fill the gap between costs of educating nurses and income from tuition and fees.

Nursing students will benefit directly from the enactment of H.R. 8630 through its provisions for financial aid as well as through its efforts to improve the quality of nursing education. The legislation authorizes $83 million over 3 fiscal years for innovations such as interdisciplinary programs and cooperative arrangements between academic institutions and hospitals supplying necessary clinical experience. Nursing student loans as well as provisions permitting borrowers to cancel portions of a loan and interest are continued. A new provision would permit up to $10,000 of a loan and interest to be cancelled upon completion of at least 3 years of full-time professional service in a designated area of acute nursing shortage. Besides alleviating the imbalance in geographical distribution of nurses, this provision would provide an additional inducement for nurses to remain in active practice.

The program of scholarships would be extended and the maximum amount available to any one student would be increased to $2,000 per year, providing authority for approximately 102,000 scholarships.

An important innovation is the emphasis on imaginative attempts to broaden the base of recruitment by encouraging the active search among men, mature adults, and members of certain ethnic groups for persons with potential for nurse training. By drawing from a variety of candidates, the quality of nurses will keep up with the complexity of services and cultural needs of patients.

The legislation provides $66 million over 3 fiscal years for advanced traineeships in order to promote increased professional awareness, to create career opportunities for individuals, and to assure an adequate number of highly qualified teachers, clinical specialists, and supervisors. During the past 7 years since passage of the Nurse Training Act, the number of initial programs of nursing education has increased by approximately 15 percent. The number of unfilled faculty positions has grown accordingly. Academic and clinical preparation necessary for such responsibility increases with the range of services demanded and supplied.

Providing health care requires even more than personal dedication. The nurse of today is asked to function with professional competence in a field which extends far beyond the traditional hospital setting. Nurses reach out to every community in fulfilling their responsibility to prevent illness and maintain the highest standards of health. The nursing profession needs the funds that H.R. 8630 would provide for improvements in the academic and clinical education of increased numbers of nurses.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, an effective national policy directed toward improving the quantity and availability of health services in the United States necessarily depends upon our willingness to encourage young Americans to enter careers in the profession of nursing. In 1964, Congress enacted the original Nurse Training Act as a means of achieving precisely this goal.

Today we have an opportunity to extend and improve upon the nurse training program begun several years ago. H.R. 8630, the Nurse Training Act of 1971, provides some $710 million over 3 fiscal years to maintain and increase

the supply of trained professional nurses in the United States. By 1980, it is estimated that we will require 1,100,000 nurses to meet the ever-increasing demand for health services. Without this new legislation, existing shortages of nurse personnel—already very acute—will grow to grave proportions. H.R. 8630 should therefore be given overwhelming support from the Members of the House.

The bill makes new moneys available to support the construction of new teaching facilities and for the replacement and rehabilitation of existing nurse training institutions. Institutional assistance will be provided in the form of capitation grants to support the continued operations of nurse training schools.

For prospective nursing students there are new incentives in this bill. Loan assistance is improved by increasing the total amount of money that a student may borrow from $6,000 to $10,000 during her professional basic training. What is more, up to 75 percent of any outstanding educational loans can be canceled, if the graduate nurse agrees to practice in areas where there are critical shortages of skilled nursing personnel. Additional scholarship money is also provided for under the new legislation. The maximum amount of an annual scholarship would be increased from $1,500 to $2,000, and it is hoped that schools will thereby be able to attract to nursing the young people who otherwise might not be able to afford professional training.

In all, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8630 represents a new and bold commitment by Congress toward expanding the sorely needed personnel resources this country needs if health care is, in fact, ever to become a "right" for every citizen to enjoy. I urge every Member of this body to lend his or her wholehearted support for this important proposal.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I know of no more critical need in the Nation today than the urgent requirement for more nurses to care for our sick.

There is no question that we are not keeping pace with the increased demand for highly trained, professional nurses. Increased patient loads in our major hospitals, critical shortages of nurses in the smaller institutions, and the growing complexity of health care has created a demand that the Federal Government take steps to bolster the capability of teaching facilities to train nurses and, at the same time, provide official Federal encouragement for young people to enter upon this most worthwhile and rewarding career with the least amount of personal hardship during training.

For these, and other reasons, I fully support the concept of H.R. 8630 and similar bills aimed at meeting this urgent requirement. In fact, I am a cosponsor of this legislation.

The bill we are considering today will provide Federal assistance for traineeships and loans for student nurses as well as help to teaching institutions in the way of construction and improvement grants.

Passage of this bill will enable the Nation's nurse training institutions to develop new and meaningful programs to develop nurses skilled in the newest techniques of medical care. This bill will help shape the future of health care across our land, for with funds provided by this bill, institutions can train men and women in new skills heretofore unavailable to the medical field.

To say that America needs more nurses is truly an understatement. America must have more nurses if those in need of medical care are to receive it.

Passage of H.R. 8630 will be a major step in the right direction.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, anyone who has ever been exposed to health care realizes the value of a good nurse. They are a vital member of the health care team. This nursing training bill goes hand in hand with the health manpower bill we considered today in meeting this country's health care needs. There is presently a shortage of 150,000 nurses and, if we do not act today to alleviate that shortage, it may be too late to try to catch up tomorrow.

H.R. 8630 authorizes the expenditure of $594.5 million over the next 3 years. One hundred and five million dollars of this amount would go for construction, replacement, and rehabilitation of nurses training facilities. Also, this bill contains $132 million for student loans and scholarships. The need for increased financial aid to students has been brought to my attention several times in the last few weeks by young people in my district who have expressed a sincere interest in entering the health fields, but do not have the economic resources to meet the high cost of health education. We will be helping the country as a whole by helping these people train themselves as health professionals.

I am proud to be a sponsor of this Nurse Training Act and I strongly urge its passage.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the American nurse is becoming increasingly responsible for a number of areas of patient care which previously had been only the province of doctors. In addition, nurses must be able to cope with a field whose technology is becoming more complex each day. Today's nurse is a professional in the highest sense of the word.

I support the Nurses Training Act because unfortunately professional nurses are in critically short supply. This shortage will reach crisis proportions unless Federal assistance is given to programs of training in nursing.

A nursing education is an expensive proposition. There can be no skimping where the care of human life is involved. Nurses must be trained to use the sophisticated machinery which have become an integral part of everyday health care. Yet few families or individuals have the resources to purchase such an education.

Through the Nurses Training Act, money will be available for scholarships and tuition loans, as well as loans for building increased numbers of facilities. And because a greater number of nursing students will mean a greater demand for professors, the act provides for a number of subsidized advanced traineeships.

Our young people, the recent high school and college graduates, will not be the only ones to benefit from this program. An effort will be made to utilize the training of former military corpsmen who have had much practical experience in nursing. Retiring firemen and policemen and older men and women who have completed one career and are not ready to retire, will all be encouraged to consider nursing as a profession.

Mr. Chairman, this program has already shown its effectiveness by substantially increasing the number of nursing students we have graduated in the last 6 years. But we need more, many more, and so I urge the passage of this bill today.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assmbled,

SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE TO ACT

SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the "Nurse Training Act of 1971".

(b) Whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Public Health Service Act.

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

SEC. 2. (a) AUTHORIZATION LEVEL.—Section 801 (42 U.S.C. 296(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

"SEC. 801. There are authorized to be appropriated for grants to assist in the construction of new facilities for collegiate, associate degree, or diploma schools of nursing, and for grants to assist in the replacement or rehabilitation of existing facilities for such schools, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—Clause (A) of section 803(a) (42 U.S.C. 296b(a)) is amended by striking out "66⅔ per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "75 per centum"; and clause (B) of such section is amended by striking out "66⅔ per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "75 per centum" and by striking out "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "67 per centum".

(c) LOAN GUARANTEES.—Part A of this title VIII is amended by adding after section 808 (42 U.S.C. 296g) the following new section:

"LOAN GUARANTEES

"SEC. 809. (a) In order to assist nonprofit private schools of nursing to carry out construction projects for training facilities, the Secretary may, during the period beginning July 1, 1971, and ending with the close of June 30, 1974, guarantee (in accordance with this section and subject to subsection (f)) to non-Federal lenders making loans to such schools for such construction projects payment when due of the principal of and interest on any loan for construction of such facilities if the loan was made to a school which is eligible (as determined under regulations of the Secretary) for a grant under this part to assist a construction project for such facilities. The Secretary may make commitments, on behalf of the United States, to make such loan guarantees prior to the making of such loans. No such loan guarantee (1) may, except under such special circumstances and under such conditions as are prescribed by regulations, apply to any amount which, when added to any grant for construction under this part or any other law of the United States, exceeds 90 per centum of the cost of construction of the project, or (2) may apply to more than 90 per centum of the loss of principal of and interest on the loan.

"(b) In the case of any nonprofit private school of nursing which is eligible (as determined under regulations of the Secretary) for a grant under this part to assist a construction project for training facilities, and to whom a loan has been made by a non-Federal lender to assist it in carrying out such project, the Secretary, during the period beginning July 1, 1971, and ending with the close of June 30, 1974, may, subject to subsection (f), pay to the holder of such loan (and for and on behalf of the school which received such loan) amounts sufficient to reduce by not to exceed 3 per centum per annum the net effective interest rate otherwise payable on such loan.

"(c) A loan guarantee or interest subsidy payment may be made under this section only upon an application (submitted in such manner and containing such information as the Secretary may by regulations require) approved by the Secretary. The Secretary may not approve an application for a loan guarantee or interest subsidy payment unless he determines that the terms, conditions, security (if any), and schedule and amount of repayments with respect to the loan are sufficient to protect the financial interests of the United States and are otherwise reasonable, including a determination that the rate of interest does not exceed such per centum per annum on the principal obligation outstanding as the Secretary determines to be reasonable, taking into account the range of interest rates prevailing in the private market for similar loans and the risks assumed by the United States. The Secretary may not approve an application for a loan guarantee, unless he determines that the loan would not be available on reasonable terms and conditions without the guarantee under this section.

"(d) (1) The United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant for a loan guarantee under this section the amount of any payment made pursuant to such guarantee, unless the Secretary for good cause waives such right of recovery; and, upon making any such payment, the United States shall be subrogated to all of the rights of the recipient of the payments with respect to which the guarantee was made.

"(2) To the extent permitted by paragraph (3), any terms and conditions, applicable to a loan guarantee under this section may be modified by the Secretary to the extent he determines it to be consistent with the financial interest of the United States.

"(3) Any loan guarantee made by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be incontestable in the hands of an applicant on whose behalf such guarantee is made, and as to any person who makes or contracts to make a loan to such applicant in reliance thereon, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such applicant or such other person.

"(e) There is established in the Treasury a loan guarantee and interest subsidy fund (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the 'fund') which shall be available to the Secretary without fiscal year limitation, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts, (1) to enable him to discharge his responsibilities under guarantees issued by him under this section, and (2) for interest subsidy payments authorized by this section. There are authorized to be appropriated from time to time such amounts as may be necessary to provide the sums required for the fund; except that the amount appropriated for interest subsidy payments may not exceed $1,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $2,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $4,000,00 in the fiscal year ending June 3, 1974. There shall also be deposited in the fund amounts received by the Secretary or other property or assets derived by him from his operations under this section, including any money derived from the sale of assets. If at any time the sums in the fund are insufficient to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities under guarantees issued by him under this section or to make interest subsidy payments authorized by this section, he is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but only in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase any notes and other obligations issued hereunder and for that purpose he may use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which the securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include any purchase of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this subsection. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Sums borrowed under this subsection shall be deposited in the fund and redemption of such notes and obligations shall be made by the Secretary from the fund.

"(f) (1) The cumulative total of the principal of the loans outstanding at any time with respect to which guarantees have been issued under this section may not exceed such limitations as may be specified in appropriation Acts.

"(2) In any fiscal year no loan guarantee may be made under subsection (a) and no agreement to make interest subsidy payments may be entered into under subsection (b) if the making of such guarantee or the entering into of such agreement would cause the cumulative total of—

"(A) the principal of the loans guaranteed under subsection (a) in such fiscal year, and

"(B) the principal of the loans for which no guarantee has been made under subsection (a) and with respect to which an agreement to make interest subsidy payments is entered into under subsection (b) in such fiscal year,

to exceed the amount of grant funds obligated under this part in such fiscal year for construction grants; except that this paragraph shall not apply if the amount of grant funds so obligated in such fiscal year equals the sums appropriated for such fiscal year under section 801."

(d) INTERIM FACILITIES.—

(1) Section 843(1) (42 U.S.C. 298b(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'buildings' includes interim facilities.".

(2) Section 843 (42 U.S.C. 298b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(j) The term 'interim facilities' means teaching facilities designed to provide teaching space on a short-term (less than ten years) basis while facilities of a more permanent nature are being planned and constructed."

(3) Section 802(b)(2) (A) and 804 (42 U.S.C. 296(b)(2)(A), 296(c) are each amended by inserting "(or in the case of interim facilities, within such shorter period as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe)" immediately after "twenty years".

(e) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 802 (a) (42 U.S.C. 296a(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 802. (a) The Secretary may from time to time set dates (not earlier than in the fiscal year preceding the year for which a grant is sought) by which applications for grants under this part for any fiscal year must be filed."

SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

SEC. 3. (a) AUTHORIZATION LEVEL.—Section 808(a) (42 U.S.C. 296g(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 808. (a) For payments under grants and contracts under section 805 there are authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $28,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

(b) ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—Effective with respect to appropriations made under section 808(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 296g(a)) for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1971, section 805 (42 U.S.C. 296d) is amended to read as follows:

"SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

"SEC. 805. (a) From appropriations under section 808(a) the Secretary may make grants to any public or nonprofit private health or educational entity, and enter into contracts with any public or private health or educational entity, to assist in meeting the costs of special projects to—

"(1) assist in—

"(A) mergers between hospital training programs or between hospital training programs and academic institutions, or

"(B) other cooperative arrangements between hospitals or academic institutions,

leading to the establishment of nurse training programs;

"(2) develop training programs, and train, for new roles, types, or levels of nursing personnel, including programs for the training of pediatric nurse practitioners or other types of nurse practitioners;

"(3) develop programs for cooperative interdisciplinary training among schools of nursing and schools of allied health, medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, public health, or veterinary medicine, including training for the use of the team approach to the delivery of health services;

"(4) assist in increasing the supply, or improving the distribution, of adequately trained nursing personnel or to promote the full utilization of nursing skills;

"(5) effect significant improvements in the curriculums of schools of nursing;

"(6) research, develop, or demonstrate advances in the various fields related to education in nursing; or

"(7) plan, develop, or establish new programs or modifications of existing programs of nursing education.

Contracts may be entered into under this subsection without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5).

"(b) The Secretary may also make grants from appropriations under section 808(a) to assist public or nonprofit schools of nursing which are in serious financial straits to meet operational costs required to maintain quality educational programs or which have special need for financial assistance to meet accreditation requirements. Any such grant may be made upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be reasonable and necessary, including requirements that the school agree (1) to disclose any financial information or data deemed by the Secretary to be necessary to determine the sources or causes of that school's financial distress, (2) to conduct a comprehensive cost analysis study in cooperation with the Secretary, and (3) to implement any operational and finan-

cial reforms recommended by the Secretary on the basis of information obtained in the course of the comprehensive cost analysis study or on the basis of other relevant information.

"(c) The Secretary shall provide assistance (including assistance under this section which may be provided without regard to section 807) to the heads of other departments and agencies of the Government to encourage and assist in the utilization of medical facilities under their jurisdiction for nurse training programs."

INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS

SEC. 4. (a) CAPITATION GRANT.—Effective with respect to appropriations under section 808(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 296g(b)) for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1971, subsection (a) of section 806 (42 U.S.C. 296e(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 806. (a) From sums appropriated under section 808(b) for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall make grants to schools of nursing, with approved applications, computed as follows: Each school shall receive $200 for each full-time student enrolled in such school in such year (other than a student enrolled in such school who will graduate, as determined by the Secretary under subsection (c)(1), from such school in such year), and $500 for each student enrolled in such school who will graduate (as determined by the Secretary under subsection (c)(1)) from such school in such year. If the total of the grants to be made under this subsection for any fiscal year to schools with approved applications exceeds the amounts appropriated under section 808(b) for such grants, the amount of the grant for that fiscal year to each such school shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount determined for the school for that fiscal year under the preceding sentence as the total of the amounts appropriated under such section for that year bears the amount required to make grants to each school in accordance with such sentence."

(b) ENROLLMENT INCREASE.—Effective with respect to grants made under section 806 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1971, the first sentence of subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "July 1, 1963, through June 30, 1968, by at least 2½ per centum of such average first-year enrollment, or by five students" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1966, through June 30, 1971, by at least 5 per centum of such average first-year enrollment, or by ten students". The last sentence of such section is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or that the required increase would create an extreme hardship on such school".

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The first sentence of section 806(b) (42 U.S.C. 296e(b)) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

(d) AUTHORIZATION LEVEL.—Subsection (b) of section 808 (42 U.S.C. 296g(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For grants under section 806 there are authorized to be appropriated $54,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $56,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and $59,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

(e) START-UP GRANTS.—Part A of title VIII is amended by adding after the section 809 of such title added by section 2(c) the following new section:

"START-UP GRANTS FOR NEW NURSE TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 810. (a) The Secretary may make grants to any public or nonprofit private entity to assist in meeting the costs of planning, developing, or initiating new programs of nurse training. In considering applications for grants under this section, the Secretary shall take into account—

"(1) the number of students proposed to be enrolled in such program, and

"(2) the other resources available to such program.

"(b) The Secretary shall give special consideration to each application for grant assistance under this section for a new program of nurse training which contains or is reasonably supported by assurances that, because of the use that the program will make of existing facilities (including Federal medical facilities), it will be able to accelerate the date on which it will begin its teaching program.

"(c) No grant may be made under this section unless an application therefor has been submitted to, and approved by, the Secretary. Such application shall be in such form, submitted in such manner, and contain such information, as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe.

"(d) The amount of any grant under this section shall be determined by the Secretary, but in no event may any grant exceed $100,000 for any fiscal year. Payments under such grants may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals and on such conditions, as the Secretary finds necessary.

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not to exceed $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. Sums appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended."

TRAINEESHIPS

SEC. 5. Section 821(a) (42 U.S.C. 297(a)) is amended (1) by striking out "and" after "1970,", and (2) by inserting after "1971," the following: "$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $24,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974,".

LOANS

SEC. 6. (a) LOAN CEILINGS.—

(1) Effective with respect to academic years (or their equivalent as determined under regulations of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under section 823 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 297)) beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking out "$1,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "2,500".

(2) Section 823(a) (42 U.S.C. 297(a)) is amended by striking out "$6,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000".

(b) LOAN CANCELLATION AND REPAYMENT.—

(1) Section 823(b)(3) (42 U.S.C. 297b(c)(3)) is amended by striking out ", except that" and all that follows in such section down through and including "may be canceled".

(2) Section 823 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) In the case of any individual—

"(1) who has received a baccalaureate or associate degree in nursing (or an equivalent degree), a diploma in nursing, or a graduate degree in nursing;

"(2) who obtained (A) one or more loans from a loan fund established under this part, or (B) any other educational loan for nurse training costs, including tuition, fees, books, supplies, and other related education expenses included under regulations of the Secretary; and

"(3) who enters into an agreement with the Secretary to serve as a nurse for a period of at least three years in an area in a State determined by the Secretary, after consultation with the appropriate State health authority, to have a shortage of and need for nurses;

the Secretary shall pay whichever is the least, $10,000 or up to 75 per centum of the outstanding principal and interest on the total of such loans upon completion by that individual of the service specified in such agreement. The Secretary shall, on or before the due date thereof, pay any loan or loan installment which may fall due within the three-year period with respect to which the borrower has entered into an agreement with the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3), upon the declaration of such borrower, at such times and in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe (and supported by such other evidence as the Secretary may reasonably require), that the borrower is then engaged as described by paragraph (3), and that he will continue to be so engaged for the period required (in the absence of this sentence) to entitle him to have made the payments provided by this subsection for such period. A borrower who fails to fulfill an agreement with the Secretary entered into pursuant to paragraph (3) shall be liable to reimburse the Secretary for any payments made pursuant to the preceding sentence in consideration of such agreement."

(3) Notwithstanding the amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection to such section 823(b)(3)—

(A) any person who obtained one or more loans from a loan fund established under part B of title VIII of the Public Health Service Act, who before the date of the enactment of this Act became eligible for cancellation of all or part of such loans (including accrued interest) at the 15 per centum annual rate authorized by such section 823(b)(3) (as in effect on the day before such date), and who on such date was not engaged in a practice for which loan cancellation at such rate was authorized under such section (as so in effect), may at any time receive cancellation at such rate in accordance with such section (as so in effect); and

(B) in the case of any person who obtained one or more loans from a loan fund established under such part B and who on such date was engaged in a practice for which cancellation of all or part of such loans (including accrued interest) was authorized at such rate under such section (as so in effect) such section (as so in effect) shall continue to apply to such person for purposes of providing such loan cancellation until he terminates such practice.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent any person from entering into an agreement for such loan cancellation under section 823(h) of the Public Health Service Act (as added by paragraph (2) of this subsection).

(c) AUTHORIZATION LEVEL.—Section 824 (42 U.S.C. 297c) is amended (1) by striking out "and" immediately after "1970,", (2) by striking out "and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975", and (3) by striking out "before July 1, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "before July 1, 1974".

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 826 (42 U.S.C. 297e) is amended by striking out "1974" each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "1977".

(2) The first sentence of section 827(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 297f) is amended by striking out "next three fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "next six fiscal years".

(3) Section 822(b)(4) (42 U.S.C. 297a(b)(4)) is amended by striking out "1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1974".

SCHOLARSHIP GRANTS

SEC. 7. Effective with respect to scholarship grants made under subsection (a) of

section 860 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 298c) for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1971—

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

"(b) The amount of the grant under subsection (a) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for each of the next two fiscal years to each such school shall be equal to $3,000 multiplied by one-tenth of the number of full-time students of such school. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the grant under subsection (a) shall be such amount as may be necessary to enable such school to continue making payments under scholarship awards to students who initially received such awards out of grants made to the school for fiscal years ending before July 1, 1974.";

(2) subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended (A) by striking out "1970, and the next fiscal year" in clause (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "1972, and the next two fiscal years", (B) by striking out "1971" in clause (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "1974", and (C) by striking out "1972, and each of the three" in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "1975, and each of the two"; and

(3) Subsection (c)(2) of such section is further amended by striking out "$1,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000".

PROGRAMS TO ENCOURAGE FULL UTILIZATION OF NURSING EDUCATIONAL TALENT

SEC. 8. Section 868 (42 U.S.C. 297c–7) is amended to read as follows:

"PROGRAMS TO ENCOURAGE FULL UTILIZATION OF NURSING EDUCATIONAL TALENT

"SEC. 868. (a) To assist in achieving the purposes of this part, the Secretary may make grants to public or nonprofit private health or educational entities, and may enter into contracts (not to exceed $100,000 per year per contract) with public and private health or educational entities, for the purpose of—

"(1) identifying individuals of financial, educational, or cultural need with a potential for nurse training and encouraging them to complete secondary school and undertake postsecondary educational training in the field of nursing.

"(2) identifying other individuals or classes of individuals with a potential for nurse training and encouraging them to undertake training in the field of nursing, or

"(3) publicizing existing forms of financial aid for nursing students, including aid furnished under this part.

Contracts may be entered into under this subsection without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5).

"(b) For the purpose of making payments pursuant to grants and contracts under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 9. Section 841(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 298(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "sixteen members" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "nineteen members";

(2) by striking out "Four" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Three of the appointed members shall be selected from full-time students enrolled in schools of nursing, four"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following: "The student-members of the Council shall be appointed for terms of one year and shall be eligible for reappointment to the Council."

ADVANCE FUNDING

SEC. 10. Part C of title VIII of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"ADVANCE FUNDING

"SEC. 844. Any appropriation Act which appropriates funds for any fiscal year for grants, contracts, or other payments under this title may also appropriate for the next fiscal year the funds that are authorized to be appropriated for such payments for such next fiscal year; but no funds may be made available therefrom for obligation for such payments before the fiscal year for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated."

REPORT

SEC. 11. The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Congress, prior to June 30, 1974, a final report on the administration of title VIII of the Public Health Service Act which shall include an estimate of the increase in the number of persons entering the nursing profession effected under such title prior to the enactment of this Act; an estimate of such increase effected in consequence of the enactment of this Act; an estimate of the number of nurses in relation to the need of the public therefor; and an appraisal of title VIII, as amended by this Act, to meet long-term national needs for nurses. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a first interim report prior to June 30, 1973, and a second interim report prior to January 31, 1974, describing his preliminary findings in the preparation of his final report.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 12. Parts A, B, and C (other than section 841(a) thereof) of title VIII are each amended by striking out "Surgeon General" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary". Section 803(b) (42 U.S.C. 296b(b)) is amended by striking out "Surgeon General's" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary's". Section 841(a) (42 U.S.C. 298(a)) is amended by striking out "Surgeon General" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary (or his delegate)".

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

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 13, beginning in line 14, strike out "Effective with respect to" and all that follows down through and including line 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 806 (42 U.S.C. 296e) is amended by striking out 'July 1,' ".

Page 13, line 23, strike out "section" and insert "subsection."

Page 14, line 4, strike out "1973" and insert in lieu thereof "1971".

Page 16, beginning in line 11, strike out "the date of enactment of this Act" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971".

Page 17, strike out lines 13 through 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

the Secretary shall upon completion by that individual of the practice specified in such agreement pay, for and on his behalf, the principal of and interest on any loan of his described in paragraph (2) which is outstanding on the date he begins such practice; except that the total amount of principal of loans of any such individual which the Secretary may repay under this subsection may not exceed the lesser of $10,000 or 75 per centum of the total amount of principal of such individual's loans outstanding on such date. Notwithstanding the requirement of completion of practice, the Secretary shall, on or before the due date thereof, pay.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS: Page 25, add after line 19 the following:

SEX DISCRIMINATION

SEC. 13. Title VIII is amended by adding after section 843 the following new section:

"DISCRIMINATION ON BASIS OF SEX PROHIBITED

"SEC. 844. The Secretary may not make a grant, loan guarantee, or interest subsidy payment under this title to, or for the benefit of, any school of nursing unless the application for the grant, loan guarantee, or interest subsidy payment contains assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the school will not discriminate on the basis of sex in the admission of individuals to its training programs. The Secretary may not enter into a contract under this title with any such school unless the school furnishes assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that it will not discriminate on the basis of sex in the admission of individuals to its training programs."

Mr. ROGERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, this is a similar amendment to the amendment which was offered by the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) to the previous bill, and I shall not take a great deal of time in discussing it.

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

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would certainly have no objection to the amendment being adopted.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman said it was similar?

Mr. ROGERS. It is the same as the Green amendment.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is the same as the Green amendment?

Mr. ROGERS. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MRS. MINK

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to

the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mrs. MINK: On page 21, insert after line 5 the following:

(e) EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR LOANS.—Sections 822(b)(4) and 823(b)(1) and the part of section 823(b)(2) preceding clause (A) thereof (42 U.S.C. 297a(b)(4), 297b(b)(1), 297(b)(2)) are each amended by striking out "full-time course of study" and inserting in lieu thereof "full-time or half-time course of study".

and, on

Page 22, strike out "and" at the end of line 7; strike out the period at the end of line 10 and insert in lieu thereof "; and"; and insert after line 10 the following:

(3) subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended by inserting "or half-time" immediately after "full-time" each place it occurs.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer two amendments to H.R. 8630, the Nurse Training Act of 1971.

I regret that I did not have the opportunity to bring the matter covered by my amendments before the committee during its hearings on this important legislation, but only recently was the problem involved brought to my attention. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) for permitting consideration on the floor.

In brief, my first amendment would allow nursing loans to be made available to half-time students as well as full-time students. The present law specifies that full-time students are eligible for these loans, but I feel that circumstances warrant their extension to half-time nursing students, too. My second amendment makes a similar provision for half-time scholarships for nursing students.

I was advised by a nursing education supervisor at a hospital in Hawaii that while many of the nurses are graduates of hospital nursing courses, they do not have degrees in nursing. Recently, the nursing schools closed and all students are now required to attend the University of Hawaii to become nurses. The nondegree nurses are consequently realizing that it is important for them to go back to school and acquire a degree.

A community college on the island concerned has developed a new program that would recognize the experience of the nondegree nurses as a partial credit toward a degree in general studies. There are about 30 nurses who are interested in this opportunity. Most of them, however, are unable to attend college on a full-time basis. They are already employed and badly needed in our hospitals.

Even if they were able to enter college full time, it would be unwise to do so because this would create a shortage in a vital area of nursing.

As I looked at this problem, it occurred to me that there was an even wider need for half-time assistance. This entire bill is addressed to a serious nationwide shortage in trained professional nurses, and I believe that the availabiilty of aid for half-time studies would go far toward remedying this situation.

There may be many persons in all of our States who would be interested in the profession of nursing, but lack the means of attending college on a full-time basis. My amendment would permit them to study half time where courses were offered or could be developed, meanwhile holding other jobs or tending to their families.

My amendment does not require that any specific amount be set aside for the purpose of half-time assistance. It would be entirely at the discretion of the administering agency.

I would merely like to remove statutory limitations which do not allow this discretionary flexibility at the moment. I think the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is capable of determining the proper requirements and standards for this assistance. My intent is that as far as possible the policies should remain the same except that half-time assistance would be available where needed.

I urge the adoption of my amendments.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say that on this side we have no objection to the amendments offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and would accept the amendments.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, we on the minority side have no objection to the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Iowa: On page 20, after line 8, insert the following and redesignate the following paragraphs accordingly:

"(c) ALTERNATE REPAYMENT.—Section 823(b) (42 U.S.C. 297b) is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(1) In lieu of payments required under this section, an institution may enter into an agreement with a student providing that, beginning with the student's second taxable year which begins after the student ceases to pursue a full-time course of study, repayments shall be made at a rate for each taxable year equal to five per centum of the person's personal net taxable income for such year, as defined or determined by section 63 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, until such loan is repaid.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I think almost everyone agrees that we have a crisis in our health delivery system. Some would disagree as to how to take care of it. Some would just pour more money into the present system. I happen to think we must reform the system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is nice to hope that this bill that was passed just a few minutes ago to help educate physicians will provide enough doctors so that everybody can have a specialist for every ailment they have, but I do not believe it is going to happen. The only way we will have adequate medical service in this country is to delegate some of the doctors' responsibility to the nurses. And that is the reason I think this is an important bill. But we cannot delegate those responsibilities unless there are plenty of good nurses.

About 70 percent of our school teachers in many areas of this country, are married women whose children are at least past the preschool stage, and that is exactly where a big increase in the supply of the nurses are going to have to come from. Since we do not have an adequate source of nurses in this country, the question is how do we get these nurses? Well, if a young woman is poor enough and if her parents are poor enough, she can get a scholarship. In many places, she can get all the money she needs. Or, if your parents are wealthy enough, her parents can pay her way. But what if she is just a good, young all-American girl whose parents are average in this country, who make about 8 or 10 thousand dollars a year, and she expects during her lifetime to work about 25 of the next 30 years and at the same time raise a family?

She walks in to get a loan. She is faced with an inflexible repayment schedule—10 percent each year of the total amount of the loan for 10 years. If she is out of the job market a couple of years, she is in default on her loan and carried on the list of defaults. She gets so far behind, it seems she had just as well never expect to catch up. The prospect of the situation is just too much for some of these young women who are 18 and 19 years of age to face. They say—I do not know for sure what I am going to do. I hope to get married. I hope to have a family and I do not want a rigid repayment schedule for a large debt.

What this amendment does is to provide that in this kind of an event, the nursing school can say—OK, we will permit you to repay a certain percentage of your income per year in lieu of a rigid repayment schedule. In those years you work, you will pay and in those years you do not work, you will not pay.

This they can understand. It does not bind them unduly during a period of uncertainty and this is what they will accept.

Several of the nursing school people have been before our Committee on Appropriations and they tell us that this will help a great deal to get some of the good young women of America that they want and they have not been able to get into the nursing schools.

If we are going to extend the nursing schools, they are going to have to take care of this kind of problem so I say it is about time we started thinking about these kinds of problems. I do not think this bill is sensitive as to this particular problem and I would hope the committee would adopt the amendment.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I do so very reluctantly because I consider the gentleman who has just spoken, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), to be one of the finest Members of this Congress that we have and, certainly, consider him as one of my great and good friends.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee in their wisdom have decided that this is not appropriate to the bill. I can remember—it seems to me it was in 1968 that the gentleman offered the same amendment and we opposed it at that time. It was not put into the legislation this time and it is not in the legislation. I oppose the amendment, Mr. Chairman, because the subcommittee in their wisdom feel that it should not be in the legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, there are very sound reasons for opposing this amendment.

There is no reason why nurses should not repay a loan and all the nurses I know feel that way about it.

Under the gentleman's amendment it would be possible under certain circumstances that the loan never would be repaid because it calls for 5 percent of the net income.

In some circumstances she would work and never pay anything or even be required to pay anything in her entire lifetime. Let me show you what the bill does do—a nurse can get 10 percent a year up to one-half of the loan or 50 percent of the total for working in any public or nonprofit institution.

She can get 50 percent for just working and she can get 75 percent forgiveness in 3 years if she works in a shortage area.

This is not any burden on anybody. We give them every opportunity to have forgiveness of a loan and it is not forcing anything upon them.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, you are talking about the years that she is working. My amendment is not directed at repayment obligations during those years. When she is working, let her repay the loan. You are saying that she should be repaying those years that she is working.

What about the years when she has several children—preschool-age children or does not work?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am talking about the years right after she graduates when she expects to work and that first period of years we expect to get the loan repaid.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If she does not repay the regular loan, you are not going to get it back anyway.

Mr. SPRINGER. But the way the gentleman has it if, for instance, she had no net income over the years, she could carry that on her income tax in certain ways and if she has no income tax at all, certainly, she would never be required to pay anything.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The fact is that the worst possible time for the repayment to be inflexible is the first years immediately after she graduates because that is when she has young children and the best time to repay is a few years later. If she is in that situation, she still has 30 years to pay.

Mr. SPRINGER. I believe the gentleman is mistaken on this because I think you will find most of the nurses working are young nurses and immediately after they get married.

We have three all in the same circumstances. But under the gentleman's amendment, we would have returned all of this money back to the Treasury in the time that they worked for the loan. But if you are going to stretch this out to those years where you can just take 5 percent and that is all, and that is the only obligation she would have, I can figure ways by which, if she is a smart operator, she would never repay the loan or any part of it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. You are saying that the nursing schools to whom students apply for a loan, students who need and want a loan, that those nursing schools and their loan officers would be too generous and lend money to such people.

Mr. SPRINGER. Certainly they are going to give the money to the people who are in need. The question is not one of need. The question is how and under what circumstances we shall require the loan to be repaid. What seems far more important is that we must measure those in the same way we have measured other loans. To change the form of payment would require us to be back next year with a modification of repayment terms for everybody else under this program; $10,000 is quite a large sum of money to give to anybody to allow them to be educated. It certainly is not nearly as much as a doctor requires, I am willing to concede to the gentleman. Nevertheless, it is a sizable amount of money to encourage a person who does not have money to go to a nursing school to be trained in that profession.

But I think it would be wrong for us to give the idea here that there would be a possibility that these loans would not be repaid. I think that would be the worst thing we could do, so far as the Congress is concerned, to demonstrate to the public that in a program under which we are lending public funds, we are not expecting very prompt payment of the loans.

May I say this to my distinguished colleagues from Iowa, for whom I have the greatest respect, that the rate of repayment on all of these loans of all kinds is very high. We have had excellent repayment. We have not had any objection to the way in which these repayments are made. The good part of the program, and the reason I recommend this program so strongly, is that we are getting the money back, and that is because we have set up a sound method by which we can expect repayment with forgiveness of 50 percent, under other conditions 75 percent, and other conditions under which they do not have to repay anything. We are giving the advantage to the people who apply for these loans.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I think the gentleman will realize that the default rate has been rising and I think that about half of those who do not repay should not be considered bad risks for it is really not their fault. They have a particular circumstance that puts them out of the job market for a year or two. They should not be in the bad debt category.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. My concern is that the amendment would not encourage people to go into nursing but to stop working. That is exactly what we want to encourage young ladies to do, to work, to be nurses. That is the purpose of the legislation, and we should write this into the contract. I would urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair (Mr. GRAY) 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. 8630) to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for training increased numbers of nurses, pursuant to House Resolution 482, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 324, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 108, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—324

Abbitt	Biaggi	Carney
Abernethy	Biester	Carter
Abourezk	Blackburn	Casey, Tex.
Abzug	Blanton	Chamberlain
Addabbo	Blatnik	Chappell
Anderson, Calif.	Boggs	Chisholm
	Boland	Clark
Anderson, Ill.	Bolling	Clausen, Don H.
Anderson, Tenn.	Brademas	
	Bray	Clawson, Del
Andrews, Ala.	Brinkley	Clay
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brooks	Collins, Ill.
	Brotzman	Colmer
Annunzio	Brown, Mich.	Conte
Archer	Brown, Ohio	Conyers
Arends	Burke, Fla.	Coughlin
Ashley	Burke, Mass.	Culver
Aspin	Burleson, Tex.	Daniel, Va.
Aspinall	Burlison, Mo.	Daniels, N.J.
Badillo	Burton	Davis, S.C.
Begich	Byrne, Pa.	Davis, Wis.
Belcher	Byrnes, Wis.	Delaney
Bennett	Byron	Dellenback
Bergland	Cabell	Dellums
Betts	Camp	Denholm
Bevill	Carey, N.Y.	Dennis

Derwinski	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Dickinson	Kazen	Rogers
Diggs	Keating	Roncalio
Dingell	Kee	Rooney, N.Y.
Dorn	King	Rooney, Pa.
Dow	Koch	Rosenthal
Downing	Kyros	Rostenkowski
Drinan	Landgrebe	Roush
Dulski	Lent	Roy
Duncan	Link	Roybal
du Pont	Lloyd	Ryan
Eckhardt	Long, Md.	St Germain
Edmondson	McClory	Sarbanes
Edwards, Ala.	McCollister	Satterfield
Edwards, Calif.	McCormack	Scherle
Eilberg	McDade	Scheuer
Erlenborn	McEwen	Schneebeli
Esch	McFall	Schwengel
Eshleman	McKay	Scott
Evans, Colo.	McKevitt	Sebelius
Evins, Tenn.	McKinney	Shipley
Fascell	Macdonald,	Shoup
Findley	Mass.	Shriver
Fish	Madden	Sisk
Fisher	Mahon	Skubitz
Flood	Mailliard	Slack
Flowers	Mann	Smith, Calif.
Foley	Mathis, Ga.	Smith, Iowa
Ford, Gerald R.	Matsunaga	Smith, N.Y.
Ford,	Mayne	Snyder
William D.	Mazzoli	Spence
Forsythe	Meeds	Springer
Fountain	Metcalfe	Stafford
Fraser	Mikva	Staggers
Frenzel	Miller, Ohio	Stanton,
Fulton, Pa.	Mills, Md.	James V.
Fulton, Tenn.	Minish	Steed
Fuqua	Mink	Steele
Galifianakis	Minshall	Steiger, Wis.
Gallagher	Mitchell	Stokes
Garmatz	Mizell	Stratton
Gaydos	Mollohan	Stubblefield
Gettys	Monagan	Stuckey
Giaimo	Montgomery	Sullivan
Gibbons	Morgan	Symington
Goldwater	Morse	Talcott
Gonzalez	Mosher	Teague, Calif.
Goodling	Moss	Teague, Tex.
Grasso	Murphy, Ill.	Terry
Gray	Myers	Thompson, Ga.
Green, Oreg.	Natcher	Thompson, N.J.
Green, Pa.	Nedzi	Thomson, Wis.
Gross	Nelsen	Thone
Grover	Nichols	Tiernan
Gude	Nix	Udall
Haley	Obey	Ullman
Halpern	O'Hara	Van Deerlin
Hammer-	O'Konski	Vander Jagt
schmidt	O'Neill	Vanik
Hanley	Patman	Veysey
Hanna	Patten	Vigorito
Harrington	Pelly	Waggonner
Harsha	Pepper	Waldie
Harvey	Perkins	Ware
Hays	Pickle	Whalen
Hébert	Pike	Whalley
Hechler, W. Va.	Pirnie	White
Helstoski	Poage	Whitehurst
Henderson	Podell	Whitten
Hicks, Mass.	Powell	Widnall
Hicks, Wash.	Preyer, N.C.	Wiggins
Hillis	Price, Ill.	Williams
Hogan	Price, Tex.	Wilson, Bob
Holifield	Pryor, Ark.	Winn
Horton	Quie	Wolff
Hosmer	Quillen	Wright
Howard	Rangel	Wyatt
Hungate	Rarick	Wylie
Hunt	Rees	Yatron
Hutchinson	Reid, Ill.	Young, Fla.
Jacobs	Reid, N.Y.	Young, Tex.
Johnson, Pa.	Reuss	Zablocki
Jones, Ala.	Riegle	Zion
Jones, N.C.	Roberts	Zwach
Karth	Robinson, Va.	

NAYS—0

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Schmitz

NOT VOTING—108

Adams	Buchanan	Davis, Ga.
Alexander	Caffery	de la Garza
Ashbrook	Cederberg	Dent
Baker	Celler	Devine
Baring	Clancy	Donohue
Barrett	Cleveland	Dowdy
Bell	Collier	Dwyer
Bingham	Collins, Tex.	Edwards, La.
Bow	Conable	Flynt
Brasco	Corman	Frelinghuysen
Broomfield	Cotter	Frey
Broyhill, N.C.	Crane	Griffin
Broyhill, Va.	Danielson	Griffiths
Gubser	Lennon	Randall
Hagan	Long, La.	Rhodes
Hall	Lujan	Robison, N.Y.
Hamilton	McCloskey	Roe
Hansen, Idaho	McClure	Rousselot
Hansen, Wash.	McCulloch	Runnels
Hastings	McDonald,	Ruppe
Hathaway	Mich.	Ruth
Hawkins	McMillan	Sandman
Heckler, Mass.	Martin	Saylor
Hull	Mathias, Calif.	Seiberling
Ichord	Melcher	Sikes
Jarman	Michel	Stanton,
Johnson, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	J. William
Jonas	Mills, Ark.	Steiger, Ariz.
Jones, Tenn.	Moorhead	Stephens
Keith	Murphy, N.Y.	Taylor
Kemp	Passman	Wampler
Kluczynski	Pettis	Watts
Kuykendall	Peyser	Wilson,
Kyl	Poff	Charles H.
Landrum	Pucinski	Wydler
Latta	Purcell	Wyman
Leggett	Railsback	Yates

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Roe with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Latta.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Cotter with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Donohue with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Poff.

Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Robison of New York.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Rhodes.

Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Ruth.

Mr. Bingham with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Melcher with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. McClure.

Mr. Runnels with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Hagan with Mr. Crane.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Hall.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Martin.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Caffery with Mr. Hastings.

Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Danielson with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Wampler.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Kemp.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Bow.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Pettis.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. Yates with Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Adams with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Collins of Texas.

Mr. Seiberling with Mr. Conable.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Kyl.

Mr. Randall with Mr. J. William Stanton.

Mr. Griffin with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Rousselot.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND THE WEEK OF JULY 5, 1971

(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 leader the program for the rest of the week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

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

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

Mr. BOGGS. I am very happy to respond to the distinguished minority leader. In response to the latter part of your question, we have completed the work of this legislative week.

Monday, of course, is the July 4th recess.

On Tuesday we have scheduled the Private Calendar, the Consent Calendar, and one suspension, H.R. 9181—Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Amendment. As far as I know, it is not controversial.

On Wednesday we have scheduled:

H.R. 6483, Marine Corps generals appointment, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

H.R. 8805, Obscene mail category for minors, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

On Thursday we have scheduled:

H.R. 8181, Export-Import Bank extension, subject to a rule being granted.

H.R. 9093, Desalting program expansion, subject to a rule being granted.

Conference reports and privileged resolutions, of course, may be called up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Can the Members expect that the resolutions of inquiry which were reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs will be coming up on Wednesday? Is that a possibility?

Mr. BOGGS. It is more than a possibility, I believe. The chairman of the committee informed me he intends to call them up on Wednesday. Of course, that is subject to change; he could change his mind.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it also true that on Friday, July 16, and on Friday, July 30, there is the expectation that there will be business on both those days?

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman will recall that in response to a question he posed some weeks ago the answer was in the

affirmative. That is also subject to whether or not legislation is available.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next, July 7, 1971.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall No. 176. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL WORTH OF CONGRESSMAN ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, today I am placing into the RECORD a complete statement of my financial worth as of December 31, 1970. This statement includes a listing of all assets which are held in my name individually or which are held jointly with my wife, as well as all assets which are held by my wife in her individual name.

I have also included a statement of our income, from all sources, for calendar year 1970, as developed from our income tax return for that year.

I intend to place a full financial disclosure into the RECORD for each year that it is my honor to serve in the Congress of the United States.

The statement of finances is as follows:

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

ROMANO L. AND HELEN D. MAZZOLI

December 31, 1970

Cash on deposit	
Lincoln Federal S&L Assn., Account 37889	$2,174.74
Liberty National Bank & Trust Co., Account 09-013390	3,479.63
Liberty National Bank & Trust Co., Account 08-33-816-7	716.72
American United Life Insurance Co., Policy 1011729	387.94
Securities, Stock, and Bonds	0
Real property	
Residential:	
House (Louisville): Assessed Value	$18,860.00
Less: Mortgage, Portland Federal S&L	12,251.99
Equity	6,308.01
Commercial or Investment	0
Household Goods and Miscellaneous personalty (Estimated)	4,000.00
Cash surrender value of life insurance policies	
American United Life Insurance Co., Policy 1011729	$2,231.84
American United Life Insurance Co., Policy 1116312	171.05
Automobiles	
1965 Rambler	$745.00
1955 Chevrolet (Estimated)	100.00
Law Office Furniture, Equipment, and Library	523.00
Total assets	20,837.93

INCOME FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1970

Interest income	
Lincoln Federal S & L Association	$105.00
Liberty National Bank & Trust Company	190.00
American United Life Insurance Company	15.00
Political Honoraria	685.00
Law Practice, Net Income (Gross: $8,602.00)	2,430.00
Commonwealth of Kentucky, State Senate	
Salary	$1,875.00
Unexpended Expense Allowance	2,132.00
	4,007.00
Total income	7,432.00

TURKEY BANS OPIUM PRODUCTION

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Turkish Government on the steps that it has taken to ban within its borders the cultivation of opium after 1972.

I realize that there has just been some discussion on this floor on this subject, some of it critical. I think, however, that before we jump to conclusions, we must realize the complexities of enforcement in a country like Turkey and the fact that there are, as I recall it, something like 15 counties or provinces that are involved and that this is a very valuable cash crop to these farmers. I believe that the Turkish Government has taken a very substantial forward step and that our Government and our own Government agencies are to be commended for their activity and for this accomplishment. I would hope that other governments in Asia and Latin America would be as cooperative as Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, that Turkey has banned all opium cultivation within its borders after 1972 is the most encouraging item of news in today's Washington Post.

The U.S. Government through various agencies has been working in cooperation with the Government of Turkey for several years to achieve this encouraging advance. Since 80 percent of the heroin that is smuggled into the United States is derived from Turkish opium, the decision of the Turkish Government to cut off opium production represents a real breakthrough in efforts to control our Nation's domestic heroin addiction epidemic.

If the governments of the Southeast Asian and South American countries could achieve similar success in enacting laws to control their narcotic drug production, our national addiction crisis would be expeditiously solved. Our Government could beneficially focus its attention on the cultivation of narcotic drugs in these countries next.

I commend the Government of Turkey and our own Federal agencies for their cooperative effort. I include an article from the Washington Post of June 30 for the RECORD:

TURKEY PLANS BAN ON OPIUM GROWING

ANKARA, TURKEY.—Turkey has agreed to ban all opium production after 1972, authoritative sources said yesterday. U.S. officials have estimated up to 80 per cent of the heroin smuggled into the United States is made from Turkish opium.

The prohibition would fulfill a major American foreign policy goal. The sources said the United States would compensate Turkey poppy growers in return.

The ban, to be published officially today, names the four provinces in western Turkey where opium can be planted this fall under a previous government decision last year, the informants said.

And after next July's harvest, the planting of opium poppies or the production of opium would be completely forbidden within the borders of Turkey.

President Nixon and Turkish Premier Nihat Erim are expected to make statements today about the ban, the sources said.

FEDERAL COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, starting today, the Department of the Interior is conducting a series of meetings to compile information and suggestions on the enforcement of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, which President Nixon signed into law on December 30, 1969. The importance of this act in improving conditions for the more than 140,000 men who work in coal mines of the United States was dramatically presented today in a statement by the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton. At this time I insert Secretary Morton's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS OF ROGERS C. B. MORTON

This morning we are opening a series of meetings pursuant to our announcement in the Federal Register of June 25 regarding coal mine health and safety. We hope the input and testimony we will receive will be of real assistance to the Department. This information will be carefully evaluated in the compilation of our report to the Congress concerning Departmental responsibilities and activities as defined in the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.

At the outset, may I express my personal thanks for the time and effort contributed by all the participants in this and subsequent meetings. Our common goal is to improve the health and safety for more than 140,000 men working in the coal mines of the United States.

First, let us review the current situation in the industry. Over the years, the coal mining industry has been the most accident prone and the source of more fatalities than any other major industry in America. Between 1954 and 1969, there were 5,553 fatalities and 207,988 injuries resulting from accidents in coal mines. This does not include any measure of the deterioration of individual miners' health due to working conditions on the job.

One of the early legislative proposals of this Administration was the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, which was signed

into law by President Nixon in December of 1969.

A good measure of our current effort to improve health and safety in mines is drawn from the funding level of the current program compared to that of former years. For example, in fiscal year 1968, the Bureau of Mines Budget for health and safety was $10,777,485. The request for fiscal year 1972 by the Bureau is for $71,075,000.

Since the Act became law, the Bureau of Mines has increased its inspector force from 300 to 1,090. These men are now either working actively in mines inspection or are undergoing an extensive training program which will give us a fully trained inspector force by the end of this year.

Since January of this calendar year, the Bureau has conducted 11,011 inspections, has cited 32,201 violations, and has levied 38,000 fines totaling $4,800,000. This compares with 2,408 notices of violations made by the Bureau for the full year of 1968.

The Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, then, marks a threshold as we enter a new era of action to reduce the hazards which confront the men who work in our mines.

During the six-month period from January through June of 1971, the Bureau recorded 98 fatalities which was the lowest number of fatalities recorded in any comparable period since the Bureau started accumulating these records.

Though this is an improvement, there is still a long way to go, and we do not accept the current accident rate as satisfactory.

Most accidents which occur in coal mines can be placed into two categories: One—accidents which are caused by conditions in the mines which the operator of the mine can control, and two—accidents which are caused by carelessness or failures on the part of the miner himself.

We will strive to attain the highest possible level of health and safety by continuing to improve the standards and practices in both categories. By working with management and supervisory personnel within the mining industry and through constant and vigilant inspection, we can and we must eliminate those conditions which cause accidents of the first category.

Through education and training programs carried out in cooperation with the unions, management, other employee groups, and the individual miner himself, we must, to the limit of our resources, do all that is feasible to reduce the accidents and fatalities of the second category. In other words, we must help the miner help himself.

These two approaches cannot be separated—nor can one be sacrificed for the other.

Significantly, education for the individual miner has parallel throughout American industry, in many agencies of government, and by such public spirited organizations as the National Safety Council. For example, the Federal Aviation Administration has carried on for years a pilot safety program that has been implemented by associations, by fixed base airport operators, and training schools and by pilots themselves. Major industry throughout the country constantly conducts training seminars and safety education programs for their workers.

The coal mining industry, with its hundreds of operating entities must depend on help from the Bureau of Mines in this effort. There are many small operators who do not have the expertise or the resources to carry out comprehensive education and training programs for the people who must work in the hazardous environment of underground mines. I can report to you that the Bureau of Mines is currently reviewing several methods by which it can best render this service.

If a single miner's life is saved as a result of better safety education and a better understanding of the hazards and risks, the program definitely is a worthwhile investment.

We are equally determined to join with management in a comprehensive effort not only to help them comply with the law, but to enforce compliance as well.

Specifically—despite dramatic improvement in the control of respirable dust—we are still vitally concerned with this area and methane gas levels in the mines as well.

We will also seek to improve existing engineering standards for roof support and for coal extraction. We are encouraging the development of safer and better mining technology. As innovative methodology becomes available, we will do all possible to insure its use in the mining industry.

Dr. Osborn, Director of the Bureau of Mines, will present before this meeting a detailed account of the Bureau's plans for carrying out its mission and its responsibilities to the miners of America.

We appeal to those interested parties to address themselves via this meeting, to ways and means with which this great government agency can better serve its constituency. We invite your comments; we solicit your criticisms; we appreciate your ideas.

We want your complete objectivity—partisan politics has nothing to contribute to the life and health of the miner.

I can say without equivocation that the Administration, the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Mines are fully committed to the health and safety of the men who work in the coal mines of America. We fully understand the importance of this industry to the Nation's welfare. We are confident that the mining industry in America will make a meaningful contribution to the standard of living of future generations.

Again, I wish to express my sincere and personal appreciation to all of you and to all of those who will participate in these important meetings as they take place.

POW BENEFIT BILL

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, with bipartisan support of 37 cosponsors, I have today introduced a bill which would provide for the first time in our history special lifetime compensation to men who have been held prisoner of war.

Under the bill, upon return to civilian life American servicemen held prisoner of war by hostile governments during the Vietnam era would receive $30 a month for each year or portion thereof of imprisonment, with a maximum of $150 a month.

This compensation would be in addition to any other benefits to which they are entitled under existing law.

In my view, the POW's of the Vietnam conflict thoroughly merit this unprecedented consideration, because the inhumane circumstances in which they are incarcerated are without precedent in our history.

Never before have enemy authorities so persistently and grossly violated even the most minimal standards of decency and humanity in dealing with soldiers taken prisoner. The grave continuing violations of the Geneva Convention Relative to Treatment of Prisoners of War are recognized and deplored worldwide.

North Vietnam and its allies in Southeast Asia have refused to identify all prisoners they hold, they have refused to allow impartial inspection of prisoner facilities, they have not permitted free exchange of mail between prisoners and their families, they have not released seriously sick and wounded prisoners, and they have not been willing to negotiate for the release of all U.S. citizens they hold captive. Each of these is a violation of the provisions of the 1949 Geneva Convention Relative to Treatment of Prisoners of War, which North Vietnam ratified in 1957.

Because of this inhumanity, the prisoners of this war and their families have suffered, in a real sense, one of the very heaviest and most cruel burdens of the entire war.

The compensation proposed in this bill, while modest, will later help these men and their families overcome the anguish of the years of separation and uncertainty. In the meantime, it will evidence our Government's determination to serve the needs of these long suffering heroes as long as they live.

Here is the text of bill and list of cosponsors:

H.R. 9569

A bill to provide compensation to prisoners-of-war of the Vietnam era because of the inhumane circumstances of their incarceration

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 314 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(t) If the veteran was detained, through no misconduct of his own, as a prisoner-of-war during the Vietnam era by the Government of North Vietnam or governments or forces allied with such Government, such detained status shall be deemed to be a disability within the meaning of section 310, and the rate of compensation therefor shall be $30 per month for each year or portion thereof that the veteran was detained as a prisoner-of-war, up to a maximum of $150 per month. Such compensation shall be independent of any other compensation provided in this section, and is authorized because throughout the Vietnam conflict the Government of North Vietnam and governments and forces allied with such Government have persistently and grossly violated the provisions of the Geneva Convention Relative to Treatment of Prisoners-of-War, which North Vietnam ratified in 1957."

LIST OF CO-SPONSORS

Bella S. Abzug, Democrat, of New York.
LaMar Baker, Republican, of Tennessee.
Tom Bevill, Democrat, of Alabama.
Jack Brinkley, Democrat, of Georgia.
James A. Burke, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
Harold R. Collier, Republican, of Illinois.
Mendel J. Davis, Democrat, of South Carolina.
John J. Duncan, Republican, of Tennessee.
Don Edwards, Democrat, of California.
Paul Findley,[1] Republican, of Illinois.
Edwin B. Forsythe, Republican, of New Jersey.
Bill Frenzel, Republican, of Minnesota.
James G. Fulton, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Edward A. Garmatz, Democrat, of Maryland.
Barry M. Goldwater, Jr., Republican, of California.
Gilbert Gude, Republican, of Maryland.
Seymour Halpern, Republican, of New York.

[1] Chief sponsor.

Julia Butler Hansen, Democrat, of Washington.
James F. Hastings, Republican, of New York.
Ken Hechler, Democrat, of West Virginia.
Margaret M. Heckler, Republican, of Massachusetts.
Louise Day Hicks, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
William L. Hungate, Democrat, of Montana.
Albert W. Johnson, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Jack F. Kemp, Republican, of New York.
Norman F. Lent, Republican, of New York.
F. Bradford Morse, Republican, of Massachusetts.
David R. Obey, Republican, of Wisconsin.
Thomas M. Pelly, Republican, of Washington.
Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey.
Robert A. Roe, Democrat, of New Jersey.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat, of New York.
Fernand P. St Germain, Democrat, of Rhode Island.
John H. Terry, Republican, of New York.
Lawrence G. Williams, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Gus Yatron, Democrat, of Florida.
C. W. Bill Young, Republican, of Florida.
Richard H. Fulton, Democrat, of Tennessee.

LITHUANIAN SELF-RULE AND INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, for 121 years now the Lithuanian people have been an oppressed people. First came the domination of the Russian Czars. Then, with German occupation in 1918, during World War I, Lithuania declared her independence.

It was only an illusion, however, because 22 years later, on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union again invaded the Baltic States and by force of arms took Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Thirty years ago this month, the Kremlin moved its troops into the Baltic republics and promptly annexed them. Then under Red army guns the Soviet Union held so called "honest elections." This was truly one of history's great election frauds. Frauds like it continue to this day and not only in the Eastern European and Balkan lands.

Although in June 1941 the people of Lithuania were able to overthrow the Communist regime, proclaim their freedom of independence and restore a free government, their exuberance was short lived. Six weeks later the Nazis overran the country and suppressed all activities.

Never, since the United States recognized the independent Lithuanian Government in 1922, have we recognized the forced absorption of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. We must continue to insist on the inalienable rights of these brave people to national independence.

This country, whose children have enriched our culture and strengthened the spirit of freedom in America, must be encouraged to continue the struggle to maintain their identity and their self respect. We must do all we can to insure that the Lithuanian dream of independence and self-rule become a reality.

GALLAGHER CALLS FOR EMBARGO ON ARMS SHIPMENTS TO PAKISTAN

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss briefly the situation in East Pakistan and the American response to a situation which our arms and military equipment helped to create. The current policy, which has allowed arms to continue to be shipped from the United States to the Government of Pakistan, in spite of the ban of March 25, is bureaucratic ineptitude which will become, in my judgment, diplomatic catastrophe.

On June 15 I introduced H.R. 9160 which will cut off all military, economic and relief assistance to the Government of Pakistan until outside observers report a cessation of army action against the population of East Pakistan and that the refugees, as far as feasible, have been allowed to return to their homeland and reclaim their property. I visited the refugee camps early in June and found the situation to be one of unimaginable horror.

Although many of the world community regard the crisis as an internal matter of Pakistan, it appears obvious to me that any policy which creates 6 million refugees completely destroys the queasy legalism of "an internal matter." In addition, it is bad enough that our arms contributed to the brutal actions of the army's repressive sweep through East Pakistan on and after March 25; it is impermissible for us to continue to subsidize the slaughter by not completely stopping our arms shipments.

The shipments of military equipment now going forward are in the Department of Defense pipeline, due to the fact that ownership passed to the Government of Pakistan prior to the time the ban was announced. The only way now to plug up that pipeline is for the United States to issue a formal embargo and I regard that step as crucial.

Mr. Speaker, I have learned that the Government of Canada has stopped military shipments to Pakistan which in some cases, resulted from licenses and approvals granted as long ago as 5 years. Surely, given the extraordinary nature of the crisis and the damaging effect a continuation has on our credibility, our Government can find an adequate response.

Any kind of aid to that government will be misused and, in my judgment, will be diverted to crush the people who won the election in East Pakistan. We must never forget that the Awami League won 167 of the 169 seats contested in East Pakistan and this gave them a clear majority in the constituent assembly. It is obvious that the leaders of the Awami League felt that they could trust the word of the Government, or else they would have established "Bangla Desh" as soon as their electoral victory was confirmed. It is a fact that they did not and so, in spite of many misleading statements, they must not be regarded as rebels or secessionists. They are people who made democracy work and they are now under what might be called an internal siege; that is, the Army is in control. To put it another way, it might be said that the people of East Pakistan are the victims of outside aggression, in the sense that West Pakistan is separated from East Pakistan by 1,000 miles.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, the problem facing the United States is not to make the problems any worse. Yet, we are allowing ships to sail from the United States with our military goods on board and these weapons will be used to continue the crushing of the winners of the election. In addition, I also believe that the United States must cut off all economic aid. Informed testimony during the hearings of my Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee in May by Prof. Robert Dorfman confirmed that American economic aid is all that is keeping Pakistan from bankruptcy and, according to the professor, a resumption of our aid is essential for Pakistan to continue its savage repression in its east wing.

The World Bank has refused to make any additional finances available to the Government of Pakistan, and I call upon the United States to follow that lead.

One hopeful sign is that Presidential Adviser Henry Kissinger will visit India and Pakistan in the next several days. I hope that he will visit the areas of the refugee camps, for, if he does, he will come away a believer. I had some doubts about the stories of brutality and unparalleled human misery myself before I visited those camps. When one sees the problem firsthand, its enormity is clearly visible and the appalling suffering is clearly evident. If Mr. Kissinger sees the camps and hears the stories of the refugees, he will, I am sure, recommend that the United States alter its policy.

This must happen, Mr. Speaker. Our policy now continues to inflame a situation that is a mounting tragedy and contains the clear threat of war between India and Pakistan. No government can continue to accept refugees in such staggering numbers and, no matter how compassionate or humanitarian the Government of India has been since the first refugee crossed its borders, such disruption cannot continue. India must receive not only all the relief assistance of the world community, she must also receive help by a vigorous and courageous effort to pacify the source of the refugees. If East Pakistan does not return to normal, India will be forced to consider undesired and unwanted options, which will have worldwide implications.

India has shown incredible restraint. Why cannot the U.S. Government take a forthright, although difficult action and stop the shipment of arms? Do we so lack flexibility that once we begin on a course, nothing can change it? We can clearly see the dangers of the Pakistan situation; let us draw back now, while there is still time.

Any further shipments to Pakistan, no matter what the technical explanation, will be viewed by India as a lack of sympathy for its plight and as approval of Yahya Kahn's use of terror as a political weapon. By continuing support in economic and military terms, we are inter-

vening in the situation on the side of the Army of Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, I call on this administration to issue a formal embargo to stop the pipeline of arms to Pakistan. By so doing, we will reopen the pipeline of good will to India; and restore some of our lost credibility in the eyes of the nations of the world. Even more, we will show that we can be responsive to situations which alter suddenly and we will demonstrate that the humanitarianism which highlighted so much of our past is still relevant and visible in our relations with other countries today.

THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE CORPORATION

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

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Postal Service Corporation has assumed control of this Nation's postal system.

Elaborate reorganization plans have been unveiled, new booklets and promotional materials have been distributed, new advertising devices employed, rates hiked, and a number of independent first-class postal facilities cut back.

I do not desire to condemn this embryonic Postal Service Corporation in advance, nor to advocate a return to the former system or yet another change before trying this latest legislative product.

I cannot help feeling alarm, however, at stories and examples of increasingly inadequate postal service being told by my constituents, and I am certain that similar problems are confronting the constituents of many other Members of this House.

Missed deadlines for media, notices which announce sales but do not arrive on time, information which is delayed, materials which do not reach their destinations within reasonable periods of time, and mail which is routed in a cumbersome, inefficient fashion are phenomena found with increasing frequency in complaints from my constituents, and also in my own mail.

I am not sure how Members of Congress can now properly express their own and their constituents' collective outrage and indignation at rising rates and declining patterns of service with the postal system. No longer responsible—and seemingly no longer responsive—to the Congress, the Postal Service has sprouted new crops of liaison officers, professional buffers and soothers whose sincere efforts nevertheless have not helped mail in my district one bit.

The postal service is the lifeblood of many individuals and most businesses in this country, and we cannot afford sloppy administration and slipshod service in this new corporation.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S RECENT ENERGY MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, in a statement on June 23 on the House floor, I criticized President Nixon's recent energy message to Congress.

At that time, I expressed considerable concern that his research and development program was more notable for what it ignored than for what it included. Recent indications that nuclear fusion, which has been and is still significantly underfunded, will become a viable energy source tends to substantiate this concern. Scientists are expressing considerable confidence that a feasibility experiment soon to be conducted will demonstrate nuclear fusion's viability. Yet Mr. Nixon made no mention of fusion in his energy proposal. This is particularly important since nuclear fusion, unlike present fission methods, is virtually free from danger of explosion or radiation leakage.

With regard to the President's expanded leasing program for resources on public lands, I proposed that all leasing be halted immediately, pending the development of a wise energy policy. This policy would encompass not only resource issues, but economic considerations as well. Principal among these would be an investigation of the growing monopoly of all energy sources—coal, oil, natural gas, and uranium—in the hands of a few large oil companies.

At this point in the RECORD, I include two articles from the June 26 New Republic which reflect some of these concerns:

NIXON ON ENERGY

A series of energy crises threaten the nation, some this summer, more in the next few years and still others in the decades ahead. Coal is plentiful but sulfurous, natural gas is clean but scarce, oil is near its domestic pumping limit and uranium is a suspect arrival on the energy scene. In any event fossil fuels are destined to power the US energy economy for many years and the domestic resources of clean fuel immediately available are limited.

Against this background of impending crisis, President Nixon delivered the first energy message any Congress has ever received from the White House. According to the President's program $3 billion in federal funds will be required over the next 10 years to develop clean energy sources. It should be noted that the federal government spent over $3 billion in the past 10 years on development of civilian power, most of it for nuclear-electric power.

The big budget item targeted in the Nixon message is the power-breeder, a nuclear reactor designed to produce economic electricity and at the same time more nuclear fuel (plutonium) than it burns. General Electric, Westinghouse and North American Rockwell are the three candidates vying to build this demonstration power-breeder. Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Atomic Energy Commission chairman, stated on June 4 that the new reactor would cost "between $400 million and $500 million." President Nixon announced an increase of $50 million for the machine, equaling the amount already budgeted; this added to AEC fuel waivers and support adds up to $130 million in federal funds. The government hopes that the nuclear industry and utilities will put together a package that would make up the difference.

Even before the power-breeder "demo" is funded, it is under attack by environmentalists who fear that the facility will be far from clean. Prior to the President's energy message, the Scientists' Institute for Public Information (SIPI) brought a lawsuit against the AEC to force it "to prepare a comprehensive environmental impact statement on the complete LMFBR program and also a detailed assessment of the alternative means of power generation." LMFBR stands for liquid metal fast breeder reactor, a liquid sodium cooled power-breeder most favored by the AEC as the "demo" to be built. The White House fell short of this challenge by directing the AEC to prepare a 102 statement (Sec. 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act) on the environmental impact of just the "demo." Considering the fact that other types of power-breeders are under development, it would be useful to have such statements on all designs so that the decision on the power-breeder encompasses an overall assessment of the environmental capability of the new reactors.

The big item almost left out of the President's message is oil. (See Mr. Dietsch's report which follows.) Accounting for 43 percent of all US energy and two-thirds of the energy dollar, oil dominates all other fuels. Furthermore, domestic production of crude oil, now 3.5 billion barrels per year, is nudging the limits of capacity and oil products must be imported to fill the nation's 5.3 billion barrel current annual demand. Yet nothing is mentioned about oil import policy and one senses the crisis here by the President's emphasis on tapping off-shore oil (hardly a pollution-free source) and on developing our domestic oil shales.

"About 80 billion barrels of this shale oil are particularly rich and well situated for early development," reads the message, although acknowledging that "at present there is no commercial production of shale oil." The oil shale program of the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Mines has bumped along at a maximum funding of $2.5 million annually with $11.2 million spent in the last six years. A ton of good oil shale found in the Green River Formation in Colorado and adjoining states yields three-fourths of a barrel of oil. To supply 1 billion gallons of oil will mean excavating and processing twice the amount of coal now mined each year. Thus it's good that the message calls for an environmental (102) statement on shale oil. About 80 percent of oil shale is on federal land, and one hopes that the Secretary of the Interior will lease it so as to safeguard the taxpayer's interests—both financial and environmental.

The nation's most pressing energy need is to find additional natural gas. Here is a fossil fuel resource that is vanishing so fast that its use as an energy source will have to be curtailed in the next few years. The presidential message calls for intensification of the effort to gasify coal. The gasification of coal is technically feasible, although the development has limped along for years on a skimpy budget which only this year will top the $20 million mark for the Office of Coal Research. Our most abundant fossil fuel resource has in the past received little research and development attention—about a few percent of funds accorded nuclear power. I strongly suspect that nuclear funds for civilian power would not have been available either, had they not been virtually coattailed to the military atom. In any event coal gasification is now slated to advance to the demonstration stage with the government providing $20 million and industry kicking in half that amount. Nothing is said in the Energy Message about a 102 statement on coal gasification, although I estimate that it will take all of the US coal mined in one year to produce about half of the natural gas consumed this year.

"Energy has been an attractive bargain in this country—" states the message "and demand has responded accordingly." Indeed, the Federal Power Commission's 1964 National Power Survey observed that the 1962 price of electric energy was 1.7 cents/kilowatt

hour and it aimed at 1.2 cents/kw-hr by 1980. One wonders what the 1970 National Power Survey, now in preparation, will say about the requirement for low-cost energy. Obviously, it's an economic and political impossibility to stop power growth, but should low-cost energy be a primary national goal? This is only one element in a national energy policy and the Energy Message is not a statement of such a policy.

A true national energy policy would set time goals and fix the "energy mix," i.e. the proportion of fuels to be consumed in the light of national needs, resource adequacy and environmental compatibility. President Nixon recommends consolidating energy resource development programs under a single energy authority within the new Department of Natural Resources, which has yet to be established. This would have certain virtues, but it would be more a budgetary and administrative arrangement than a real energy policy agency. Presumably there will be no national energy policy until Big Oil decides to make one.

Meanwhile, the nation's electric energy production continues to soar and a sevenfold growth by the year 2000 has been set for the utilities. Then over half of the electric power will be nuclear and the trend is towards huge energy centers each generating 5 million kilowatts or more. The transportation hazard posed by making almost 10,000 "hot atom" shipments per year may make it necessary to process spent fuel at the power site. The Energy Message highlights the need for proper plant siting and location of transmission lines. It also urges that Americans use energy more wisely and recommends better insulation for houses and more efficient electrical appliances. But it does not recommend a ban on air conditioners, for example, or any restraints on all-electric living promoted by the utilities. Nor is there any admonition to Detroit to cut back vehicular horsepower which consumes 90 billion gallons of gasoline per year!

Skilled political chef that he is, the President has prepared an energy menu that has something for everyone. His critics cannot complain that he has glossed over the quality of our environment: "clean" as a characteristic of fuels appears in almost every paragraph. Environmentalists have not been crying in the wilderness, but they will hardly welcome the President's prime response: "Our best hope today for meeting the nation's growing demand for economical clean energy lies with the fast breeder reactor." He's putting his chips on the AEC's power-breeder as the energy source of the future.

In the showdown between nuclear and fossil fuels, opponents of the atom assert that reactors pose greater hazards than conventional power plants, and that we can make do with the fossil fuels. This is an argument of anticipation since fossil fuel fumes already pollute the environment and nuclear power is just coming on stream under tight restrictions just announced by the AEC.

The President's comprehensive introduction to the energy resource-environment must now be followed by a White House report on energy fuel needs of the future, resource availability, conversion prospects for solid fossil fuels and a comparative assessment of nuclear vs fossil fuel pollutants. Our high-energy society has in the space of 70 years burned up 37 billion tons of coal and over 80 billion barrels of oil. This massive conflagration has resulted in a growing environmental insult largely because of a lack of planning and control as America pursued the goal of low-cost power. This era is ending. That is the real meaning of the President's energy message, although you have to read between the lines to discern it.

THE WIDE REACH OF OIL

In his long-range energy resources program, the President put a lot of emphasis on nuclear energy; the Atomic Energy Commission reports 13 nuclear plants were ordered in the first four months of 1971, and the agency thinks up to 50 nuclear plants will be ordered over the next two years. Construction may be delayed by rows over environmental hazards, but nuclear power seems destined to supply an ever-greater amount of the nation's energy.

And yet oil men aren't too unhappy, because they control almost half the known uranium reserves in the United States, and it's uranium which drives nuclear power plants. In their rush to become "total energy companies," oil corporations have gobbled up most of the coal producers (they already controlled a good portion of natural gas reserves, gas and oil often being found together), and they're rushing into uranium. Oil companies in 1968 drilled 44 percent of uranium footage and in 1970 controlled an estimated 45 percent of uranium reserves, most of which are in the Rocky Mountain states. By now the figure may top 50 percent. Kerr-McGee Corp. (the Kerr in this oil firm is the late Sen. Robert Kerr of Oklahoma) runs the nation's largest uranium mill; others are under construction by Continental Oil (in combination with Pioneer Natural Gas) and Humble Oil, a subsidiary of New Jersey Standard Oil.

Uranium ore has to be enriched before it's used in a power plant, and today this enrichment is done exclusively in three government-owned plants, at Oak Ridge, Tenn., Paducah, Ky., and Portsmouth, O. The Nixon administration would like to sell these facilities to private industry (they were built at a cost of $2.3 billion), but the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Commission is opposed. Some persons familiar with energy and corporate finance think only the giant oil corporations have the resources (cash or bank credit) to bid on the plant. If oil companies did acquire them, they would be in monopolistic position to pretty much set the price of nuclear-generated power, in addition to enjoying their present influence in setting the price of oil, coal and natural gas. Like oil, uranium is a protected business: imports are prohibited by the AEC, although ores are mined much more cheaply in Canada and South Africa.

Oil's "total energy" rush is of growing concern. In 1970, of the nation's 25 largest oil companies, 18 had substantial interests in oil shale (the administration wants an "orderly formulation of a shale-oil policy" on government-owned lands), 11 in coal, 18 in uranium and 7 in tar sands (another potential source of crude oil). The largest owners of coal reserves are New Jersey Standard and Continental Oil. More than half of all coal mined in the US is sold by oil companies. The oil firms defend their "total energy" concept as logical and legal diversification; they want to be prepared, they say, for the day when coal might be converted economically as a supplement to gasoline and natural gas, when oil can be extracted economically from shale and tar sands and when nuclear energy becomes a full substitute for coal and oil in generating plants. Nonetheless, S. David Freeman, of the White House energy policy staff (and one of the few Democrats in the administration), told a Senate investigating subcommittee chaired by Lee Metcalf of Montana:

"We are witnessing a major transformation of the [energy field] with far-reaching consequences that deserve intensive scrutiny. . . . The speed and scale of dominance of the independent coal industry by their petroleum company competitors raises a question of whether the public interest is being best served. Only two of the largest coal companies are independently owned any longer. The remaining eight, which account for 42.9 percent of coal industry production, are owned by oil companies or large industrial concerns with other stakes in the energy field. These same eight companies owned 67 percent of the new mines opened in 1970."

The National Economic Research Association, a private consulting firm, says "the acquisition by oil companies across the total energy spectrum may be viewed as classic horizontal integration on a scale comparable to the formation of the trusts in the latter decades of the 19th century." Sen. Philip A. Hart (D, Mich.) says "primary fuel production, once clearly divided on the product lines of gas, oil, coal and uranium, is becoming the domain of the oil industry. Oil companies have acquired so many large independent coal companies that the remaining ones are rarities. Nuclear energy, which once afforded new hope of competition, also is the stomping ground for oil." Sen. George Aiken (R, Vt.), says "when you control energy then you control the nation. I see this as a very serious threat to political democracy."

Prodded by Hart and Rep. Joe L. Evins (D, Tenn.), the revitalized Federal Trade Commission is beginning to study the anti-competitive consequences of concentration in energy. The various fuels compete with each other, thus making (in theory at least) for lower consumer prices; decreasing competition, of course, makes for higher prices. The FTC also has ordered Kennecott Copper to sell off Peabody Coal, acquired in 1968. The FTC staff now is putting together cases against a number of coal takeovers by oil companies, including Continental Oil's 1966 acquisition of Consolidation Coal, the No. 1 producer. Senator Hart plans further hearings into the antitrust aspects of the "total energy" moves by oil, and Sen. John Sherman Cooper (R, Ky.), would like the Senate Interior Committee to probe not only coal shortages (which a few critics link to deliberate mine opening slowdowns by parent oil corporations), but the mushrooming energy concentration. The American Public Power Association has urged the White House to lead an antitrust investigation. Fifty-three senators have recommended creation of a national commission on fuels and energy. Others want a new look at the fragmented federal supervision of energy resources. Power brownouts and blackouts, undoubtedly coming again this summer, will spur further investigations.

AMERICAN BOWLING CONGRESS

(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, as a member from the State of New York, I take great pride in saluting the American Bowling Congress which was born in our State and presently is observing its 75th anniversary year. Devotees of the tenpin bowling will recall that the congress, which today is recognized as the world's largest sports organization, had its humble beginning in New York City's Beethoven Hall on September 9, 1895. It also is significant to note that several New Yorkers played prominent roles in the launching years of the ABC, many of whom unselfishly devoted much time and effort during this formative period.

For example, the first two presidents of ABC were New Yorkers: Thomas Curtis, serving in 1895–96, and Dr. Henry Timm

from 1896 to 1901. Eight others from the State have had the honor of heading the world's largest sports participation organization over the years.

New York is proud to join its sister States in recognizing the dramatic impact of organized bowling as fostered by the American Bowling Congress. Its diversified services to its 4½ million members, including complimentary service to the uniformed personnel in the far-flung U.S. military installations around the world, is largely responsible for making bowling so appealing to all levels of society.

For example, 3 million women participate in the leagues belonging to the Women's International Bowling Congress which is sponsored by the two adult organizations.

Surveys also show that 40 million men, women, and youngsters participate to some degree in the game.

ABC's anniversary year will be climaxed in Milwaukee, Wis. August 20 to 28 when it and its sister organization, the WIBC, will host the seventh world bowling tournament of the Federation Internationale des Quilleurs.

Thirty countries are expected to send national squads of men and women to this event which is really the Olympics of bowling. The tournament will be conducted on 28 specially built lanes in the Milwaukee Arena.

Our U.S. Postal Service will recognize this activity—the first ever to be held in the United States—with a commemorative stamped envelope, just announced by Postmaster General Winton M. Blount. The first-day cancellation ceremonies for this 8-cent stamp and envelope will be held in Milwaukee during the opening weekend of the world tournament.

Mr. Speaker, no remarks on the affairs and the history of the American Bowling Congress could possibly be complete without reference to my good friend and former constituent, John Martino. John is both a past president and a life member of the ABC. He is one of the individuals directly responsible for the commemorative stamp to which I referred a moment ago. He is also one of the finest gentlemen it has ever been my pleasure to know.

John Martino grew up with an abiding love for the sport of bowling. As a young man in Syracuse, he worked his way through the Christian Brothers Academy as a pinsetter. And typical of the diligence that was to manifest itself in his adulthood, John graduated from CBA as valedictorian of the class of 1915.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the ABC and one of its illustrious leaders, John O. Martino.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution introduced by my friend, the distinguished alderman of the 25th ward of the city of Chicago, Hon. Vito Marzullo.

Alderman Marzullo has given outstanding service for many years to the constituents of the Seventh District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent. He has served in many capacities over the years, not only as alderman and committeeman of the 25th ward, but as chairman of the Committee on Local Transportation of the city of Chicago and as a former member of the Illinois Legislature.

His resolution urges the Congress of the United States to remove certain restrictions imposed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Transportation in order to get public transportation moving once more in the large cities of America.

As Members of the U.S. Congress, all of us are fully aware of the problems that confront the large urban areas of our country, and public transportation is one of the top priorities in Chicago.

Providing effective urban mass transportation systems in the large cities of America is fast becoming one of our most urgent domestic issues and the Congress must find a workable solution to the problem before our urban areas come to a complete standstill and choke to death.

The resolution, which was approved by the Committee on Local Transportation on June 29, 1971, follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the public transportation systems serving the people living in our nation's cities are facing a financial crisis; and

Whereas, public transportation service is essential to the well-being of our cities; and

Whereas, public transportation is a public service which must be supported with public funds; and

Whereas, the U.S. Congress overwhelmingly passed the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1970 which was intended to provide financial assistance necessary to begin to solve problems related to the long neglected mode of public transportation; and

Whereas, federal legislative, administrative and bureacuratic restrictions have in effect emasculated the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1970 and precluded the implementation of programs which Congress intended be accomplished by the act; now, therefore

Be it resolved, that the City Council of Chicago urge the U.S. Congress, the President of the United States and the agencies of the federal government to take immediate steps to alleviate the critical problems facing public transportation systems in our nation's urban areas by:

(1) Allocating and authorizing expenditure of funds for transit improvements as provided in the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1970;

(2) Restoring contract authority to the urban mass transit program so that continuous funding is available for essential projects;

(3) Removing administrative restrictions imposed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and the U.S. Department of Transportation which presently reduce federal financial participation in many areas from two-thirds to one half thus creating intolerable economic strain on local units of government;

(4) Modifying federal administrative procedures so that undue delays in executing transit programs are eliminated; and

Be it further resolved, City Council of Chicago asks the U.S. Congress to thoroughly investigate the inconsistencies which exist in programs designed to assist transportation systems and take action necessary to:

(1) promote balanced urban transportation systems;

(2) increase the federal share of financial assistance to public transportation to 90% as presently exists for interstate highways;

(3) augment federal funds available for public transportation programs so that they more closely approximate federal highway funds available through the long standing highway trust fund; and

(4) assure that the people living in our urban areas are provided balanced transportation systems and public transit service so essential to the viability of our cities.

U.S.A. AND THE SOVIET MYTH

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the divergent reviews that are being written about the current work "U.S.A. and the Soviet Myth," authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, are enough to suggest that a chasm of thought and knowledge, not to speak of ruffled emotions on the part of mystified Russian lovers, exists with regard to the critical subject of the Soviet Union. Considering the present foreign policy of Canada and the foolish behavior of Trudeau in the U.S.S.R., it is not surprising to witness the scathing reviews emanating from the press of that country. Those from the United States and Great Britain provide, it seems, a contrast in balanced thinking and emotion. The following two, one written in Britain and the other in Canada, should prove the point as to the provocative content of this work:

U.S.A. AND THE SOVIET MYTH

"U.S.A. and the Soviet Myth"; by Lev E. Dobriansky. Devin-Adair Company. Price $6.75 or £2.85 including postage.

It is necessary for any student of politics, or indeed anyone who is really interested in what is happening in the world in which we live, to keep himself up-to-date and well informed on what is going on inside Russia, but it is even more important to understand what Russia really is and what she really is trying to do. The author of this book, already an acknowledged authority on Soviet affairs, gives the reader a fascinating insight into the Kremlin mind and how it works.

On page 30 the author writes:

"A second ruling misconception has the Soviet Union as a 'nation' with a Soviet people, a Soviet society, a Soviet economy, a Soviet political system and humans called 'the Soviets'. Here, too, the Soviet Union is no more a nation than was the British Empire. Whether many realise it or not, these monolithic terms have for some time been the stock of Moscow's terminology for export. They readily serve the semantic purpose of blurring the real, diverse and distinctive elements in the Soviet Union. The true meaning of a soviet, as a council or workers, is no longer even recognisable."

If you want to know what the first misconception is you must get the book.

On page 253 the author argues for the need for cold war education. He writes:

"The Red totalitarians have trained their professional revolutionaries for decades. Their schools have developed the operational science of psycho-political warfare. . . . There is nothing comparable to this in a free world."

Those who have been disturbed by the current vogue of "protest demos" will find this well-indexed book both interesting and disturbing. It is a strongly recommended book and the author's remarks on the Khrushchev

memoirs certainly give the reader food for thought.

[From the Tribune, June 5, 1971]

A TENUOUS PLAN FOR RUSSIA'S DESTRUCTIONS

(By O. W. Gerus)

U.S.A. and the Soviet Myth by Lev E. Dobriansky; The Devin-Adair Co., Old Greenwich, Conn.; $6.50.

This book is Prof. Dobriansky's latest contribution to the continuing polemical literature of the Cold War. The author, who teaches economics at Georgetown University, is most apprehensive about the growing isolationist sentiment in the United States.

He argues that the United States, as leader of the Free World, has the moral, if not the divine, duty to wage an uncompromising war on diplomatic, economic, cultural and psychological fronts against that foe of democracy and the security of the United States, "the Soviet-Russian imperio-colonialism".

Having thus concluded that, for reasons of survival, America must continue the Cold War, Dobriansky proposes an ingeneous weapon guaranteed to dismember the Soviet Union with a minimum of risk. In his opinion the U.S. policy toward Moscow has been often based on a faulty premise, on a myth of Soviet homogeneity. The Soviet Union in actuality is a multi-nation state with over 100 nationalities dominated by a Russian minority.

He advances a tenuous thesis that all these groups are kept within the Soviet structure by coercion alone. The nationalism of Soviet minorities is the Achilles heel of Moscow and the key to the destruction of the entire "Red Empire" i.e., International Communism.

Washington must abet and harness this nationalism to its advantage. Active exploitation of the nationality issue would lend encouragement to the existing anti-Russian tendencies and, in accordance with the author's wishful thinking, bring about the demise of the Soviet Union.

It seems that the first step in this direction was taken in 1959 with the now controversial Captive Nations Resolution of the U.S. Congress, a resolution which in essence regards the Soviet sphere of influence and control as a temporary one.

With the current sentiment in the U.S. Congress to normalize relations with Moscow, the resolution has been under increased criticism. Dobriansky defends it vigorously, castigating its critics as unwilling Communist stooges "hopelessly affected by nuclearitis."

The author's anti-Russian bias is reflected in his loss of proper historical perspective. He oversimplifies the complex dynamics of Soviet society by completely ignoring Marxist ideology.

In the area of nationalism his scholarship is equally ambiguous. While on one hand he sees nationalism as a divisive force within the USSR, on the other he cannot accept similar implications of the different brands of national Communism (e.g. Yugoslavian, Chinese) in the concept of Communist unity.

Dobriansky signals out the Ukrainian nationalism as the most serious threat to the integrity of the USSR. While Ukrainian nationalism indeed is a factor in Soviet dynamics, its scope and impact on Soviet society has been exaggerated by both Western and Soviet propagandists.

Approaching everything in absolute terms they blur the aspirations for decentralization and an outright independence.

According to the author, the USSR without Ukraine equals zero. This view of Ukraine's importance to Soviet economic and political well-being made some sense in the interwar period, but in the light of the postwar Soviet expansion and the economic exploitation of Siberia, it is no longer valid.

Nonetheless, Dobriansky's domino theory regards the separation of the Ukraine as leading to the disintegration of the entire USSR into its national components (here he ignores population redistribution) leaving for the Russians the territory of the ancient principality of Muscovy. Furthermore, in the collapse of the USSR he naively expects the fall of Communism since "without the USSR the Red Empire, including China would dissolve."

Despite the acute difficiencies of the USSR and one's sympathy for the plight of the Ukrainians and other nationalities, one simply cannot treat the book as a serious study. The distoritions of information, so reminiscent of Soviet methodology, offends the sensitivities of a reader. The quasiparanoic suspicion and hatred of things Russian do not help the cause Dobriansky so passionately advocates.

Mr. Gerus is an assistant professor in the department of history, University of Manitoba.

NATIONAL SAFE BOATING WEEK

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, recreational boating continues to grow as more and more of our Nation's people participate each year. The latest estimates for 1970 show a total boat population of over 8.8 million; close to $4 billion spent for boats, associated equipment and services; and about 44 million people participating in some form of boating each year—one-fifth of the population. Recognizing the potential growth of boating, the 85th Congress passed Public Law 85–445, calling for the annual observance of National Safe Boating Week. In accordance with the law, the President of the United States issued the following proclamation:

A PROCLAMATION

More Americans each year are choosing boating as the ideal way to relax with their families and friends. All too often, however, what starts out as a pleasant cruise ends in tragedy because boatmen fail to teach their families to swim, fail to properly equip their craft with life preservers and other protective devices, or fail to instruct their passengers on the use of such devices prior to a boating cruise.

Every year, about 1,300 lives are lost in boating accidents. These fatalities can be reduced and boating made more pleasurable if those who engage in it will emphasize boating safety rules.

Recognizing the need for that emphasis, the Congress, by a Joint Resolution approved June 4, 1958 (72 Stat. 179), has requested the President to proclaim annually the week which includes July 4 as National Safe Boating Week. Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 4, 1971, as National Safe Boating Week. I urge all who use our waterways to acquire those skills essential to their own safety and that of others and to apply them carefully.

I also invite the Governors of the States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to provide for the observance of this week.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 28th day of January, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and seventy-one, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-fifth.

THE PROBLEM

The emphasis placed on boating by this proclamation is clearly necessary when we examine the annual boating statistics report released by the U.S. Coast Guard on May 1. The report is required by the Federal Boating Act of 1958. This act provides for a standardized system for the numbering and identification of undocumented vessels, including pleasure boats of more than 10 horsepower, uniform accident reporting, and participation in these programs by the States. Since the effective date of this legislation, April 1, 1960, every jurisdiction but the States of Alaska, New Hampshire, and Washington and the District of Columbia have provided for numbering systems which have been approved by the U.S. Coast Guard and meet the standards set forth in this act.

There was an increase in boating fatalities in 1970—1,418 as compared to 1,350 in 1969. In its annual report, the Coast Guard revealed that 19.1 percent or 271 of the boating accident deaths last year involved rowboats, canoes, sailboats, and other small craft without engines. These types of craft are not required by Federal law to carry lifesaving devices. During the same period the boats numbered in all States and territorial possessions of the United States reached an all-time high of over 5.1 million.

Capsizings, as in past years, still remain responsible for the largest number of recorded deaths. In 1970, capsizings resulted in 40.1 percent of the total number of lives lost in boating accidents. This figure is about the same as the 1969 percentage. Of the 1,418 fatalities, drowning accounted for 1,305 victims, and 756 of the drowned either did not have or did not use lifesaving devices.

Last year a total of 4,762 vessels were involved in 3,803 boating accidents involving at least $100 property damage, an injury which incapacitates anyone for over 72 hours, or death. This is 264 less than in 1969. 1,132 of these vessels were involved in fatal accidents, while 499 were in accidents resulting in injuries. The amount of property damage was approximately 8.2 million, an increase of 1.9 million over 1969.

Since 1966 the estimated number of boats has grown 9.1 percent while the number of accidents has decreased 11.4 percent. During the same 5 year period the number of fatalities has increased 7.6 percent. Even though the number of fatalities, accidents, and injuries have remained relatively small over the past few years, the number of boats in operation has increased appreciably. It has taken dedicated effort by the coast guard the States and many fine volunteer organizations to accomplish this. What has been done, however, is not enough. The Coast Guard, with its responsibility for safety on navigable waters, and the States must do more in order to reduce these accident figures. We can hardly expect the number of accidents to remain stable, much less decrease, without additional resources and the proper legislative tools.

The Coast Guard has embarked on a four-pronged attack on the problems of boating safety called the 4E's—engineering standards, education, enforcement and environmental concerns.

A boatman should expect that the boat he buys meets minimum safety stand-

ards. This is not the situation at present. While there are some safety requirements that can be enforced by the Coast Guard, they are not adequate and are too specific to adapt to new technology. The basis for these requirements is the Motorboat Act of 1940—responsive at the time but now woefully inadequate. Boats that comply with safety standards also help protect the public by breaking the chain of events that leads to operator error. The Coast Guard is seeking new legislation that is broad enough in scope to protect the public against the range of today's hazards.

This legislation is the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971—H.R. 19, S. 696. Among other things, it provided for establishing minimum Federal safety standards for boats and associated equipment based on a documented need. For the first time the responsibility for building a safe boat will be placed upon the manufacturer. The boatman of course will still be responsible for the safe operation and proper maintenance of his craft. I support this bill and urge every Member of Congress to do likewise.

Educating the boatman in the hazards of a relatively unfamiliar environment is another effective safety tool. The States Coast Guard Auxiliary, U.S. Power Squadrons, American National Red Cross, National Safety Council, Boy Scouts of America, and many other organizations assist the Coast Guard in the enormous task of education.

To be effective, the millions of individuals comprising the boating public must be reached. The Coast Guard, through boating films, safety publications, Coast Guard Auxiliary programs, and utilization of boating-safety detachments in public education activities, takes advantage of every opportunity to stress the practical aspects of boating safety. The Coast Guard also has close coordination with the boating industry, the National Safety Council, and other such vital organizations.

President Nixon has emphasized the critical need for decentralizing government. Historically, the concept of a Federal police force has been repugnant and has been consistently rejected. The Coast Guard therefore minimized Federal involvement in law enforcement actions directly involving the individual. On waters of the United States where both Federal and State authorities have jurisdiction, they look to State and local jurisdictions to enforce those safety requirements with which the operator must comply. Federal enforcement is provided only where reasonable State capabilities are unavailable—particularly in coastal waters—or where safety violations are observed by the Coast Guard forces.

This policy is reflected in the use of the Coast Guard's 54 boating-safety detachments. These detachments are three-man teams which visit navigable lakes, rivers, and other waters where boating activities are concentrated. The detachments, as well as over 250 other Coast Guard units, are the principal forces presently carrying out a safety-patrol concept. This is a roving, waterborne patrol designed to deter, detect, and report unsafe practices as well as educate the public. The mission of this enforcement and education is to minimize unsafe practices such as speeding in congested areas, overloading, improper loading, operating while under the influence of liquor, operating in swimming areas, and operating in posted dangerous areas. The safety-patrol concept will continue to be stressed on all waterfronts this year.

Boating-safety detachments have an effective broad impact because of their mobility and flexibility. Their effectiveness is not to be measured in the number of boardings accomplished, but rather in whether or not our waterways are made any safer; whether the boating public is better educated in safe boating procedures by the apprehension of the reckless or negligent operator; and, finally, whether the accident rate decreases. The Coast Guard plans to more than double the number of boating-safety detachments over the next 5 years. I strongly support this plan and urge those responsible to make every effort to increase the number of these detachments so vital to the boating-safety program.

Water is the boatman's environment. While we cannot control the environment insofar as preventing storms or bad weather, the boatman can be provided with the best possible information while on the water. The Coast Guard has a study underway to provide better ways of warning the boatman about the weather. Much has already been done to expand the present systems as well.

BOATING SAFETY A JOINT EFFORT

The Coast Guard Auxiliary is extremely active in the education of the boating public in safe boating practices. As a voluntary nonmilitary organization, the auxiliary's purpose is to promote safety in recreational boating. I congratulate the auxiliary on its dedicated and unselfish efforts to keep America's pleasure boaters safe. Its 32,000 members are experienced boatmen, amateur radio operators, or licensed aircraft pilots. The three basic programs carried out by the auxiliary are courtesy motorboat examination, public instruction, and operation; 269,521 persons were instructed in three safe-boating courses last year; 236,718 courtesy motorboat examinations were performed; over 4,700 regattas were patroled; and over 11,800 cases of assistance were recorded.

In addition to the auxiliary, many other fine organizations participate actively in safe boating activities. The U.S. power squadrons, American National Red Cross, and Boy Scouts, are just a few.

The States are also very much involved in boating safety and very concerned about what the future will bring. Educational efforts by the State are increasing as rapidly as limited funds permit. The Coast Guard works closely with the States on every aspect of boating safety. This can be easily seen in the number of State jurisdictions—42 with three pending—that have signed cooperative agreements with the Coast Guard. These agreements directly affect the coordination and effectiveness of safety patrols and enforcement activities. The encouragement of uniformity and comity among the different States regarding these boating laws is of vital importance to everyone involved with boating. The Congress, in the Federal Boating Act of 1958, established this, and Coast Guard policy encourages the principle. The mechanics of uniformity, however, are often complicated by the inadequacies of existing Federal laws.

NATIONAL SAFE BOATING WEEK

National Safe Boating Week—Focusing attention upon the need of pleasure boatmen to know and comply with safe boating practices and regulations—begins July 4 this year as stated in the proclamation. Its objective is to emphasize efforts urging the more than 44 million people using boats on our waters to help keep boating safe; to teach important fundamentals of safe boating to newcomers; and to remind experienced operators as well as the novice to practice commonsense and courtesy afloat. The basic theme for this year's observance of the week is "Safe Boating Is No Accident." National Safe Boating Week also pays tribute to the many persons and organizations who have contributed toward maintaining boating's fine safety record. Over 2,000 local groups such as Coast Guard auxiliary flotillas, U.S. power squadrons, boating clubs, States, and other boating and safety-minded organizations are expected to participate in the National Safe Boating Week observance in communities throughout the country. The concerned individual is truly the backbone of the effort. Assisting the local organizations is the National Safe Boating Committee, sponsor of National Safe Boating Week, principally by distributing promotional material. 7,500 promotional kits have been sent to local organizations all over the country. Promotional material has also been distributed to major news media organizations. The committee includes representatives from the U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary, the American Boat and Yacht Council, the American National Red Cross, the American Power Boat Association, the American Water Ski Association, the Boat Owners Association of the United States, the Boat Owners Council of America, the Boy Scouts of America, the Corps of Engineers, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers, the National Association of State Boating Law Administrators, the National Boating Federation, the National Fire Protection Association, the National Safe Boating Association, the National Safety Council, the Outboard Boating Club of America, the U.S. power squadrons, the Marine Division of Underwriters Laboratories, Inc., and the Young Men's Christian Association. To all of these organizations, safety in boating is as important as it is to the individual and his family. To all of those national and local committees actively participating in National Safe Boating Week, I extend my congratulations. I urge all others interested in boating safety to join in making this an even more effective National Safe Boating Week than the successful ones in the past. Let us continue the good

practices set forth by National Safe Boating Week throughout the year.

FEDERAL BOAT SAFETY ACT OF 1971

One final point, Mr. Chairman, as I have mentioned previously, there are several inadequacies in existing boating laws. I again urge Congress to support the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971. With the tools in this bill, the Coast Guard and the States will be better able to keep our boating public safe.

PEACE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, recent developments in Paris point up, I believe, the wisdom of not restricting the President's negotiating powers, as well as the fact that perhaps meaningful negotiations can take place. Let us pray that they do.

Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon took office, one of the most troublesome problems that he inherited was the long, agonizing war in Vietnam. The year 1968 saw the most intense military action of the war, a year in which over 550,000 American troops bore the major share of the combat responsibility. Although the President inherited a strategy of further escalation until the enemy was ready to make concessions or conclude a peace agreement, he put into operation a reverse policy.

Today, there are 300,000 fewer Americans in Vietnam than when President Nixon assumed the responsibility for the conduct of the war, and the total will be cut by another 60,000 by December 1. As a result of this policy which has substantially scaled down American involvement, the cost of the war to the United States has been cut by more than 50 percent. It should be apparent that this is a complete reversal of the policy that led to the escalation of troops from 500 to nearly 550,000 in the 1960's.

An important fact that is left out of most arguments today is that the ability of the South Vietnamese to defend themselves has vastly improved over the last 2 years, and, for the first time, we can look forward to an end to the war that does not turn South Vietnam over to the "nine man central committee" who control the Lao Dong Communist party in North Vietnam, the same nine men incidentally who tyranically control more than 19 million people in the North, and an end which does not neglect the prisoners of war and those missing in action who are held incommunicado in violation of the Geneva Accords by the Communist North Vietnamese.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the desire to withdraw from Vietnam at an even faster rate as reflected in the recently passed Mansfield amendment to H.R. 6531, the Selective Service Act.

I believe that the rate of withdrawal can be expedited, perhaps even faster than the Mansfield proposal. But, surely, the majority of Senators who voted for the amendment are aware that the President has been, and is still, singularly responsible for accelerating the withdrawal without jeopardizing the lives of our remaining troops or our POW's—MIA's or our allies. In view of this, I believe we ought to leave the rate of withdrawal up to the President without restricting his ability to negotiate a faster settlement.

Under the Constitution, the President has the exclusive right to negotiate, and thus I think we ought to concede him that right, especially in view of the progress he has made in helping Vietnamese help themselves and winding down American involvement. The essence of the Mansfield resolution is not legislating but trying to negotiate and set down certain negotiating conditions that say we will withdraw on certain conditions. However, we cannot negotiate with the enemy from the floor of Congress anymore than Congressmen and Senators can negotiate with the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong while visiting Paris. Our troops will be out in 1972 if we give the President, who has the Constitutional responsibility to carry on negotiations with foreign nations, the chance to get those troops out in a responsible way.

The President has made the point that he unequivocally rejects setting a deadline for withdrawal at this time. He recognizes that while there are good political reasons to go on record as favoring a date, there are no diplomatic or strategic reasons for it. The President opposes setting a deadline to keep open a threat of a Korea-type solution which would keep a substantial residual force in Vietnam as continuing pressure for a negotiated settlement. A negotiated settlement means that both sides get out of Vietnam—not merely the allied forces.

However, if the Mansfield amendment becomes the basis for our policy, the avenue for a negotiated settlement will be closed. Total withdrawal and a date certainly is a negotiable item. It should be negotiated at the bargaining table, not unilaterally given away without getting something in return.

Thus we have a situation in which the President wants a negotiated settlement and the advocates of the Mansfield amendment want a virtually unconditional withdrawal. Unfortunately, our POW's–MIA's have become "pawns", to force the President into unilateral withdrawal without a negotiated settlement or any hope of getting one. I have introduced an article at the end entitled "Monkey Wrenches in the Peace Machinery" by Richard Wilson which reflects very well what I am talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that negotiations are still the quickest way to get out, and I support all attempts for a negotiated settlement. If we follow the outline of the Mansfield amendment and tie our withdrawal to the release of our POW's, we will not be out of Vietnam at any time in the near future, for the Communists do not easily exchange POW's. It is important to note that in 1954, North Vietnam and France signed a peace treaty which guaranteed that Hanoi would repatriate immediately the French POW's. But actual negotiations for this release continued until 1962—approximately 8 years—before Hanoi showed any inclination to have the treaty. In view of this, the effects of this amendment are potentially very long-term, and it actually retards rather than enhances the hopes that all of us have for a quicker withdrawal from Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the assumption on which the Mansfield amendment is based is that it will give Hanoi an opportunity and a motive to release our prisoners. It assumes that Hanoi would have a strong incentive to release our prisoners if they understand that release would encourage American withdrawal. I question this assumption.

Hanoi already knows we are withdrawing our forces. That is clearly U.S. policy. The Mansfield amendment would only complicate the process of obtaining prisoner release, because Hanoi would interpret the amendment as a sign of American desire to get out regardless of the consequences. Hence, Hanoi would feel little incentive to facilitate prisoner release.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the amendment reflects the gullibility of many of those in the Congress with regard to Hanoi's doubletalk on the question of the return of POW's–MIA's. Just prior to key Senate votes, reports, coming from Paris and Hanoi, were intended to convince Americans that the POW's–MIA's would come home just as soon as we set a withdrawal date.

I realize that the Members of the Senate suffer indirectly from this pressure as we do in the House. I recognize how politically seductive it is to appear as the one who got us out of the war. But, we have no guarantee that our withdrawal, or our promise to withdraw, will induce the North Vietnamese to release, or discuss the release of our POW's. This fact completely undermines the assumption of the Mansfield amendment that as soon as we set a date, our POW's–MIA's will be released.

Even those who rely on wishful thinking that the North Vietnamese will discuss the safe return of our POW's–MIA's if we totally withdraw are being deceived and are seriously jeopardizing their return.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the release of our POW's–MIA's, the Mansfield amendment predicts an unprecedented act of humaneness and reasonableness on the part of the Hanoi government. I wish I could believe that Hanoi would make the amendment an opportunity for progress and not for mischief, but it is clear that the Communists are cruelly using our men and prisoners in attempts to further their own, unjustified aims.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at the end an article entitled "Hanoi Doubletalk on POW's" by Messrs. Evans and Novak that well reflects what I am talking about.

Mr. Speaker, the question of peace and the return of our men from Vietnam as well as our POW's–MIA's is not a partisan cause. This cause transcends political divisions. It has nothing to do with hawks and doves, but it has everything to do with the fact that, as Americans, we are very much concerned about these questions of peace and the plight of those 1,600 men who are missing or held prisoner by the enemy in Southeast Asia.

There is one very grim aspect of all

48-059 O - 72 - pt. 18 - 5

this that makes me want to speak out. For unlike other wars in history, both our fighting men and our POW's–MIA's cannot take comfort in the knowledge that our country stands united behind them.

Mr. Speaker, in World War II, Winston Churchill made the comment that England could afford to lose a battle but it could not afford to lose its honor. The clear majority of Americans seek peace with honor in Southeast Asia, which is revealed in a recent poll which I have included in the RECORD. According to the poll, while the American people will support almost any plan that promises an end to the war, they will clearly not support a plan that either endangers our prisoners or threatens a Communist takeover.

Many of the critics have accused this country and those who serve in our military as not desiring peace. Whatever the divisions we may have over the origins of the war, I believe that the desire for peace is unanimous and, I am sure, having visited Southeast Asia in 1968, that nowhere is the desire for peace felt more strongly than among those who know it first hand.

Mr. Speaker, peace cannot come as a result of congressional declarations, unless of course, we want the type of peace at any price that is bought at the expense of someone's freedom or is purchased by accepting the dictates of the enemy.

At the end, I would like to include an article by William S. White entitled "Vote Saves the Constitution."

Mr. Speaker, those who believe sincerely that Congress can declare peace, I think, are overlooking the lessons of history as well as subscribing to the myths that are exposed if we are interested enough to look at the truth about our involvement in Vietnam. I would like to enclose, at the end, some documentation that gives a side to this involvement that is seldom heard and even more seldom listened to.

Mr. Speaker, the President, in terms of foreign relations, has tremendous responsibilities, responsibilities that can be shared in part, but not shared in total, with the Congress. As Commander in Chief, he must take into consideration all eventualities, and it is significant to note that he is willing to be held accountable. This means that he must not only take into consideration the short-range effects of his actions in Vietnam but also the long-range effects. Some of these effects alluded to here are perfectly brought out in an article recently written by William K. Stringer entitled "Any Risk Here?" That too must be included in the RECORD. I believe that if Americans thought more about the tremendous responsibility that the President alone shoulders for our remaining troops, out POW's–MIA's, our allies in Southeast Asia and our worldwide credibility, they would have more confidence in his conduct of the ending of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to include the various materials mentioned in my statement.

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 28, 1971]

MONKEY WRENCHES IN THE PEACE MACHINERY

(By Richard Wilson)

At a time when the White House had begun to have real hope that there might be a break in the Paris peace negotiations, the Mansfield withdrawal resolution has thrown a monkey wrench into the machinery.

The same may be said, in fact, on the publication of the secret Pentagon war study. For all the sanctimonious reliance on freedom of the press, "the public's right to know," and so on, the publication at this time of these historical records is proving more than merely embarrassing.

Like the Mansfield resolution, the furor over the war study, with its emphasis on deception by the American government only serves to expose anew and flagrantly the failure of will in this country on getting a constructive settlement. That exposure comes at a time when it might be possible to move toward a truly negotiated settlement instead of an abject, virtually unconditional and total withdrawal on a fixed date in the near future.

It needs to be repeated again that Nixon is not going to set a fixed date for withdrawal from Vietnam under existing conditions. Even if the House follows the Senate lead (which it probably will not) in supporting the Mansfield resolution, Nixon can sign the draft extension bill to which it would be attached and disavow the resolution. That is very likely what he will do under these circumstances.

Nixon is stubborn for a reason. The return to Paris of Le Duc Tho, the chief Communist negotiator, scheduled in advance of the Senate passage of the Mansfield resolution and not related to it, signaled a new turn in the negotiations. The Senate passage of the Mansfield resolution gave Lu Duc Tho something to hang his hat on. He promptly did so and made it that much harder for Nixon to move toward the kind of negotiated settlement he had begun to hope for.

Perhaps there are good political reasons why senators wish to go on record as favoring a total withdrawal from Vietnam after the freeing of American prisoners of war. But there are no good diplomatic or strategic reasons for it.

It may as well be frankly stated what the situation is as far as the White House is concerned. Nixon is absolutely opposed to setting a deadline at this time. He needs and desires to keep open the threat of a Korea-type solution which would keep a substantial residual force in Vietnam as continuing pressure for a genuine negotiated settlement. A negotiated settlement means that both sides get out of South Vietnam, not merely the allied forces.

But the Senate would deny him even an attempt to negotiate a settlement. That avenue would be closed if the Mansfield resolution were made the basis of policy. At the White House it is considered tragic that Nixon's motives and intentions in Vietnam have been so badly misinterpreted and at a time when the prospect for a settlement is more encouraging.

It is said, in fact, that anyone who votes for the Mansfield resolution should expect to assume full responsibility if the prospects opened up by Le Duc Tho's return now fail to materialize.

Perhaps the White House expectations or hopes are overblown, but what escapes rational justification is the conclusion on which the Mansfield resolution is based. That conclusion is simply that Nixon can't be trusted to end the war because he desires a negotiated settlement instead of virtually unconditional withdrawal.

The prisoners have become political pawns in this game, used now to pressure Nixon into precipitate withdrawal without a negotiated settlement or any hope of getting one.

Hanoi continues to hold the prisoners for one reason alone, and that is also to keep Nixon under pressure for a total withdrawal by a fixed date. The men in Hanoi are counting once again, as they have so astutely in the past, on the deterioration of American will. The North Vietnamese in Paris have indicated their satisfaction that anti-war sentiment has prevailed in the Senate.

They may believe that Nixon ultimately will be overwhelmed by the irresistible pressure to get the war ended totally and the prisoners released before the next presidential election. If they are making this assessment, they are probably misjudging Nixon.

Their best bet might be immediate, unconditional release of the prisoners. That would put Nixon on the spot. But then, of course, they would lose their pawn and would have to negotiate.

In any case, this game is too fatefully complicated for political kibitzing by the U.S. Senate.

HANOI DOUBLETALK ON POWS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The skill and audacity with which the Vietnamese Communists manipulate American public opinion on the emotion-charged prisoner-of-war issue is illustrated by a diplomatic cable transmitted back to Hanoi June 11 by the North Vietnamese negotiating team in Paris.

That cable contained the official Communist transcript of an interview in Paris three days earlier between Xuan Thuy, chief North Vietnamees negotiator, and Chalmers M. Roberts of The Washington Post. The transcript quoted Xuan Thuy as saying that "if the United States sets a reasonable deadline for the complete withdrawal of troops, we could *discuss* the settlement of the prisoner of war question"—precisely the Hanoi line.

In truth, however, that is not what the Communist negotiator said at all. Roberts, a respected diplomatic correspondent, reported Xuan Thuy as telling him, "if a reasonable date is set, the question of prisoners may be settled." In response to another question, he amended that to "*will* be settled."

The discrepancy reveals the POW game played by the Hanoi Politburo. The soft line actually given in the interview with Roberts is intended to convince Americans that the POWs will come home just as soon as President Nixon sets a troop withdrawal deadline. The altered transcript cabled to Hanoi reiterated the hard line that is the Vietnamese reality: Hanoi promises nothing whatever in return for a troop withdrawal deadline.

This audacious game has worked, feeding demands in the United States for quick withdrawal. Two antiwar Democrats, Sen. Vance Hartke of Indiana and Rep. Robert Leggett of California, returned from talks with the Communists in Paris indicating that the Americans were to blame for the negotiations deadlock. Clark Clifford, former Secretary of Defense, has predicted release of the prisoners 30 days after agreement to withdraw. In a climate further soured by the Pentagon papers, many Americans believe the worst of their own country's leaders while exercising complete gullibility about Communist promises.

When not talking to American politicians and journalists, the Communists revert in formal Paris sessions to the hard line of their official statements. Based on those statements, there is every reason to believe that the Communists plan to use the POWs as hostages to steadily up the ante in fulfilling all goals in Vietnam.

The basic position is point one of the

South Vietnamese Communist eight-point "elaboration" of last Sept. 17. It not only links prisoner releases with a fixed date for U.S. troop withdrawals but also talks about taking all U.S. weapons and war materials from South Vietnamese troops and dismantling U.S. bases in Vietnam. Thus, the troop withdrawal deadline accomplishes nothing.

Consistently, the official Communist line in Paris has been that such a deadline set by Mr. Nixon would win him merely the right to *discuss* prisoner releases. Mme. Nguyen Thi Binh, chief South Vietnamese Communist negotiator, deviated from this only once. On April 15, an article by her in the French newspaper Le Monde suggested that Mr. Nixon need only fix a deadline "for GIs and American prisoners to be rapidly and safely returned."

But on the very day that article appeared, Mme. Binh was her usual intractable self at the negotiations session. Prisoners would return home, she said, only after the war had "come to an end"—that is, after a political settlement along Communist lines.

Rep. Leggett's visit to Paris on May 31 again showed the two faces Nguyen Van Tien, Mme. Binh's deputy, told the congressman that POWs could be released as soon as Mr. Nixon set a "reasonable date" for withdrawal. But when reporters queried Communist spokesmen about Leggett's visit, they were told repatriation of prisoners would be merely *discussed* once the withdrawal of troops was announced.

Still another example occurred when Anthony Lewis of The New York Times interviewed Xuan Thuy May 21. Lewis reported the North Vietnamese negotiator "understood the concern about the American prisoners and was ready to do something immediately . . . if Mr. Nixon set a withdrawal date." But the official Communist "transcript" cabled to Hanoi said only the Communists will "be ready to talk to Mr. Nixon on the POW issue" after a troop withdrawal.

The pattern is unmistakable. The ransom for American POWs will be much dearer than the Democratic-sponsored troop withdrawal deadline. To get them home, the U.S. must agree to humiliating concessions ending with a Communist regime in Saigon. Such is the iron *realpolitik* behind the Oriental smiles exhibited in Paris for American politicians.

Pull-Out Poll Misleading

The recent highly publicized and widely misinterpreted national opinion poll—showing that 73 percent of all Americans wanted a Congressional vote to bring home all U.S. troops from Vietnam before the end of this year—turns out to be false in its implications and grossly misleading.

The belief that the American people want out of Vietnam by December 31, 1971, regardless of consequences, is a myth. This is clearly shown in the attached report of a national survey taken May 1–2.

Here are some of the results of that survey:

1. By an overwhelming margin of 72 percent to 18 percent, the American people "support President Nixon in his plan to end the war in Southeast Asia."

2. Support for the proposed Congressional plan for pulling out all U.S. troops by December 31 almost evaporates—when the American people are confronted with the possible consequences such as jeopardy to our POW's or a communist take-over.

3. Well over half the American people oppose a December 31, 1971 deadline for withdrawal, if that withdrawal means a Communist take-over of South Vietnam.

4. By almost seven to one, Americans oppose any year-end withdrawal that threatens the lives or safety of American prisoners of war.

5. The earlier poll is misleading and has been grossly misinterpreted, because, while the American people will support almost any plan that promises an end to the war—they clearly will support no plan that either endangers our prisoners, or threatens a Communist take-over.

Do the People Really Favor Immediate Withdrawal From Vietnam?

Princeton, New Jersey: The Public seems willing to endorse any plan that promises to bring all U.S. troops home from Vietnam soon—but *not* if it endangers our POW's or threatens a Communist takeover, according to the latest survey conducted by Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton, N.J.

Seventy-two percent of the public say they support President Nixon in his plan to end the war in Southeast Asia, compared to 18% who do not support his plan and 10% who have no opinion. At the same time, 68% of those polled would approve their Congressman voting for a proposal requiring the U.S. Government to bring home all U.S. troops before the end of this year; 20% opposed this move and 12% have no opinion.

However, when various possible consequences of quick withdrawal are tested, the public is against withdrawal of all U.S. troops by the end of 1971 if it means a Communist takeover of South Vietnam. When asked if they would favor withdrawal of all U.S. troops by the end of the year if it meant a Communist takeover of South Vietnam, 55% said no, 29% said yes, and 16% had no opinion. Also an overwhelming majority, 75%, would not favor withdrawal by the end of 1971 if it threatened the lives or safety of the United States POW's held by North Vietnam.

Eleven percent of those polled would favor such a withdrawal and 14% had no opinion.

The results of this survey were obtained by nationwide telephone interviews conducted among 1,026 persons aged 18 and over during the period May 1 and 2. Following are the actual questions asked and their results:

1. "Do you support President Nixon in his plan to end the war in Southeast Asia?"
Yes, 72; no, 18; no opinion, 10.

2. "A proposal has been made in Congress to require the U.S. Government to bring home all U.S. troops before the end of this year. Would you like to have your Congressman vote for or against this proposal?"
Yes, 68; no, 20; no opinion, 12.

3. "Would you favor withdrawal of all U.S. troops by the end of 1971 even if it meant a Communist takeover of South Vietnam?"
Yes, 29; no, 55; no opinion, 16.

4. "Would you favor withdrawal of all United States troops by the end of 1971 even if it threatened the lives or safety of United States POW's held by North Vietnam?"
Yes, 11; no, 75; no opinion, 14.

Vote Saves Constitution

(By William S. White)

Those who seek an honorable withdrawal from Vietnam short of a naked American surrender and a total loss of the world's respect for the commitments of the United States have gained at least a breathing space. The Senate's rejection by 55 to 42, in the teeth of one of the most massive propaganda campaigns ever mounted, of a resolution to "force" President Nixon to surrender by Dec. 31 by the one-sided withdrawal of all our forces has permitted the responsibles in public life to hang on a little longer.

At least, the Constitution has been saved. For the right of any President to command the disposition of American troops in war zones lies at the heart of that document and the effort of Sens. George McGovern and Mark Hatfield to destroy it by legislative fiat has been beaten back in circumstances where they had almost everything possible going for them.

If, however, this ancient aspect of the right of government to govern has been sustained, the security of the United States has been seriously compromised by the clandestine handing over to The New York Times, which published them on the eve of the McGovern-Hatfield vote, of top secret defense materials which will have lasting effects on the security of the nation. For one thing, foreign governments are already asking the State Department in so many words whether in future they can dare deal in confidence with Washington.

For another thing, the man who leaked this information has, according to honorable military men, also handed to present and potential enemies of the United States a means would could assist them in breaking our highest defense codes.

The judge who granted a temporary injunction against further publication by the Times was Murray Gurfein, whose senior sponsor for the bench was the all-out antiwar Senator Jacob Javits. As this is written, the issue as to whether there is to be a permanent injunction is still in court. But whatever the outcome there, the damage has been done.

In a limited space it is impossible to describe the disclosures made to the Times except in the briefest way. Handed over were millions of words of memoranda and documents. All this was gathered up by a Pentagon "team" of lower and middle echelon people who had no power to make policy and whose one common quality was their covert antagonism to the policy of their chiefs—first, President John F. Kennedy and then, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

What, in summary, resulted was a hostile manifesto directed most of all at Mr. Johnson but calculated also to smear President Kennedy and nearly every other high official connected with the war.

The venom of these anonymous memo writers and interpreters was directed at such widely divergent persons as William and McGeorge Bundy; General and later Ambassador Maxwell Taylor; and, of course, the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Bureaucratic "researchers" were free to pick and choose among their materials; to select this and to discard that. It is a truism that by this method even the Holy Bible may be used to "prove" almost anything.

One innuendo put forward was that military planning against this or that contingency—which is the manifest duty of any government—was somehow wrong. Another implication was that the withholding of information about prospective military operations—an essential for the safety of American troops and a reticence whose omission would be an impeachable offense by any President—was somehow conspiratorial in motive.

Moreover, much of the contingency planning discussed by the researchers was never, in fact, put into action. Its mere existence was treated as sinister—to the horror of other countries, at this moment notably Israel, for whose defense in certain eventualities contingency plans are even now lying in other Pentagon files.

A criminal prosecution of the human conduit of this material is now in preparation. But it is all too late. Nor is it only the prowar people in Washington who are appalled at what has happened; so, too, are such vehement antiwar leaders as Averill Harriman and Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey.

Finally, who benefits politically from it all? Certainly the extreme doves in the short run. As to the longer run, who can possibly say? To suggest, as some have done, that President Nixon and all who support his policy, have been "helped" is the sour laugh of the year.

The Communist Position on Prisoner Releases

Point 9 of the NLF's "10 Point" proposal of May 8, 1969 implicitly linked the release of

prisoners of war with the payment of war reparations by the U.S. Point 9 stated:

"To resolve the aftermath of the war:

"A. The parties will negotiate the release of soldiers captured in the war.

"B. The United States Government must bear full responsibility for the losses and devastations it has caused to the Vietnamese people in both zones." [i.e. North and South Vietnam]

Point 1 of the PRG's "8 Point" elaboration of September 17, 1970 linked prisoner releases with the setting of a fixed date for the withdrawal of all U.S. and other foreign troops. The full text of Point 1 is as follows:

"The U.S. Government must put an end to its war of aggression in Vietnam, stop the policy of 'Vietnamization' of the war, totally withdraw from South Vietnam troops, military personnel, weapons, and war materials of the United States as well as troops, military personnel, weapons, and war materials of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp, without posing any condition whatsoever, and dismantle all U.S. military bases in South Vietnam. In case the U.S. Government declares it will withdraw from South Vietnam all its troops and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp by June 30, 1971, the People's Liberation Armed Forces will refrain from attacking the withdrawing troops of the United States and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp, and the parties will engage at once in discussions on:

"The question of ensuring safety for the total withdrawal from South Vietnam of U.S. troops and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp.

"The question of releasing captured militarymen."

Following the September 17, 1970 Paris meeting at which the "8 Points" were presented by PRG chief delegate Mme. Binh, PRG spokesman Duong Dinh Thao elaborated on the prisoner of war question. The following are the pertinent excerpts from Thao's press conference (using the North Vietnamese VNA transcript):

Bernard Redmont (NBC):

"I would like to ask about the problem of the captured military men. Does this mean that, when the U.S. Government announces that it will totally withdraw U.S. troops from South Vietnam, discussions on the release of prisoners of war will be held immediately? And also, does it mean that the captured military men will be set free immediately at the end of the discussions and not at the end of the war?"

Answer:

"First of all, it must be clearly stated that the Americans must announce that they will pull all U.S. troops out before 30 June 1971. Then, the parties will immediately begin to discuss the problem of the release of militarymen captured during the war. And, if the U.S. Government fosters good will, really desires to put an end to the war, and actually carries out the withdrawal of all U.S. and foreign troops from South Vietnam; and if it also displays a serious attitude in the discussions, then we are convinced that the release of the militarymen captured during the war will be carried out rapidly.

"We yearn for an early end to the war so as to be able to put an end to the suffering and mourning of the Vietnamese people and also of the American people. At the same time, this will enable captured American youths and militarymen to rejoin their families in a not too distant future."

Subsequently, Communist delegates and spokesmen in Paris have consistently adhered to the line that a prisoner of war release would only be "discussed"—not automatically resolved—should the U.S. set a withdrawal deadline. The one apparent exception was an article by Mme. Binh in Le Monde of April 15, 1971 in which she claimed that President Nixon had "only to fix a reasonable deadline for the total withdrawal for GI's and American prisoners to be rapidly and safely returned." However, in the Paris session held the day this article appeared (April 15), Mme. Binh and her North Vietnamese counterpart, Xuan Thuy, took a somewhat different official line. The following are excerpts from the transcript of this meeting:

Mme. Binh:

"In order to settle the question of captured military personnel, it is necessary to settle the problem of the cessation of the war—a problem in which the crucial question is the repatriation of American troops. As long as the war goes on, not only will the question of captured military personnel not be able to be settled but also the list of the captured will only grow longer indefinitely.

"The Vietnamese people who feel no animosity toward the American people and who have no interest in the prolongation of the captivity of captured American military personnel, still desire to see the war come to an end as soon as possible in order that this question be rapidly settled. In this spirit, the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam stated that it would enter immediately into discussions on the question of the release of captured military personnel if the Government of the United States agreed to withdraw all of its troops before June 30th, 1971. . . . It is thus clear that if the American Government had truly wanted to correctly settle the question of captured military personnel, this question would long since have been discussed and settled in an appropriate manner. . . .

"Rapidly withdrawing American troops according to a determined deadline, renouncing the maintenance of the Thieu/Ky/Khiem clique, letting the South Vietnamese population determine freely its own political future—these are urgent demands not only on the part of the Vietnamese people but also on the part of the American people and public opinion the world over. It is up to the Nixon Administration to respond to these legitimate demands so that these negotiations can truly progress, the war come to an end as soon as possible and American troops in Vietnam, including captured American military personnel, go back rapidly and in complete safety to their homes."

Xuan Thuy:

"In our prepared statement today, we called on the United States party to give a response to the three points which we mentioned in our speech today with the aim of rapidly arriving at a peaceful settlement of the Vietnamese question. If you give a response rapidly and positively to these three points, then a rapid return home will be possible for captured military personnel and for the personnel now participating in the war. [Xuan Thuy's three points called for the U.S. to: (1) set a withdrawal deadline; (2) cease bombing North Vietnam and 'violating its sovereignty and security;' and (3) respond to the PRG proposal to replace the present South Vietnamese Government with one which will engage 'in serious talks' with the PRG.]"

The Hanoi daily Nhan Dan of April 19, 1971 stated:

"It is thus obvious that whether or not captured American military men will be released depends entirely on the U.S. A prolongation of the war will only delay the settling of this question."

It thus emerges from the above Communist statements that more than a troop withdrawal deadline is required in order to free the prisoners of war. While the Communists are ready to "discuss" the prisoner question if the U.S. sets a deadline, they indicate that the war will have to end—presumably on their terms—before the prisoners will be actually freed. This would involve not only a deadline, but also the establishment of "provisional coalition government" and probably also the cessation of all U.S. military aid to South Vietnam and the payment of war reparations. In any case, the Communist side can be expected to extract the highest possible price for a prisoner release.

There has been some confusion in the interpretation and reporting of statements attributed to Communist spokesmen and delegation members in Paris. The following excerpts from the North Vietnamese (VNA) transcript of questions and answers at North Vietnamese spokesman Nguyen Thanh Le's "tea party" of April 21, 1971 might serve to clear up some of these misunderstandings:

Redmont (Westinghouse Broadcasting Corporation):

"I paid much interest to an article carried in the International Tribune today which quotes U.S. Senator Hartke as saying that in his meeting with Mr. Nguyen Minh Vy [North Vietnamese delegate], the latter said that after the United States announced it would withdraw all U.S. troops . . . and the prisoners of war would be released three weeks later. Will you give your opinion on this?"

Answer:

"When Mr. Hartke came to Paris he suggested that a cease-fire be observed . . . Mr. Nguyen Minh Vy answered that, with regard to the question of cease fire, Minister Nguyen Thi Binh made a three point statement on 10 December 1970 . . . With regard to captured military personnel, if the United States agrees to the proposal of the PRGRSV that it announce the withdrawal of all U.S. troops and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp before 30 June 1971, the parties will discuss immediately the release of American prisoners of war.

"I would like to add that with regard to the question of American prisoners of war, I think that if the United States puts forward a deadline for the total withdrawal of its troops and ends the war of aggression, I believe . . . that . . . there will be no difficulties just as . . . towards the French in the past."

Goldsmith (AP):

". . . Why does your side think that no further precision can be given . . . U.S. opinion is concerned about your refusal to announce a fixed date for the release of prisoners of war. This fact gives the Americans a pretext for refusing to set a deadline for the total withdrawal of U.S. troops."

Answer:

"In my opinion, the problem of captured militarymen is not too difficult to solve . . . we formerly had this experience with the French and the problem was settled satisfactorily. We have said: Should the Americans advance a deadline for the total withdrawal of U.S. troops, then the parties would enter into discussions, that is, serious and true discussions on the release of captured militarymen."

Note: In answering questions, Nguyen Thanh Le three times referred to the precedent established by the release of French prisoners of war. Prior to the question and answer period, Le stated:

"At the Geneva Conference in 1954, the question of releasing captured militarymen was not difficult to settle. After a basic agreement on the ending of the war and on a cease-fire, the question of releasing captured military men was settled. On 20 July 1954 the Geneva agreements were signed. A few days after, the parties discussed the releasing of captured militarymen. At the end of July 1954, the release started, and it ended in August 1954."

This appears to be an additional indication that the Communists do not intend to release American prisoners until the war has ended on their terms.

VIETNAM PERSPECTIVE 1954–1970

THE GENEVA ACCORDS—1954

The Geneva Conference held in 1954 to settle the Indochina War resulted in Accords signed by only two powers: France and North Vietnam. The Accords provided for a military cease-fire, a regroupment of military forces, the provisional division of Vietnam into two zones divided at the 17th parallel, and the free movement of the population between the two zones for a period of 300 days. The Accords also called for the creation of an International Control Commission (Canada, Poland and India) to supervise the implementation of the provisions.

In declarations attached to the Accords (and unsigned by any powers), it was stipulated that free elections by secret ballot in accordance with democratic procedures should be held in July 1956. The United States and South Vietnam each had urged effective United Nations verification and supervision for these elections. North Vietnam, then and now, totally rejected any U.N. role in Vietnam. The U.S. and South Vietnam therefore refused to sign the 1954 Geneva Accords. No powers signed the final declarations attached to the Accords.

NGO DINH DIEM

In South Vietnam, the political focus rested on Ngo Dinh Diem. Diem was appointed Prime Minister of the State of Vietnam by Emperor Bao Dai in 1954 before the Geneva Accords were drawn up. He was supported by the United States as a result of his long record as a nationalist, non-Communist political leader. Diem was not an American puppet nor was he Cardinal Spellman's silly putty. He had only come to the attention of Americans in 1951 but Diem was the son of the grand chamberlain of the emperor at the Imperial Court in the city of Hue in Central Vietnam. Born into a family which had a long tradition of Catholicism (nearly two million Vietnamese in South Vietnam today are Catholic) Diem was educated at the same high school that Ho Chi Minh had attended in Hue city.

Diem became well-known throughout Central Vietnam as a dedicated, honest and competent nationalist. In 1930, following service as a District Chief, Diem's talents came to the attention of the French administration. The French subsequently offered Diem the position of Minister of Interior. Diem took the post on condition that the French grant genuine concessions toward increased Vietnamese independence. When it became clear that the French had no intentions of keeping their word, Diem resigned after 18 months of service warning the French that they would lose their hold on Vietnam as a result of denying Vietnamese a real role of participation.

In 1940, Diem refused with equal stubbornness to collaborate with the Japanese occupation forces in Vietnam. He remained an obdurate Central Vietnamese patriot. In 1945, Diem's brother was buried alive by Ho Chi Minh's forces in North Vietnam—a fact that Diem never forgot nor forgave. Ho later offered Diem a position in North Vietnam's short-lived "coalition" government. Diem refused the offer.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE COMMUNIST THREAT

In 1951, Diem was encountered by American scholars in Tokyo. He was searching for help for Vietnam, just as Ho Chi Minh had left Vietnam in 1912 never to return until 1941. Subsequently, Diem came to the United States. He felt the need for help was more urgent than ever due to the events that had taken place in Southeast Asia. A coalition government formed with nationalists, Communists and neutralists in Hanoi by Ho Chi Minh had been destroyed in six months during the summer and autumn of 1946 and Ho Chi Minh had abolished the Communist party which had only a few months before destroyed the nationalists in the coalition.

By 1951, with Mao Tse-tung in control of the Chinese mainland and involved in the Korean War, Ho Chi Minh had felt bold enough to abolish the broad national front and resurrect the Communist party in public position of leadership. Named the Lao Dong (Workers) Party, in March 1951 this antagonistic non-Vietnamese organism once again was in the saddle. (A theory of a German named Hegel and a vision of a German named Marx was going to be translated into a dictatorship of the proletariat on the unwilling backs of a people who were fighting for genuine Vietnamese independence and the freedom in village self-government terms that has characterized the three regions of Vietnam for centuries.) The Lao Dong Party was in fact but another reincarnation of the first political brainchild of Ho Chi Minh fresh from his 1923–25 training in Moscow—the Indochinese Communist Party of 1930.

DIEM AND THE UNITED STATES

Diem's quest for U.S. support was redoubled after the emergence of the Lao Dong Party from behind the mask of the broad national front against the French in March 1951. Diem was favorably regarded by Senator John F. Kennedy, Senator Mike Mansfield and a host of American political spokesmen who regarded him as a genuine Vietnamese nationalist.

In 1954, the United States decided to support Diem for the post of Prime Minister when he was being considered by Emperor Bao Dai for that job. One reported French reaction to Diem's selection was: "He is the last cigarette in the pack." It was a French estimate that Diem would last only a few weeks. Diem proved to be adept at survival, becoming Prime Minister in 1954 and in 1955 defeating Bao Dai in a national referendum for the position of President. Diem remained President of South Vietnam until November 1963.

REBUILDING IN THE SOUTH

As President of South Vietnam, Diem was able to restore telecommunications, rebuild roads, triple educational enrollment, increase health facilities in the countryside, re-settle nearly a million refugees, meet the challenges of armed political-religious sects threatening the government's authority, destroy the Binh Xuyen, (a Mafia-like organization which controlled the opium, gambling and prostitution in Vietnam which was one of the troublesome legacies from the days of French control) and register a very large increase in rice production. Diem had set South Vietnam on an impressive course of economic reconstruction. Professor Hans Morgenthau lauded Diem and his impressive efforts in 1956 as "a living miracle."

THE DEMISE OF VILLAGE ELECTIONS

On the other hand, confronted by the illegal presence of some 5,000 Communist troops in five hold-out areas in South Vietnam, Diem was deeply worried about security in the countryside. He reacted by repressing political opposition. In June 1956, Diem abolished village self-government in South Vietnam. The election of village councils had been a cherished Vietnamese tradition dating back to the 1600's. Diem's action though perhaps understandable in terms of military security opened a deep political vulnerability in the countryside which the Communist cadres skillfully exploited during the following three years. It should be noted that the many local grievance groups that existed in the countryside proved to be fertile targets for the Communist organizers who were determined to prepare the political battlefield in South Vietnam.

DIEM AND THE GENEVA ELECTION ISSUE

Diem had profound concern about any election contest with North Vietnam. He knew the record of North Vietnam's Stalinist regime ruled out the possibility that the North would hold democratic and free elections by secret ballot. The record of Ho Chi Minh's systematic betrayal of Vietnamese nationalists to the French during the previous decades was further cause for caution. Diem also knew that the North (even after the flight of nearly a million refugees to the South) simply outnumbered the South in terms of voting population. Ho Chi Minh had violated the Geneva Accords signed by North Vietnam on the stipulations concerning free choice of movement for the people of the North and the South. Communist roadblocks prevented most of the people of North Vietnam from ever reaching the International Control Commission teams which were supposed to be available to all. Only those who could reach the ICC teams in the former French-held areas of the Red River Delta had much chance of stating their choice. Others forged papers and tried to slip past the Communist Party security squads which sought to prevent such contact.

U.S. OPINION ON THE 1956 ELECTION ISSUE

Diem was adamant in his reservations. It was certain that the Communist regime would regiment more votes at the ballot box than the South's voting age population could match. The ICC with its pro-Communist Polish representatives could not provide any assurances of a free electoral test. Without U.N. supervision, Diem felt any elections between North and South would be meaningless. American spokesmen such as Senator John F. Kennedy and Senator Mike Mansfield agreed. They continued to press for an election formula calling for effective international supervision and warned against "forcing Diem" into these rigged and unrepresentative elections.

THE POST-GENEVA RECORD

The fact that South Vietnam had never signed the Geneva Accords, added to the strength of Diem's refusal to submit to the Communist demands on this issue. By July 1956, France, one of the two signatories of the Accords, had departed South Vietnam and North Vietnam had consistently violated important provisions of the Geneva agreement by several significant policies. More than 5,000 regular army troops loyal to the Lao Dong Party, the Communist Party of North Vietnam, were left in the South in 1954–55. Their refusal to regroup to the North as the Geneva Accords had prescribed provided North Vietnam with a built-in military threat to South Vietnam's development and survival.

The size of North Vietnam's regular army at home was trebled in open defiance of specific stipulations in the Accords that no increase would take place. In South Vietnam meanwhile, 685 U.S. military advisors were assigned to training tasks in answer to a request by President Diem and in accordance with the Accords provisions permitting rotation of training personnel. At the same time, South Vietnam's regular army was reduced in size to keep within the Geneva stipulations even though neither South Vietnam nor the U.S. were signatories to the Accords.

INSIDE NORTH VIETNAM 1954–1956

Ho Chi Minh's regime in North Vietnam by 1956, was experiencing widespread unrest and resistance to the bloody "land readjustment" campaign which killed small farmers and landholders as a preparatory step to turn their lands into collective farms. There were a minimum of large landlords in North Vietnam which had traditionally been a country of small farms and land worked by the owners. Nevertheless, more than 50,000 people were executed by the Communist Party compaign in two years. By 1956 more than a half a million people were in forced labor camps or re-education centers and countless

families had been destroyed by wives being forced to divorce their husbands who had been branded "reactionaries." In August 1956, intellectuals in Hanoi publicly demanded the overthrow of the Lao Dong Party publishing their demand in the newspaper "Nhan Van" (Humanity). The Lao Dong Party closed the protesting newspapers and periodicals, suppressed the university students and jailed the dissenters.

REBELLION IN NORTH VIETNAM—1956

In November 1956, despite regime apologies for the "tortures and murders" of the previous two years, the farmers of Ho Chi Minh's home province of Nghe Anh, rose against their Stalinist masters, seized guns from the Communist Party armory and fought against the Lao Dong Party. Two divisions of North Vietnamese regular army troops were sent in to suppress this rebellion, but the troops could not erase the fact that the people of North Vietnam were emulating the revolts flaring in Poland and Hungary a half a world away against the same system of totalitarian Communist rule.

This was the atmosphere in 1956 when the North Vietnamese might otherwise have held the Geneva-prescribed elections. The precincts in North Vietnam were rotten. There were no model unification elections there either. Ho went on national radio in North Vietnam and apologized for errors and mistakes of the land reform executions: "My children, Land Reform is like hot soup, it must be taken slowly." General Giap, hero of Dienbienphu and Defense Minister of North Vietnam apologized before a formal meeting of the Party Congress, stressing that the murders and tortures that had occurred during those two years were a result of over zealous actions.

HO CHI MINH

When Ho took power as a Communist leader in North Vietnam in 1954, he had already traveled a long and special road. He had been born in 1890 with the name: Nguyen That Thanh. (Nguyen Who Will Be Victorious.) In his lifetime he would adopt and discard 21 aliases to mask his identity. His father was a functionaire and was alternately working for and being prosecuted by the French. In 1912 Ho left Vietnam under an alias as a cabin boy on a French ship and in time sailed from Marseilles, France on the maritime routes that took him to Africa, New York City and London. In the years of World War I he was in France where he was known as Nguyen O Phap (Nguyen Who Hates the French.) In 1919 he rented a top hat and tails and attempted to present a petition for Vietnam's independence to the Big Four peace conference meeting at Versailles. They were too busy to see him.

ALIAS NGUYEN AI QUOC

In 1920, reinforcing his years of contact with the Socialist movement in Europe, he attended the Socialist Congress at Tours, France and when the meeting split into two factions, he followed the Communist faction into session and became a founding member of the French Communist Party. He adopted the name: Nguyen Ai Quoc (Nguyen the Patriot). His French Communist Party roots would show clearly years later when he, in 1946, negotiated the return of the French to Vietnam (the French Communist Party felt it had a good chance of conquering France by parliamentary action in 1946 and issued orders that year to the Vietnamese Communist Party that "under no circumstances should any attempt be made to prevent the return of French troops to Vietnam in 1946"). Ho Chi Minh bargained the French in to get the occupying Chinese Nationalist troops and influence out of North Vietnam. Southern Communists protested the entire arrangement charging Ho with being a nation seller and a betrayer. This was not a new allegation on Ho's record.

After the 1920 founding of the French Communist Party, Nguyen Ai Quoc was sent to Moscow to the Lenin Institute for training at the Toiler of the East School. There from 1923–1925 he refined his skills as a Communist organizer.

In 1925, he was assigned to Canton, China as a member of the Russian Consulate headed by Borodin. Nguyen Ai Quoc was listed as a clerk and an interpreter, but his real job was to organize Communist activities in Southeast Asia. One of Nguyen Ai Quoc's first acts upon arrival in Canton was to invite to Shanghai the leading Vietnamese fighter against the French, Phan Boi Chau. Chau had been leading the struggle against the French for more than 25 years inside Vietnam. Nguyen Ai Quoc's organization sold Phan Boi Chau to the French security police in Shanghai, China in 1925. A trip to talk about revolution had ended in betrayal and nationalist struggle against the French was weakened by the actions of the Communist organizer, Nguyen Ai Quoc. Two hundred other nationalists of various parties were subsequently invited to China by Nguyen Ai Quoc to study revolution. After a year's study at Whampoa Military Academy many of them refused to join the Communist movement and they too were betrayed to the French Surete as they attempted to clandestinely return to Vietnam. Nationalists who had thus encountered Nguyen Ai Quoc's organization had the contemporary opinion that Nguyen Ai Quoc was betraying Vietnamese nationalism not fostering it. Nguyen Ai Quoc had to flee for safety to northeast Thailand when the coalition arrangement between the Chinese Nationalists and the Chinese Communists broke down in 1928.

THE "DEATH" OF NGUYEN AI QUOC

In 1930 Nguyen Ai Quoc held a Congress of the quarreling factions of the Indochina Communist groups in Hong Kong. There he founded the Indochinese Communist Party thus surfacing his Communist allegiance so repugnant to Vietnamese nationalists. In 1933 Nguyen Ai Quoc was reported dead and his death was accepted as genuine by Communist and non-Communist Vietnamese alike. The Communist Vietnamese were grieved, but the nationalist Vietnamese were more restrained in their mourning since the betrayer of their colleagues had passed to his next reincarnation. Some were plainly relieved that the leading menace to the nationalist movements was gone. They buried their grudges with the memory of Nguyen Ai Quoc.

ALIAS HO CHI MINH

After the false report of his death, Nguyen Ai Quoc, under a variety of other aliases worked in Thailand, Malaya, and the Soviet Union.

In 1941, eight years later, Nguyen Ai Quoc emerged from a Chinese Nationalist prison and under the alias of Ho Chi Minh—"Ho who is determined to be enlightened"—was sent into Vietnam by the O.S.S. to organize an escape net for allied pilots in Japanese occupied North Vietnam, Ho was also sponsored by a Chinese nationalists warlord who wanted to wrap up North Vietnam for himself as a V–J day present. As Ho Chi Minh, new in name and appearance (tuberculosis had aged and emaciated him, prison had grayed his hair) encountered Vietnamese nationalists, he avoided any identification with Nguyen Ai Quoc's record, downgraded the Communist Party Nguyen Ai Quoc had created and asked people to join in a Front against the Japanese. Under this name and with this organizational mask, Ho Chi Minh became the war hero and liberation hero of most Vietnamese. (Not until 1960 in public print in Hanoi did Ho Chi Minh admit that he was Nguyen Ai Quoc.)

BEHIND THE MASK—THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Consistently throughout the years from 1941 through 1945, the Communist movement hid under the mask of a Front. In 1945 with the Japanese surrender the Communist movement emerged, entered a coalition government in 1946 which was nationalist, communist and neutralist in representation. In six months, the Communists had murdered, arrested or terrorized the nationalists into flight, and the iron control of the Party had been established. However, when the war with the French began a month later, Ho once again found it necessary to abolish publicly the Communist Party and create a broad popular front which nationalist non-Communists could be expected to join.

THE LEGACY OF NGUYEN AI QUOC—1954

After France lost at Dienbienphu in 1954 and the Geneva Accords were signed in France and North Vietnam, Ho had a difficult time explaining to the Southern Communist movement of his organization why, having lost the war in 1954, France was to be permitted two more years to hang on in South Vietnam. One reason was that the Soviet Union had insisted that Ho give France two more years in Indochina as an incentive for the French to vote against the European Defense community plan then being considered in the French Parliament. Thus it was for the International Communist priority of weakening the Western European defenses which denied the 250 Soviet army divisions, that Ho Chi Minh sold out the hopes of the Southern Communists.

BAD NEWS FOR THE SOUTHERN COMMUNISTS

Between 80,000 to 100,000 Southerners had been ordered to go North at the time of Geneva to train and prepare in the North for the return to South Vietnam to organize the Communist vote in the South in 1956. For these Southern Communists who were in North Vietnam, the North's land reform revolt and the Party's eroded political condition were bad news. The need was plain. The balance between Ho's problems and Diem's progress had to be corrected by a shift in tactics.

RETURN TO THE SOUTH TO ORGANIZE AND KILL

The Southern Communist re-groupees, trained in North Vietnam went back into the South to focus the local grievances in the villages of the countryside, to organize resistance to the central Government in South Vietnam, and to kill by assassination and terror those serving the government cause in the countryside. It was this pattern, using the 5,000 hold-out stay-behind Communist troops that Ho had ordered to remain in escrow in the South, that enabled these local Southern re-groupees to carry out their tasks. They killed the corrupt first, the efficient second and never touched the mediocre. A lot of Vietnamese started to get mediocre in the performance of their tasks simply to get to the next year. The killings started in 1957. The Communists never publicly mentioned Communism nor did they create a public Communist organization. They simply rode the tiger of local grievance, joining and supporting whatever the local organizations and memories would respond to and at the same time the network of clandestine Communist agents and membership spread carefully in a technique the Communists professionally called "bead-stringing." There was much local grievance to exploit. The scene was set for the next three years of Communist assassination, terror and organizing. Diem grew increasingly repressive in response to the deteriorating security situation.

CREATION OF THE NLF—ANOTHER "FRONT"

In December 1960 the National Liberation Front was formed since Diem was nearly overthrown by a coup the previous month and the Communists were still publicly operating entirely through the diversity and variety of local grievances. They had to have a national organization that the people could join if Diem was toppled. The National

Liberation Front was a spin-off of Ho Chi Minh's long experience in masking his unpopular Communist Party's identity behind broad popular facades. But the People's Revolutionary Party (PRP) was also included inside the Front. This was in fact the Southern branch of the Lao Dong Party and its controlling role in the Front, which was largely a propaganda facade and apparatus, became painfully evident in 1962 when the PRP announced publicly that it was a "Marxist-Leninist Party, the vanguard of a Communist Revolution." This was sad tidings for the Front and the believers in local grievance causes. Once again the Front, well along the road to what it assumed to be victory, was effectively abolished in favor of Party control of policy and apparatus.

THE CRUCIAL YEAR 1964—SHOULD THE NORTHERN ARMY GO IN?

In 1964 most of the effective Southern manpower pool of re-groupees that had been sent North for training in 1954 had been used up. There still had been no uprising of the masses in South Vietnam to the Communist banner, though Diem was increasingly unpopular as a result of his deteriorating administrative apparatus in the countryside and those who carried out programs in negative fashion using his name. For the North the real question was: "If Southern cadres trained in the North are now in short supply, could the regular Northern army be sent in to wrap up the war fast?" In 1964, the Lao Dong Party moved the NVN army into training camps preparing for such a shift in policy and in September and October 1964 the first regular units of the North Vietnamese Army began to move down the Ho Chi Minh trail through Laos and into South Vietnam. The numbers increased as the months went by. From an initial advance party of 300 in November and December 1964, the Northern involvement rose to several thousand by the spring of 1965 and eventually to the 10 divisions (160,000 men) in the South today. It was these troops, wearing uniforms and insignia, coming in regular unit formations, that constituted the beginning of an actual invasion of the South by the North. The pattern of the war had changed.

THE U.S. RESPONSE—MISCALCULATION BY THE NORTH

The U.S. was now to be tested. Did it mean what it had always said? Would the South Vietnamese be overrun? The North could well reflect in 1970 that they had made a major miscalculation in 1964. For the U.S. response with the combat forces arriving in March and June 1965 prevented the collapse of South Vietnam and remains today the major element blocking a North Vietnamese military victory on the battlefield. Moreover, in 1969 President Nixon's Vietnamization policy for the first time turned priority attention to the training and equipping of the South Vietnamese in a role of leadership which places the burden for the defense of the South on the shoulders of the Southerners. The ongoing U.S. troop reduction is timetabled to enable the South to prepare to meet this challenge. Such a shift can only represent anathema to the North. For Southerners have never in 2,500 years of Vietnamese history been ruled by Northerners and a trained and equipped Southerner in his own back yard is the strongest psychological barrier to a North Vietnamese regular army intruder into the South. That is why the North has attempted to preserve the fiction for so long that it really has no troops in the South and at the same time has insisted that the U.S. must withdraw unilaterally and precipitately get out so that there will be a guaranteed Southern collapse of the non-Communist nationalists. That is the only way North Vietnam (with the mask of the NLF shredded and torn by the Tet offensive of 1968 which resulted in the execution by the Southern Communists of 5,700 people in the city of Hue in 26 days of occupation) can hope for a military success in South Vietnam. They had never thought the U.S. would in fact come to the aid of South Vietnam with troops when for seven years South Vietnam was being cut to pieces and the U.S. had sent only a few advisors. Now the North is equally worried about how to get the Americans out fast. President Nixon has indicated that one of the ways that the war can be most speedily resolved is by meaningful negotiations at Paris or elsewhere. If the Hanoi leadership refuses to negotiate then the Vietnamization program will be a constant reminder that as they dally, the South Vietnamese who have a deep residual abiding rivalry with the North are being given more time and tools to get ready.

NEW POLITICAL GROWTH AT THE RICE ROOTS IN THE SOUTH—1967–1970

It is in this context that the series of elections from the village to the Presidency in South Vietnam should be viewed. Village self-government is back. The present Saigon leadership reincarnated this venerable Vietnamese tradition in 1967. It also fostered a budget and leadership role for the village councils that more appropriately equate with the 20th century needs for services and development. Village elections were held in 1,000 villages in 1967. Another 1,000 villages were able to conduct elections as a result of the inability of the Communist forces to keep government contact away from the villages following the 1968 Tet offensive which cost the Communists more than 230,000 dead and opened up, as a result, communications and access to nearly 1,000 more villages in the following six months. Thus 2,000 of the total 2,300 villages in South Vietnam today have ignored Viet Cong threats, have voted for their own local leadership and are busy trying to rebuild their own local society despite the decade of war. The national elections, which also have ignored the VC have resulted in a House and Senate, a Presidency and Vice Presidency being created and candidates elected. In the summer of 1970, 1,000 villages held re-elections for their councils. With five candidates trying for each seat available, the 44 province councils (they advise the 44 province chiefs or governors) were elected, and in August 1970 30 seats of the 60 seat South Vietnamese Senate were the subject of re-election. Sixteen, ten-man positions contested, and the winning slate was the Buddhist, with Opposition Independents second and a pro-Thieu slate third. Even the losers said this was the most honest election in their experience.

THE BIG QUESTION FOR HANOI

In 1971, the whole country of South Vietnam votes again for the Presidency, the Vice Presidency, the Lower House of the National Assembly and the village councils in 1,000 villages. The big question for the Southern Communists is what role they will play in these elections. The U.S. and South Vietnam have offered them a chance to negotiate, to cease firing and come in and compete politically, joining in determining the arrangements for the rules and the supervision of the balloting. Hanoi and the VC have rejected these proposals and instead repeat the tired refrain that the U.S. should simply unilaterally get out and that prior to any elections a coalition government of "progressive" forces must be imposed upon the people of South Vietnam as we go. Yet non-Communist nationalist South Vietnam remembers the brief coalition experiences with North Vietnam's Communists in 1946 when the nationalists were terrorized and decimated within six months. And South Vietnam remembers the preview of Communist rule in the city of Hue where in 1968 5,700 people were executed by local Communist forces during 26 days of occupation. The U.S. is willing to talk about any settlement that preserves for the South the right to choose its own path free from outside attack, there will be no surrender. North Vietnam didn't make it through a military invasion of the South and she will not be allowed to pick up the victory politically by a U.S. cut and run. The South Vietnamese will have their increased capabilities, their test and their choice.

THE NORTH AFTER HO

In the North, Ho Chi Minh died in 1969. His heirs debate the correctness or the blunder of the policies of 1964, the sending of Northern troops and the resulting cost of the war at home. Hanoi has lost its major industrial development throughout the country. More than 700,000 Northern regular army soldiers have been killed in the South. Since 1968, the Northern wounded are coming home bearing witness by their condition of blindness, loss of limbs or crippled condition to the fury of the battle. Since 1969, death benefit payments have been instituted to the families of Northern soldiers killed in the South further surfacing the public knowledge about the terrible human cost of Northern invasion of South Vietnam.

During the time of the bombing of North Vietnam by the U.S., the war was described as being a resistance against American air raids aimed at softening up the North for invasion. The fact that Northern draftees had been sent to South Vietnam was not publicized. Northern sons were defending the coast against such an invasion. Today with the bombing ended, Northern families ask why their sons have not returned since the post-bombing condition of North Vietnam is described by Northern writers and dramatists as "a time of peace." In some plays and short stories in North Vietnam, there is often a subtle protest role surfaced. The "mother" saying: "Why should I send my son South, so many have gone, so few have returned." In the same pattern, there are hippies in Hanoi, sons of the elite, or drop-outs from the revolution whose dress and life style infuriate the party. In 1971, a rock and roll band was sentenced to 15 years for playing "golden music" in psychedelic cellars in Hanoi luring the youth from the path of revolutionary endeavor. Above all, there is the debate within the Party about the priorities of the war in the South and the need to build and reconstruct in the North. There are constant warnings in the Hanoi Party press to fight the increased corruption and decay that is appearing in the society. The events of 1970–71 concerning Cambodia and Laos offer little comfort to the La Dong Party and the 21 million people of North Vietnam under its rule. The war and its costs are very real. Yet for Hanoi there is still no victory in sight.

THREE-DIMENSIONAL FOCUS—NEGOTIATION AND VIETNAMIZATION

These are some of the factors which make it necessary for those who seek to understand this problem to place the Vietnamese in three-dimensional focus. This is unlike any war or situation we have ever encountered and that is why President Nixon has decided to follow a policy that on the one hand offers peace through negotiation and on the other continues to turn responsibilities over to the South through Vietnamization.

VIETNAM BIBLIOGRAPHY

General Surveys

Bain, Chester. *Vietnam: The Roots of Conflict*, 1967. $1.95. (Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 07632)

Trager, Frank. *Why Vietnam?*, 1966. $4.95. (Frederick A. Praeger, 111 Fourth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10003)

Fall, Bernard. *The Two Vietnams*, second edition, 1967. $7.95. (Frederick A. Praeger, 111 Fourth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10003)

Fishel, Wesley, ed. *Vietnam: Anatomy of a Conflict*, 1968. $5.95. (F. E. Peacock Publishers, 401 West Irving Park Road, Itasca, Ill. 60143)

Thompson, Sir Robert. *No Exit From Vietnam*, 1969. $4.50. (David McKay Co., 750 Third Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017)

Duncanson, Dennis. *Government and Revolution in Vietnam*. 1968. $9.50. (Oxford University Press, 1600 Pollitt Drive, Fair Lawn, N.J 07410)

The Communist Sphere

Hoang Van Chi. *From Colonialism to Communism: A Case History of North Vietnam*, 1964. $6.50. (Frederick A. Praeger, 111 Fourth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10003)

Spinks, Charles et al. *The North Vietnamese Regime: Institutions and Problems*, 1969. (Center for Research in Social Systems, 5010 Wisconsin Ave., Washington, D.C. 20016)

Hosmer, Stephen. *Viet Cong Repression and Its Implications for the Future*, 1970. $8.50. (D.C. Heath & Co., 125 Spring Street, Lexington, Mass. 02173)

Pike, Douglas. *Viet Cong: The Organization and Technique of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam*, 1966. $2.95. (MIT Press, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass. 02142)

The Vietnamese People

Hickey, Gerald. *Village in Vietnam*, 1964. $3.45. (Yale University Press, 149 York St., New Haven, Conn. 06511)

Sheehan, Susan. *Ten Vietnamese*, 1967. $4.95. (Alfred A. Knopf, 201 East 50th St., New York, N.Y. 10022)

The Early Years

Shaplen, Robert. *The Lost Revolution*, 1966. $2.45. (Harper & Row, Scranton, Pa. 18512)

Scigliano, Robert. *South Vietnam: Nation Under Stress*, 1964. $2.95. (Houghton Mifflin Co., 53 West 43 St., New York, N.Y. 10036)

Fall, Bernard. *Viet-Nam Witness: 1953–66*, 1966. $6.95. (Frederick A. Praeger, 111 Fourth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10003)

Higgins, Marguerite. *Our Vietnam Nightmare*, 1965. $6.95. (Harper & Row, Scranton, Pa. 18512)

Tanham, George. *War Without Guns*, 1966. $4.95. (Frederick A. Praeger, 111 Fourth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10003)

The Southeast Asia Context

Warner, Denis. *Reporting Southeast Asia*, 1966. $10.50. (Tri-Ocean Inc., 62 Townsend St., San Francisco, Cal. 94107)

Shaplen, Robert. *Time Out of Hand*, 1970. $2.95. (Harper & Row, Scranton, Pa. 18512)

Nuechterlein, Donald. *Thailand and the Struggle for Southeast Asia*, 1965. $6.50. (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y. 14850)

Leifer, Michael. *Cambodia: The Search for Security*, 1967. $6.00. (Frederick A. Praeger, 111 Fourth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10003)

WORKING PAPER ON THE NORTH VIETNAMESE ROLE IN THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

This working paper discusses the role of North Viet-Nam in the origin, direction and support of the war in South Viet-Nam. It is based on the appended compilation of more than 100 verbatim captured documents, intelligence briefs and the whole or part of interrogations edited for security. The information in this compilation goes as far as is now justifiable in the public interest. Obviously such a compilation cannot include information from sensitive sources who could be easily compromised under present wartime conditions. If such information were releasable, the paper would be considerably more conclusive. Nonethless, even with these limitations it is believed that the paper and accompanying compilation are both useful and informative.

The footnotes to this paper are based largely on the material in the compilation. The nature of the material is, however, fully described in the footnotes so that the reader can get a fairly good idea of the kind of information involved even if he does not have the compilation fully before him.

Among the documents in the compilation, perhaps the three most important ones, captured within the past two years and of great interest to any student of this subject, are as follows:

(a) *CRIMP Document:* A 23,000-word review of the "Experience of the South Viet-Nam Revolutionary Movement during the Past Several Years" which was written about 1963 by an unidentified Communist cadre and was captured by Allied Forces in early January 1966 during Operation CRIMP.

(b) *Le Duan Letter:* A letter dated March 1966, presumably written by Le Duan, First Secretary of the Lao Dong [Communist Party of Viet-Nam] Central Committee and member of the Politburo; captured by units of the 173rd Airborne Brigade, January 21, 1967 during Operation Cedar Falls.

(c) *Talk of General Vinh:* A talk by General Nguyen Van Vinh, Chief of Staff of the North Vietnamese High Command and Chairman of the Lao Dong's Reunification Department, made before the Viet Cong Fourth Central Office (COSVN) Congress in April 1966. It was captured by U.S. Forces in Ninh Thuan Province in early 1967. The reader may find that the style of these and other documents is heavy and frequently hard to follow. These characteristics make close scrutiny of the texts and a knowledge of the historical context essential to their interpretation.

The following discussion of North Vietnam's role in the current war is in two parts. The first deals briefly with certain aspects of the setting in which the war started. The second outlines what can be said, on the basis of this documentary material, about the origins and evolution of the war.

I. THE SETTING OF THE WAR

This paper does not attempt to provide an account of the complex series of events that led up to the current war. However, there are two features of the Vietnamese political landscape in the period following the French decision to end the fighting in 1954 that require mention.

A. The Geneva Accords, 1954

The Geneva Accords constitute the first of these features. Although much has already been written about them, their most important practical effect was to create two separate international entities in Vietnam. That a separate national entity—South Vietnam—existed against which aggression could be committed is evident from the following facts:

1. Anyone reading the Accords will recognize that the establishment of the 17th parallel as a dividing line between North and South Viet-Nam, the provision for the movement of the Vietnamese people north or south of the parallel according to their political preferences, the postponement of general elections for two years, and the ambiguity as to how such election could be organized—all point to the conclusion that the country was being divided. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. makes this point in his book, *The Bitter Heritage*, when he says that the negotiations in Geneva "resulted in the *de facto* partition of Viet-Nam at the 17th parallel and the independence of Laos and Cambodia." [1] As far back as 1955, South Viet-Nam was recognized, *de jure*, by 36 countries, and North Viet-Nam had full relations with 12 countries. Today the Republic of Viet-Nam has *de jure* diplomatic relations with 52 nations. North Viet-Nam has diplomatic relations with 24 countries, 12 of whom belong to the Communist bloc.

2. The situation had ample precedent in what had happened in Korea. There, the country had been divided at the 38th parallel, and remained so even though a resolution of the United Nations General Assembly in 1947 recommended elections not later than the end of March 1948, to be followed by the convening of a Korean national assembly, and the formation of a national government.[2]

3. The Soviet Union, in 1957, proposed to admit North Viet-Nam, South Viet-Nam, and the two Koreas to the United Nations as four separate states. In fact, Soviet spokesmen have specifically said: "The realistic approach was to admit that there were two States with conflicting political systems in both Korea and Viet-Nam." [3] They later reversed their position regarding South Viet-Nam; the United States was opposed to the admission of both North Viet-Nam and North Korea.

4. The United States, for its part, indicated in 1954 that it would "refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb" the Geneva Accords. But it also stated that "it would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the aforesaid Agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security." [4]

5. When President Kennedy wrote to President Ngo Dinh Diem on December 14, 1961, announcing a major increase in U.S. assistance to South Viet-Nam, he noted that "the campaign of force and terror now being waged against your people and your Government is supported and directed from the outside by the authorities in Hanoi." He further referred to the U.S. declaration of 1954: "At that time, the United States, although not a party to the Accords, declared that it 'would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security.' We continue to maintain that view." [5]

B. The Communist apparatus in South Vietnam

A second feature of the Vietnamese landscape both before and since 1954 has been the existence of a Communist political and military apparatus in South Viet-Nam. Party documents captured by French forces during their war against the Viet Minh described the Communist organization of the period.

1. In the South, the apparatus was broadly divided between two regions, or "interzones," and a special zone in the area of Saigon. Each of these zones originally reported directly to Communist Party headquarters in Hanoi. Interzone 5 (Trung Bo) encompassed the northern and central part of South Viet-Nam. Interzone Nam Bo consisted of the south and southwest, including the Delta. Province, district, town, and village cells reported to these "interzones." [6]

2. In 1951, when the Communist Party in the North was reconstituted as the *Lao Dong* Party, its apparatus in the South was reorganized under a six-man *Trung Uong Cuc Mien Nam*, or Central Office for South Viet-Nam (COSVN).[7]

3. The head of COSVN and senior Party representative in the South was Le Duan, an Annamite, who is now First Secretary of the *Lao Dong* Party in Hanoi. His deputy was Le Duc Tho, a northerner, who today is also a member of the Politburo of the *Lao Dong* Party. Le Duan and Tho appear to have had considerable independence of action in directing day-to-day military and political operations in the South, but remained answerable on broad policy questions to the heads of the *Lao Dong* Party in the North.[8]

4. The end of the war against France in 1954, and the establishment of North and South Viet-Nam, brought no significant change in the centralized control of the Party by Hanoi. Although COSVN was phased out, its functions in the southern and southwestern provinces were assumed by the Regional Committee for Nam Bo. Hanoi took direct charge of party activities in Interzone 5, the northern part of South Viet-Nam.[9]

Footnotes at end of article.

II. ORIGINS AND EVOLUTION OF THE CURRENT WAR

It was in this setting that the current war in South Viet-Nam started and evolved. Five major phases in this development can be readily identified. The evidence for each of the five phases and the inferences that can be drawn about the role played by North Viet-Nam are summarized below.

A. The political phase, 1954–56

This was the period in which both Hanoi and Saigon were working to secure control over their respective parts of Viet-Nam. At the same time, although one cannot be certain about the precise numbers, approximately 900,000 people fled the North to the South; about 90,000 people chose to go North under the terms of the Geneva Accords.[10] During these years, Ngo Dinh Diem—first as Premier, then as President of South Viet-Nam—undertook his campaigns to bring various dissident factions and sects under the authority of the Government of South Viet-Nam. Ho Chi Minh consolidated his power in the North, and North Viet-Nam, for its part, took the following steps with respect to South Viet-Nam:

1. Deputy Premier Pham Van Dong, at the closing session of the Geneva Conference on July 12, 1954, expressly stated that "We shall achieve unity. We shall achieve it just as we have won the war. No force in the world, internal or external, can make us deviate from our path . . ." Ho Chi Minh emphasized this determination the next day by calling publicly for a "long and arduous struggle" to win the southern areas, which he characterized as "territories of ours." [11]

2. Hanoi did withdraw the bulk of its fighting men from the South. However, most of these "regroupees" were placed in special units. They formed into the 305th, 324th, 325th, 330th, and 338th Divisions of the North Vietnamese Army. At least until 1959, these divisions were reportedly composed entirely of South Vietnamese.[12]

3. Hanoi also left a small but experienced military force in South Viet-Nam. Although its exact size is unknown, in 1956 the U.S. military attache estimated it at about 5,000 men.[13]

4. In addition, and perhaps more decisive to long term Communist strategy, North Viet-Nam continued to maintain its political network in the South.[14] Even in the first year after Geneva, it sent a small number of cadres across or around the 17th parallel.[15] A notable arrival was General Van Tien Dung, then and since chief of staff of the North Vietnamese Army, who dropped abruptly from public view in the North for a period in 1955–56. Intelligence reports placed him in South Viet-Nam, where he was working to organize additional units of former Viet Minh cadres who had not gone North, and to prepare for future infiltration and expansion of the apparatus in the South.[16]

5. Most important of all, Hanoi ordered its apparatus in the South to go underground. As the *CRIMP Document* puts it: "The party apparatus in South Viet-Nam . . . became covert. The organization and methods of operation of the party were changed in order to guarantee the leadership and focus forces of the Party under the new struggle condition." A Party policy paper of the time defines as part of "the immediate mission of Nambo . . . the consolidation and reformation of Party organisms and popular groups on a clandestine basis, based upon vigilance and revolutionary procedures designed to safeguard our forces . . ." [17]

6. These orders were apparently obeyed. There are reports of Party meetings in 1956–57 to discuss a change of tactics, and Le Duan is represented as urging increased military action. "Our political struggle in the South will sometimes have to be backed up with military action to show the strength of [our] forces," he told a Party conference in the South on March 18, 1956. "Therefore we should increase our forces in the South and develop military action.[18] Nonetheless, despite these outbursts, the apparatus seems to have followed the line of the *Lao Dong* Party through 1956, and to have worked for unification by political means; i.e. by subversion and all means short of resorting to open armed conflict.

It is clear from this evidence that:

1. Hanoi was indeed both committed and determined to bring the South under its control.

2. Hanoi was also willing to accept unification by way of the Geneva Accords, provided that it could manipulate these Accords so as to ensure victory for the *Lao Dong* Party and control of the South by the North.

3. Even so, the North Vietnamese leaders hedged their bets. They were willing to rely upon political means according to their own interpretation of the Geneva Accords. They left enough of their political and military apparatus in South Viet-Nam so as to weaken it from within and be able to take advantage of any elections should these come about. But they also were prepared to expand the apparatus in order to return to "armed struggle" or an all-out military effort if the political gambit failed. And, of course, the political gambit did fail.

Indeed, the period from 1954 through 1956 saw the consolidation of the Diem government in South Viet-Nam, and what has sometimes been described as a "miracle" of settling down and accomplishment, at least in relation to what may well have been North Viet-Nam's expectations of early collapse.

Moreover, the elections scheduled for July 1956 under the Geneva Accords never did take place. On this much-debated issue, the key points to recall are the fact that the Geneva Accords called for "free" elections and that, as all responsible observers at the time agreed, North Viet-Nam would not conceivably have permitted any supervision or any determination that could remotely have been called free. Hence, Diem refused to go through with the elections, and we supported him in that refusal.[19]

B. The outbreak of the war, 1956–59

The period from 1956 to 1959 is a particularly difficult one to characterize in a few words. In South Viet-Nam, despite earlier political and economic gains, President Diem was becoming increasingly repressive in his efforts to maintain his authority: in the process he undoubtedly contributed to growing, if relatively disorganized, opposition. In the countryside, peasant discontent was aroused particularly by his brother's excessive measures to ferret out Communist cadres; and urban discontent was aroused by his efforts to discredit and neutralize any opposition that went beyond mere dissent.

This dissatisfaction was exploited by the Communist underground apparatus which now became less reluctant to use overt means, and, in areas where its strength was relatively unchallenged by the Government, to resort to selective terrorism. Although statistics for the period are neither complete nor entirely reliable, a sharp rise in terrorism seems to have begun as early as 1957. It appears that by 1958 the Government was losing about 40 civilian officials and 40 military personnel per month, and it is widely conceded that an organized uprising against Diem got underway sometime between then and 1960.[20]

What about the role of North Viet-Nam in this uprising? The evidence indicates the following:

1. There was considerable debate within the Communist apparatus in the South as to what strategy they should follow, given the failure to achieve unification by political means.

2. By 1958, according to the CRIMP document, "the majority of the party members and cadres felt that it was necessary to launch immediately an armed struggle in order to preserve the movement and protect the forces. In several areas the party members on their own initiative had organized armed struggle against the enemy." Yet at the same time, there were others who were hesitant to push the armed struggle. "These people did not fully appreciate the capabilities of the masses, of the Party and of the movement and therefore did not dare mobilize the masses in order to seek every means to oppose the enemy." The Nam Bo Regional Committee leadership hesitated, "but the principal reason was the fear of violating the party line." [21]

3. During this period, the *CRIMP Document* reports that "the political struggle movement of the masses, although not defeated, was encountering increasing difficulty and increasing weakness; the Party bases although not completely destroyed were significantly weakened, and in some areas quite seriously; the prestige of the masses and of the revolution suffered." [22]

4. Meanwhile, Le Duan left South Viet-Nam sometime in 1957, emerged in Hanoi, and became First Secretary of the *Lao Dong* Party—an indication that those favoring the armed struggle had prevailed.[23]

5. In 1958, there is evidence that Hanoi took the first steps to organize the movement of men and supplies both through Laos and across the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ).[24]

6. Then, in May 1959, the Politburo of the *Lao Dong* Party announced the decision for war against South Viet-Nam. Although the decision itself may have been taken earlier, the directive of the Politburo, again according to the *CRIMP Document*, "stated that the time had come to push the armed struggle against the enemy. Thanks to this . . . in October 1959 the armed struggle was launched." As described by the *CRIMP Document*, "it immediately took the form in South Viet-Nam of revolutionary warfare, a long-range revolutionary warfare." [25]

7. By the end of 1959, more than 400 civilians had been murdered and another 579 kidnapped in South Viet-Nam.[26] Armed attacks had increased significantly in size, with company-strength Viet Cong units appearing in assaults on army outposts and patrols. In January 1960, a Viet Cong battalion some 500 strong successfully attacked an ARVN regiment.

The history that seems to emerge from these data is as follows:

1. Hanoi had committed itself publicly and irrevocably to a return to armed struggle in the South.

2. The southern part of the Communist apparatus had become restive with the political approach by 1956, and Le Duan in particular was persuaded that force would be required to bring about unification.

3. The Diem regime's trend toward repression made the "objective" conditions seem ripe for launching the struggle.

4. The Party apparatus was gradually reactivated into militant actions where local conditions permitted.

5. By May 1959, at the latest, Hanoi in effect declared war on South Viet-Nam and committed its political and military apparatus in the South to the struggle.

It is at least conceivable that Diem strengthened Hanoi's hand by virtue of the measures he was taking against both the dissident sects and the Communist apparatus in the South. It may even be that the sense of weakness felt by the leaders of Nam Bo, and Hanoi's fear that it would lose control over the apparatus, triggered the decision. But the fact is that Hanoi decided to reunify the country by force. Moreover, it appears to have had the only apparatus in the South capable of organizing and controlling an outbreak of violence of the magnitude that then occurred.

Footnotes at end of article.

C. The special war, 1959–63

For the next four years, from the end of 1959 to the end of 1963, the Viet Cong engaged in what the *CRIMP Document* called a long-range revolutionary warfare against the Diem regime and its immediate successor. During those four years, the strength of the Viet Cong increased substantially, and a revolutionary apparatus emerged in South Viet-Nam that was ostensibly independent of North Viet-Nam.

What role did North Viet-Nam play in these developments? On the military side, there is the following evidence of Hanoi's activities:

1. The North Vietnamese authorities formed border-crossing teams in early 1959 to transport medicines, ammunition, food, and documents across the DMZ.[27]

2. The Central Committee of the *Lao Dong* Party ordered the formation of the 559th Transportation Group to provide for the support of Viet Cong bases in the South. Founded in May, 1959, the 559th was placed directly under the Central Committee and in close liaison with the Ministry of Security, the Army General Staff, and the logistics Bureau.[28]

3. The 70th Battalion of the 559th, also formed in May 1959, was sent to the panhandle of Laos. Its responsibilities were to transport weapons, ammunition, mail, and supplies by way of 20 stations along the Laotian trails into South Viet-Nam. The Battalion was also charged with guiding infiltrating groups, and with bringing the sick and wounded back to North Viet-Nam.[29]

4. In June 1959, the 603rd Battalion was formed with a strength of 250 men. It was placed under the command of the Army General Staff and located near Quang Khe, a naval base in North Viet-Nam. It had the responsibility for clandestine maritime operations into South Viet-Nam.[30]

5. In January 1960, a special training base for infiltrators became operational at a North Vietnamese Army base in Son Tay, northwest of Hanoi.[31]

6. The 324th Division, the Nghe Au Province, was ordered to begin training infiltrators early in 1960.[32]

7. During this same period, the Xuan Mai Infiltration Training Center was set up southwest of Hanoi in the former barracks of the 228th Brigade. Once in operation, it apparently was capable of handling several 1000-man classes at one time.[33]

8. Infiltration on a substantial scale began in 1959. At the end of 1960, Viet Cong Main Force strength was estimated at 10 battalions and 5,500 men. Regional and local guerrillas probably had a strength of about 30,000. By the end of 1963. Viet Cong Main Force strength had risen to 30 battalions and around 35,000 men. It is important to note that this figure represents only a fraction of the total Viet Cong political/military apparatus operating in the South. During this same period, infiltration is estimated to have proceeded at the following rates.[34]

Year	Confirmed	Probable	Total
1959–60	4,556	26	4,582
1961	4,118	2,177	6,295
1962	5,362	7,495	12,857
1963	4,762	3,180	7,906
Total	18,798	12,878	31,676

9. Until late 1963, most of these infiltrators were ethnic Southerners, veterans of the Viet Minh with years of military experience and training, who had regrouped to the North. They were preponderantly officers or senior noncommissioned officers; through 1961, a high proportion of them were members of the *Lao Dong* Party. They assumed command positions in the Viet Cong forces and also carried out a wide range of political assignments. They provided, in sum, the core of the Viet Cong military and political apparatus.[35]

10. Prior to 1961, the Viet Cong had equipped themselves from Viet Minh caches of old French and American weapons, by the local manufacture of crude hand guns and rifles, and by capturing weapons from South Vietnamese units. Hanoi became an active supplier of weapons in 1961. At that point, modified versions of the French MAT–49 rifle began to appear on the battlefield. Their chambers had been reworked to use the standard Communist 7.62 mm. cartridge, a technique which required factory tooling.[36]

On the political side, the evidence about North Viet-Nam's activities is as follows:

1. On September 10, 1960, a resolution was adopted at the *Third* National Congress of the *Lao Dong* Party which highlighted the dominant role the North would play and stated guidelines for what was to become the National Front for the Liberation of South Viet-Nam (NLF). The resolution stated: "In the present state, the Vietnamese revolution has two strategic tasks: first, to carry out the socialist revolution in North Viet-Nam; second, to liberate South Viet-Nam from the ruling yoke of the U.S. imperialists and their henchmen in order to achieve national unity and complete independence and freedom throughout the country. . . . To insure the complete success of the revolutionary struggle in South Viet-Nam, our people there must strive to establish a united bloc of workers, peasants, and soldiers and to bring into being a broad national united front directed against the U.S.-Diem clique and based on the worker-peasant alliance." [37]

2. On January 29, 1961, Hanoi announced that the National Front for Liberation had been formed the previous month on December 20. The principal function of the Front was to conduct overt propaganda campaigns. Even so, the Front committee leadership has included *Lao Dong* Party agents who directed the work.[38] One high-ranking member of the Front is apparently Major General Tran Van Tra of the North Vietnamese Army, a top Viet Cong commander and an alternate member of the *Lao Dong* Party Central Committee in Hanoi. He seems to use the alias of Tran Nam Trung.[39]

3. Shortly after the foundation of the NLF, Hanoi announced that the insurgent forces in the South had been joined together in a "Liberation Army of South Viet-Nam" under the NLF. However, captured documents of 1962 state explicitly that "the present Liberation Army has been organized by the [*Lao Dong*] Party." [40] Other documents state that "the Liberation Army is . . . an instrument for the Party . . . for the Liberation of South Viet-Nam and the reunification of the Fatherland." [41]

4. In January, 1962, Hanoi Radio announced that a conference at "Marxist-Leninist" delegates in South Viet-Nam had organized a "People's Revolutionary Party" (PRP), which had immediately "volunteered" to join the NLF. However, documentation shows that in Hanoi's own words, "The People's Revolutionary Party has only the appearance of an independent existence; actually, our party is nothing but the Lao Dong Party of Viet-Nam, unified from North to South, under the direction of the Central Executive Committee of the Party, the chief of which is President Ho." [42] The PRP's Central Committee was later stated to comprise of 30 to 40 high-ranking Communists, with the size and composition of the committee varying from time to time as members rotated to and from the North and between regions of South Viet-Nam.[43]

5. Within this Committee, the real decision-making power lies in a select group of its highest ranking members, a standing committee known like its forerunner of the 1950's as the *Trung Uong Cuc Mien Nam*, or Central Office for South Viet-Nam (COSVN). The new COSVN was apparently formed in Hanoi after the *Lao Dong* Party Congress of 1960.[44] At that time, several Southern and Central Vietnamese were chosen to organize the COSVN, and were elevated to membership in the *Lao Dong* Central Committee. Since 1965 and perhaps earlier, COSVN and its military committee have been heavily weighted with North Vietnamese general officers. Political and military directives for the conduct of the war, captured by allied forces in South Viet-Nam, have consistently issued from Party and military organs and not from the NLF.[45]

6. Hanoi has tried to conceal its role in the political military campaigns in the South. A Southern party unit was reprimanded for copying and distributing a message from the North Vietnamese Ministry of Public Health to the party medical section in South Vietnam; this was considered a violation of party "secrecy regulations." [46] A party letter states: "The Central Party Committee directs that propaganda should rather praise nationalism, patriotism, revolutionary heroism and the role of the National Liberation Front. Indoctrination and propaganda referring to Uncle Ho, Party, class struggle, etc., should be conducted orally within internal organizations and among the people only." [47] Further, a recently captured cadre notebook for late 1967 indicates that: "The Central Headquarters of the [*Lao Dong*] Party and Uncle [Ho Chi Minh] have ordered the [*Lao Dong*] Party Committee in South Viet-Nam and the entire army and people of South Viet-Nam to implement a general offensive and general uprising in order to achieve a decisive victory for the Revolution within the [1967] Winter and 1968 Spring and Summer. . . . The above subject should be fully understood by cadre and troops, however, our brothers should not say that this order comes from the Party and Uncle [Ho Chi Minh], but to say it comes from the [Liberation] Front." [48]

The evidence on both the military and political side leads to the following conclusions:

1. From 1959 onward, Hanoi established an extensive organization for the training and infiltration of personnel, and at a later point major equipment, into the South.

2. The personnel infiltrated from the North between 1959 and 1963 provided the core and cutting edge of the Viet Cong military and political apparatus.

3. Hanoi established, from the outset, firm control over the direction and policy-making structure of the whole campaign against South Viet-Nam.

4. The National Liberation Front was established in Hanoi, in December of 1960 in order to give the appearance of local leadership. In fact, the NLF has never been in charge of the political and military conduct of the war. The covert nature of the total apparatus, and the desire for outward appearances that it was totally indigenous to the South, did contribute to its ability to attract and hold local support in South Viet-Nam.

5. The evidence suggests that Hanoi hoped to avoid overt intervention in this period and was seeking to overthrow the Saigon Government and set the stage for unification through the Viet Cong, with only leadership and control from the North.

D. Expansion of the war, 1963–65

The period from late 1963 to the end of 1965 is in some ways the most intriguing period of the current war. During those two years, which witnessed the downfall of the Diem regime, great political instability in South Viet-Nam, and an expansion of the war toward its current dimensions, both the

Footnotes at end of article.

United States and North Viet-Nam committed regular military units to the conflict. That Hanoi became overtly involved in the South during this period is generally recognized; exactly why and how is not so widely understood.

On this score, there is evidence to the following effect:

1. Hanoi probably took the decision to commit units of the North Vietnamese Army (NVA) to the South as early as December, 1963. This was shortly after the overthrow of Diem (November 1, 1963); when it became clear that the overthrow of Diem had not produced any significant defections to the Communist cause whatever, Hanoi simply changed its anti-Diem propaganda line and intensified the struggle. The 9th Session of the *Lao Dong* Party's Third Central Committee held a meeting in December and, according to a captured document, "assessed the balance of forces between us and the enemy and set forth plans and guidelines to win special war." [49]

2. Starting in early 1964, Hanoi began to develop its infiltration trails through Laos into an army-scale supply route, capable of handling continuous truck traffic to South Viet-Nam. A large group of North Vietnamese army construction battalions in at least three "Combined Forces" (Binh Tram 3, 4, and 5) was deployed in the area by 1964 to oversee the development of this roadnet.[50]

3. Some regular NVA units are known to have begun preparing for infiltration as early as April, 1964. Several prisoners from the 95th Regiment of the 325th Division have reported that their unit was recalled in that month from duty in Laos. Back in North Viet-Nam, the 95th underwent special military and political training for operations in the South.[51]

4. Hanoi also began to form new regimental-sized units for dispatch to the South. One of these, the 32nd Regiment, was activated sometime in the Spring of 1964, with personnel drawn from a number of established units. Trained draftees were added from the Son Tay and Xuan Mai infiltration centers which were in operation by 1961.[52]

5. In October, 1964, the first complete tactical unit of the North Vietnamese Army, the 95th Regiment, left the North. This was a new unit, with cadre drawn mainly from the 325th Division. It reached South Viet-Nam in December.[53] The 32nd Regiment left the North in September or October, 1964 arriving between January and March, and a second regiment of the 325th Division, the 101st, had left North Viet-Nam by December 1964. All of these dates of departure were prior to the beginning of U.S. bombing of North Viet-Nam in February, 1965. In short the evidence does not support the claim sometimes made, that the sending of regular North Vietnamese units was only in response to the U.S. bombing.

6. Between November, 1964, and the end of 1965, a buildup of 33 NVA battalions (about 10 regiments) took place in South Viet-Nam. Of these, about 3 NVA battalions (2,000 men) had arrived by the end of 1964. By the end of 1965, the NVA already constituted about 30 per cent of the total Main Force operating in South Viet-Nam.[54]

The following inferences can be drawn from this evidence:

1. Hanoi probably became dissatisfied with the failure of the Viet Cong, by itself, to capture South Viet-Nam.

2. It therefore decided to provide the increment of strength necessary to ensure seizure and control of the South. NVA regular units were to be the means to this end.

3. The relatively slow pace of the buildup is probably explainable in terms of poor transport and logistics, and the belief that time was on Hanoi's side.

4. Far from triggering the regular North Vietnamese buildup, U.S. actions were in response to it: the bombing of the North and the introduction of U.S. troops all followed not only the earlier movement of men and supplies from the North, but specifically came after regular North Vietnamese units had begun to be sent in quantity.

E. The current phase, 1965–67

The past two years, from 1965 to the end of 1967, have been marked particularly by major clashes between U.S. and NVA units, by the heavy bombing of North Viet-Nam, and by continuing efforts, thus far abortive, to negotiate a settlement of the conflict.

Here again, there is considerable evidence regarding North Viet-Nam's role in this phase of the war:

1. By early 1966, NVA units were described by Hanoi as "the organic mobile forces of South Viet-Nam".[55]

2. By the end of 1967. NVA strength in South Viet-Nam had risen to the point where its units constituted at least 45 per cent of the enemy Main Force. If one includes the NVA personnel who are in Viet Cong Main Force units. North Vietnamese troops now account for more than 50 per cent of the Main Force total.[56]

3. Dependence on logistic support from North Viet-Nam has increased commensurately. From aerial photography and pilot sightings, it is estimated that more than 300 trucks are operating on the infiltration routes in Laos alone during the dry season.

4. Since 1964, the Viet Cong Main Forces have been exclusively re-equipped with the latest Communist Chinese and Soviet automatic weapons. In addition to small arms, the Viet Cong Main Forces and the NVA units are now supplied with Soviet and Chinese heavy machine-guns, mortars, and rocket launchers. Modern Communist firearms have also been supplied to some of the local forces, although French, American, and homemade weapons still figure in the guerrilla arsenals.[57]

5. As a result of the large NVA presence in the South, it has become necessary to explain their role to the rural populace of South Viet-Nam. Communist political cadre are told to say that "we are backed up by a large war area which is the heroic socialist North Viet-Nam. It constitutes a major factor for success . . . North Viet-Nam is a large and stable rear area for South Viet-Nam and is providing us everything we need, including soldiers." Recruits from North Viet-Nam are described as having been "assigned to South Viet-Nam to liberate this part of the country . . ." [58]

6. Although the COSVN Military Affairs Committee supervises both Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Army military activity, the North Vietnamese Army command in Hanoi has increasingly assumed direct control over military operations in the northernmost provinces of South Viet-Nam.[59]

7. There is close consultation between Hanoi and COSVN before policy is decided, and the recommendations of the latter are influential. COSVN also has much leeway in applying the policy thus decided. But all basic matters are firmly reserved for direct decision by the *Lao Dong* Politburo-specifically including the nature and continuation of the war, the diplomatic program of the NLF, and the peace terms described in the public statements of the Front.[60] This can be vividly seen in the *Le Duan letter* and the talk of General Vinh, both of which lay down strategic and negotiating policies extensively with hardly a reference to the NLF. No one who reads these documents can have any doubt of Hanoi's control.

8. Thus, Resolution 12 of the Twelfth Conference of the Third Central Committee of the *Lao Dong* Party, passed in secret in December, 1965, required that the "buildup of all types of forces was to be accelerated and the pace of battle increased." [61]

9. Thus, Resolution 12 also laid down the line about the relationship between fighting and negotiating. According to Le Duan's report of it: "At present the U.S. imperialists . . . are trying to force us to the negotiation table for some concessions . . . [but] our strategy on negotiations must serve in a practical manner our concrete political aims. For this reason, the Party Central Committee has unanimously entrusted the Politburo with the task of carrying out the above strategy in conformity with the policy of our Party and on the basis of the situation between us and the enemy whenever necessary." [62] *The Talk of General Vinh*, discussing the same Resolution, reports the view of the *Lao Dong* Central Committee that "The future situation may lead to negotiations . . . while negotiating, we will continue fighting the enemy more vigorously. (It is possible that the North conducts negotiations while the South continues fighting, and that the South also participates in the negotiations while continuing to fight.) . . . We must fight to win great victories with which to compel the enemy to accept our conditions . . . we will take advantage of the opportunity offered by the negotiations to step up further our military attacks, political struggle and military proselyting."

The evidence for this phase of the war speaks for itself. It leaves no question but that Hanoi not only directs and controls the war in South Viet-Nam, but also plays the dominant role in the Main Force war.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is intended as a meticulous summary of the releasable evidence of the North Vietnamese role in the conflict. While improved intelligence in the past two years makes it possible to document North Viet-Nam's role most completely for this period, the evidence appears conclusive that the North was the driving force in bringing about the conflict from 1959 onward and in raising it to its successive dimensions at all stages. Likewise, the evidence seems conclusive that Hanoi had every intention of taking control over South Viet-Nam by one means or another from 1954 onward.

Yet, this being said, it is important to add one final note. Although the evidence is substantial that native North Vietnamese and North Vietnamese-trained personnel, coming from the North, dominate the Communist apparatus in South Viet-Nam, one cannot preclude the possibility that individuals within the apparatus now question and may come to reject the line imposed by Hanoi and the *Lao Dong* party. Reconciliation of all elements within South Viet-Nam is the declared policy of the South Vietnamese Government, which seeks also a determination of the political future of the South under Constitutional processes. Even as the United States must remain committed to assisting in resisting and bringing to an end the aggression from the North, its ultimate objective must be that the people of South Viet-Nam be free to work out their own system without external interference.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Bitter Heritage* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967), p. 10.

[2] William Reitzel, Morton A. Kaplan, and Constance G. Goblenz, United States Foreign Policy, 1945–1955 (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1956), pp. 176–177.

[3] John Norton Moore, "The Lawfulness of Military Assistance to the Republic of Viet-Nam." In *American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (January 1967), pp. 1–34.

[4] Statement by the Under Secretary of State, Walter Bedell Smith, at the concluding Plenary Session of the Geneva Conference, July 21, 1954; Department of State *Bulletin*, August 2, 1954, pp. 162–163.

[5] Letter from President Kennedy to President Diem, December 14, 1961; Department of State *Bulletin*, January 1, 1962, pp. 13–14.

[6] A report of "The Expansion of the Party" and other matters by the Party Central Com-

mittee in 1948; "Remarks on the Official Appearance of the Vietnamese Workers' Party," dated November 1951; "Report on the Work of Edification of the Party During the July/September Quarter of 1949." "Principles and Organizational Structure of the Committee for Zones Occupied by the Enemy"; March 12, 1949; "Resume of Decisions Taken by the Permanent Central Committee of the Party Regarding the Organization of the Party in the Army"; Instructions dated August 13, 1949 to the Nambo Regional Committee. (Items 1–6)

[7] "Decision to Create the Central Office for South Viet-Nam"; a *Lao Dong* Party document dated June 7, 1951. (Item 211)

[8] See a 1961 intelligence summary, compiled during the Indo-China War describing Le Duan's and Tho's positions. (Item 11)

[9] Report of the interrogation of Tran Ba Buu after his capture in 1956. (Item 12) Intelligence summary from ralliers, cadres, infiltrated agents and captured documents; deals particularly with Nambo Region (southwestern provinces). (Item 210)

[10] *Fourth Interim Report of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Viet-Nam* (April 11, 1955 to August 10, 1955) (London: HMSO, 1955, 30, Appendix IV) *C.f.*, B.S.N. Murti, *Viet-Nam Divided* (New York: Asia Publishing House, 1964), pp. 88–91; Bernard B. Fall, *The Two Viet-Nams* (New York: Praeger. Revised Edition, 1964), pp. 153–154, 358, uses the figure 860,000 from North to South; Fall *Viet-Nam Witness* (New York: Praeger, 1966), p. 76. For estimates on movements from South to North, see Murti, *op. cit.*, p. 224; R. P. Stebbins and the Research Staff of the Council on Foreign Relations, *The United States in World Affairs*, 1954 (New York: Harper and Bros., 1956), p. 285, (quoted in Kahin and Lewis), *United State in Viet-Nam* (New York: Dial Press, 1967), p. 75; both the latter cite figures in excess of 100,000. The Viet Minh claim 140,000; e.g., Wilfred G. Burchett, *Viet-Nam, Inside Story of the Guerrilla War* (New York: International Publishers, 1965), p. 128. The 1965 White Paper gives the figure 90,000; U.S. Department of State, *Aggression from the North* (Department of State publication 7839, February 1965), p. 11.

[11] Ho Chi Minh, "Appeal made after the successful conclusion of the Geneva Agreements" (July 22, 1954). *Ho Chi Minh on Revolution*, Bernard B. Fall, ed., (New York: Praeger, 1967) p. 272: "North, Central and South Viet-Nam are territories of ours. Our country will certainly be unified. Our entire people will surely be liberated." Also, Department of State, Intelligence Brief, August 5, 1954 (Item A)

[12] Interrogation of Le Van Thanh, Viet Cong signal platoon leader, in which five divisions were described that were composed of South Vietnamese were regrouped in the North following the 1954 Geneva Accords. (Item 84)

[13] U.S. Army Attache situation report. Saigon, July 1956. (Item 25)

[14] Interrogation of a man who handled Viet Cong agents at the time of his capture in 1954; 1958 South Vietnamese counterespionage report: Memorandum to All Provincial Committees from Eastern Interzone Committee, Lao Dong Party, obtained November 29, 1964; Intelligence report of November 1955. (Items 27, 28, 29, 205)

[15] South Vietnamese counter-espionage report of 1958 giving details of DRV intelligence activities; and Intelligence report of November 1955, noting the arrival of 50 experienced regroupees in South Viet-Nam in October 1965. (Items 28 and 205)

[16] Interrogation of Viet Minh cadre who deserted in 1956; document taken from a political officer with Communist forces in South Viet-Nam on November 27, 1956; description by a North Vietnamese of the Van Tien Dung Pham Van Bach missions; summary of intelligence reports concerning Van Tien Dung and the Hoa Hao. (Items 16, 19, 21, 22)

[17] *The CRIMP Document;* also a Viet Minh policy paper on strategy issued by the Central Committee on the Lao Long Party to the Nam Bo Interzone, obtained in November 1954. (Item 200)

[18] Interrogation of Viet Minh cadre who surrendered in March, 1966, in which Le Duan's disgust with DRV policy toward the ICC and his eagerness to invade South Viet-Nam are described; see also a document taken from a political officer of communist forces in South Viet-Nam on November 27, 1956, in which Le Duan is reported to feel the time for a military struggle has come; see also a document issued by the Lao Dong Party Central Committee for guidance of cadres, probably dated late Spring 1956. (Items 18, 19, 204)

[19] A somewhat more detailed discussion of the election problem, including the contemporary comments of Senator John F. Kennedy and Professor Hans Morgenthau, will be found in "The Path to Vietnam," by William P. Bundy, published by the Department of State in the Fall of 1967. (Item L)

[20] Robert Seigliano, *South Viet-Nam: Nation Under Stress* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964), p. 138; Bernard B. Fall, *Viet-Nam Witness* (New York: Praeger, 1966), pp. 185–188. Denis Warner, *The Last Confucian* (New York: Macmillan, 1963), p. 154ff.

[21] The CRIMP Document.

[22] *Ibid.*

[23] Intelligence report, March 1, 1956; intelligence report, June 15, 1956: Radio Hanoi broadcasts of September 3, 1957 and October 19 and 30, 1957, describing Le Duan's activities, (Items B–F).

[24] Interrogation of a Montagnard in Quang Tri Province, who turned out to be a Viet Cong agent and infiltrated into South Viet-Nam in October 1961 (Item 70).

[25] *The CRIMP Document;* see also Party Communique, May 13, 1959 and Comments on Party Communique, May 14. (Items J and K).

[26] See Table IV.

[27] Interrogation of member of North Vietnamese border-crossing supply team. (Item 71).

[28] Interrogation of two members of 603rd Battalion. (Item 72).

[29] Interrogation of a Senior Sergeant Viet Cong, 5th Military Region, captured in Quang Ngai. (Item 73).

[30] Interrogation reports of Viet Cong agents dispatched by maritime infiltration unit of Hanoi's Directorage captured in July, 1961; Intelligence summary based on interrogation of numerous Viet Cong agents captured in June and July, 1961. (Items 75 and 76).

[31] Interrogation of Viet Cong communications cadre. (Item 78).

[32] Interrogation of Viet Cong infiltrated into South Viet-Nam in 1962. (Item. 79).

[33] Interrogatiton of former North Vietnamese Army officers who surrendered in 1963; interrogation of former North Vietnamese Army officer who surrendered in 1963; interrogation of an officer of 1st Viet Cong Regiment, who turned himself in in April 1963. (Items 80, 81, 83).

[34] See Table I for infiltration data since 1959; Table II for growth of Main Force strength.

[35] Summary of 19 interrogations of Vietnamese officers and senior noncommissioned officers who infiltered into South Viet-Nam during the period 1959–1963; also interrogation of former North Vietnamese Army officers who surrendered in 1963. (Items G and 80).

[36] Based on a technical analysis done at the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, in November, 1965.

[37] Resolution of the Third National Congress of the *Lao Dong* Party. September 10, 1960. (Item H) It is sometimes alleged that the NFL had already been formed as early as March of 1960, in the southern tip of South Viet-Nam. However, if this had been so, it would surely have been enormously to the advantage of Hanoi to endorse the existence of a truly southern organization. Instead the Resolution of September 1960 clearly speaks of *future* creation of an NLF, and the January 1961 announcement in Hanoi clearly states that such an organization was established, *in Hanoi*, in December of 1960. The allegation that there was any pr-existing NLF, formed in the South, has no evidence other than obviously self-serving later statements of NLF spokesmen abroad and must, on any fair reading of the evidence, be dismissed as a myth.

[38] Interrogation of cadre from Western Region Committee, captured in 1963; document turned in by a Viet Cong deserter who subsequently lead GVN forces to a buried cache of Communist documents on training and propaganda. (Items 40 and 41)

[39] Interrogation of Le Xuan Chuyen, former operations officer of the Viet Cong 5th Division, deserted in August, 1966; background information on Le Xuan Chuyen. (Items 56 and 110)

[40] Training bulletin, written in 1962 and captured in November, 1963. (Item 38)

[41] "Regulations for the Party Committee System in the South Viet-Nam Liberation Army", a party document captured by the U.S. 173rd Airborne Brigade in March 1966. (Item 54).

[42] Instructions from the Provincial Committee of the *Lao Dong* Party in Ba Xuyen to the Party's district committees concerning the formation of the new People's Revolutionary Party; dated December 7, 1961. (Item M).

[43] Interrogation of North Vietnamese Army Lt. Col. Le Xuan Chuyen, who defected in August 1966; states that the PRP is the same thing as the LDP and that the PRP directly controls the NLF. (Item 46)

[44] Intelligence summary on *Lao Dong* Central Committee membership in COSVN, from interrogation of a party cadre arrested in 1967 (Item 208)

[45] Interrogation of a Viet Cong officer who defected in the Spring of 1967; interrogation of Le Xuan Chuyen; document captured by U.S. 173rd Airborne in March 1966, entitled "Regulations for the Party Committee System in the South Viet-Nam Liberation Army", cited under Note No. 41; intelligence summary in *Lao Dong* Central Committee membership in COSVN, cited under Note No. 44. (Items 47, 48, 54, 208)

[46] Instructions to cadres, March 23, 1965, captured by the U.S. 503rd Infantry in September 1965. (Item 44)

[47] Directive to Propaganda and Training Section, April, 1966, captured by U.S. 1st Infantry Division in April 1966. (Item 45)

[48] Party document instructing subordinate level party activists that the final phase of the revolutionary war is near, captured by the U.S. 101st Airborne Division in Quang Tin on November 13, 1968. (Item I)

[49] The Talk of General Vinh.

[50] Interrogation of a North Vietnamese officer of a support regiment who was responsible for the transportation of supplies from Cambodia, through Laos, to Route 96. (Items 100 and 101)

[51] Interrogation in 1965 of four North Vietnamese Army soldiers of the 325th NVA Division. (Item 86)

[52] Interrogation of a member of the 32nd Regiment, North Vietnamese Army, captured by South Vietnamese forces in November, 1965 in Pleiku. (Item 91)

[53] See Table III.

[54] See Table II for growth of Main Force strength.

[55] "Letter of Division Party Committee to Youth Members", captured by USMC in Quang Tri in July, 1966. (Item 66)

[56] See Table II for growth of Main Force strength.

[57] See Table V.

[58] Documents to serve as a guide for the cadre. Party members and others in answering questions likely to be asked of them, captured by the U.S. 199th Infantry Brigade in February, 1967; also, document on "Guidance for Handling of Recruits", captured by U.S. 25th Division in February, 1967. (Items 111 and 112).

[59] Interrogation of Viet Cong officer who defected in Spring of 1967 in which Viet Cong command organization in northern province of South Viet-Nam is discussed. (Item 47)

[60] Intelligence report on command relationships between *Lao Dong* Party and COSVN from an intellectual proselyting cadre arrested in Spring of 1967. (Item 207)

[61] Le Duan letter.

[62] *Ibid.*

TABLE 1.—INFILTRATION OF PERSONNEL FROM NORTH VIETNAM, 1959–67 (1ST HALF)

Year	Confirmed [1]	Probable [2]	Possible [3]	Total [4]
1959–60	4,556	26	----------	4,582
1961	4,118	2,177	----------	6,295
1962	5,362	7,495	----------	12,857
1963	4,726	3,180	----------	7,906
1964	9,316	3,108	----------	12,424
1965	23,770	1,910	8,050	33,730
1966	44,300	10,500	30,000	84,800
1967 (1st half)	20,700	5,100	14,100	39,900
Total	116,848	33,496	52,150	202,494

[1] A confirmed unit/group is one which is determined to exist on the basis of accepted direct information from a minimum of 2 prisoners, returnees or captured documents (any combination), in addition to indirect evidence.

[2] A probable infiltration unit/group is one believed to exist on the basis of accepted direct information from 1 captive, returnee or captured document, in addition to indirect evidence.

[3] A possible infiltration unit/group is one which is believed to exist on the basis of indirect evidence, even though no captive returnee or document is available to verify the report or reports directly. This category was not listed separately before 1965.

[4] The total does not represent all infiltration data on hand. Other information is held which, based upon the application of consistent criteria and the professional judgment of analysts, has been evaluated as insufficient to warrant inclusion in one of the above categories.

Note: There is normally a long leadtime between the infiltration of a given unit or group and the collection of sufficient intelligence to confirm the fact and time of the infiltration. In 1967, the infiltration has continued at a very substantial rate, but it will be some months before comparable figures for the year can be compiled.

TABLE II.—EXPANSION OF COMMUNIST MAIN FORCE UNITS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

[End of year]

	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967 [1]
Vietcong battalions [2]	10	[2] 0	26	30	69	91	83	83
Vietcong main force, local force strength [2]	5,500	26,700	33,800	35,000	51,300	64,300	68,000	64,000
North Vietnamese battalions					3	33	63	69
Strength of North Vietnamese Army units						2,000	26,600	46,400	54,000

[1] End of 3d quarter.

[2] These units do not include a substantial number of native North Vietnamese. Guerrilla forces are not included in these figures. It is important to note that these figures for main force units represent only a fraction of the total strength.

TABLE III.—INFILTRATION OF NORTH VIETNAMESE ARMY REGIMENTS INTO SOUTH VIETNAM, SEPTEMBER 1964 TO JUNE 1967

Unit	Infiltration data		Strength	Number of prisoners on which confirmation based	Number of captured documents on which confirmation based	Total number of prisoners taken from beach unit
	Dep NVN	Arr SVN				
95th Regiment	October 1964	December 1964	2,000	7	1	35
32d Regiment	September to October 1964	January to March 1965	1,800	4	4	53
101st Regiment	December 1964	February 1965	2,000	3	2	13
18th Regiment	February 1965	April 1965	2,000	5	2	43
22d Regiment	July 1965	September 1965	2,000	5	1	42
33d Regiment	do	October 1965	2,000	2	0	53
250th Regiment	do	do	1,000	2	2	13
6th Regiment	Unknown	do	1,500	7	1	18
21st Regiment	August 1965	do	2,000	7	3	37
66th Regiment	do	November 1965	1,500	6	1	34
18B Regiment	December 1965	February 1966	2,000	4	1	62
24th Regiment	January 1966	do	2,000	3	0	19
95B Regiment	December 1965	March 1966	2,000	2	1	17
141st Regiment	January 1966	do	1,500	6	1	10
88th Regiment	do	do	2,000	5	0	22
3d Regiment	February 1966	do	1,500	2	1	34
812th Regiment	June 1966	June 1966	1,500	2	0	15
90th Regiment	do	do	1,500	3	0	12
803d Regiment	do	do	1,500	2	0	7
165th Regiment	February 1966	July 1966	2,000	1	3	1
52d Regiment	March 1966	do	1,600	3	1	3
84th Artillery Regiment	do	August 1966	1,200	1	3	1
5th Regiment	Activated in SVN	February 1967	1,800	0	2	0
95C Regiment	August 1966	March 1967	1,550	1	2	1
29th Regiment	Unknown	April 1967	2,200	3	1	6
368B Artillery Regiment	do	May 1967	1,400	2	2	2
174th Regiment	January 1967	June 1967	2,000	2	2	10

TABLE IV.—ASSASSINATIONS AND KIDNAPINGS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

	1958		1959		1960	
	Assassinations	Kidnapings	Assassinations	Kidnapings	Assassinations	Kidnapings
January	10	25	10	17	96	37
February	36	5	11	6	122	72
March	26	43	31	21	----------	----------
April	17	12	13	16	----------	----------
May	13	5	16	22	----------	----------
June	21	15	5	15	----------	----------
July	11	24	16	22	----------	----------
August	7	18	12	11	----------	----------
September	8	24	22	34	----------	----------
October	15	26	29	42	----------	----------
November	8	19	35	[1] 89	----------	----------
December	21	20	33	[1] 48	----------	----------
Total	193	236	233	343	----------	----------

[1] Incomplete.

Source: Saigon Situation Report; January, 1960.

TABLE V.—COMPOSITION OF VIETCONG WEAPONS

[In percent]

	Chinese	Soviet	United States	French	Home-made and other
Vietcong main force:					
1963	13	2	40	39	6
1964	28	4	38	25	5
1965	38	5	35	17	5
1966	51	7	24	13	5
Irregular forces:					
1963	0	0	14	63	23
1964	0	0	24	49	27
1965	1	0	35	37	27
1966	3	0	38	32	27
Total (main force and irregular):					
1963	7	1	28	50	14
1964	15	2	32	36	15
1965	21	3	35	26	15
1966	29	4	30	22	15
1967 (mid)	35	6	26	18	15
North Vietnamese Army:					
1963	0	0	0	0	0
1964	0	0	0	0	0
1965	90	8	0	0	2
1966	80	18	0	0	2
1967 (mid)	80	18	0	0	2

Source: Defense Intelligence Agency report, July 1967.

NLF "Elaboration" of Its Proposals on Vietnam

On September 17, 1970, at the Paris Peace Talks, the NLF spokesman, Madame Binh, offered an "Eight Point Elaboration" of the NLF's earlier "Ten Points" proposals of May 8, 1969. These proposals have been adopted by the so-called "People's Peace Treaty" currently being circulated in the United States.

The following review indicates that far more demands are involved than merely getting a terminal U.S. withdrawal date or the trading of such a date for a "*discussion*" of the issue of prisoner of war releases.

POINT 1

The U.S. is asked to declare that it will withdraw all U.S. and Allied foreign troops from South Vietnam by June 30, 1971. *Discussion* would then begin on "ensuring the safety of withdrawing U.S. and foreign Allied troops and on "the question of releasing captured militarymen."

This proposal, however, is preceded by a series of general demands in Point 1 that the U.S. and Allied foreign troops must unconditionally withdraw all troops, weapons and war materiel; must dismantle all military bases in South Vietnam and must stop the assistance effort under the Vietnamization program.

While subsequently indicating some flexibility on the actual withdrawal deadline, Communist ransom demands—as clearly indicated in Point 1—would include a number of other issues. There is little doubt that any "discussion" following an announced U.S. withdrawal deadline would include the above demands as a precondition for moving on the issues of troop safety, prisoner releases, etc. The Communists have always followed one precondition with another, and they will see no reason to stop doing so as long as we keep doing what they demand.

It should also be noted that far from pledging a general cease-fire in exchange for a terminal U.S. withdrawal date, the NLF proposal indicates that the Communist side will only *discuss* the question of whether Communist forces will or will not fire on withdrawing troops of the U.S. and its foreign Allies. They are notably silent concerning South Vietnamese troops and are also silent concerning any troops not in retrograde motion. In other words, here also they would plan to advance more preconditions.

The kind of "discussions" which would follow a U.S. deadline declaration can perhaps best be judged by the "discussions" which followed the U.S. bombing halt, which was undertaken on the basis of promises by the Communist side and others that peace issues would then be discussed substantively. After the bombing halt was announced, the Communist side increased rather than decreased their demands.

POINT 2

The question of Vietnamese forces in South Vietnam is to be resolved *exclusively* by the Vietnamese parties involved. Thus the U.S., 3rd countries, the U.N., etc. would have no role whatsoever in discussing the issue of North Vietnamese troop presence and North Vietnamese troop withdrawals.

Further, no mention is made of the tens of thousands of North Vietnamese forces in *Laos* and *Cambodia*.

It should be noted that thus far Hanoi has not admitted that it has any soldiers outside of North Vietnam's borders. Hanoi has not even acknowledged its prisoners captured in South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, though 8,000 North Vietnamese prisoners of war are held in Red Cross-inspected camps in South Vietnam.

POINT 3

The negotiation and restoration of a "genuine" peace is said to necessitate an administration without President Thieu, Vice President Ky or Prime Minister Khiem. No reciprocal suggestion is made for removing the leaders of the NLF's Provisional Revolutionary Government (PRG) or for Hanoi's Politburo, though none of those leaders has ever risked the test of competitive elections as have South Vietnam's elected leaders.

Even if the three top Government of Vietnam officials were to be removed as a precondition for negotiations and South Vietnam's constitutional system was thus grossly violated, a further caveat appears in the NLF's call for an administration standing for "peace, independence, neutrality . . . democracy," *as defined by the NLF*.

Thus the issue is not, as some would have it, a question of a few personalities in the Saigon government standing in the way of a peaceful solution, but the disruption of all organized non-Communist forces.

Further, the new administration is said to ensure "democratic liberties" such as the freedoms of speech, press, assembly, belief, etc. and to release political prisoners. But, if Hanoi's definition of "democratic liberties" is as practiced in North Vietnam or in NLF purges in the South, this means nothing other than a rigidly Stalinist police state and mass political murders, with no evidence whatsoever that a new Communist-dominated administration would feel the slightest inclination to tolerate, much less guarantee, such freedoms.

POINT 4

The general election must be "really free and democratic" as *defined by the NLF*. It is to be decided without any international role, verification, etc. It is to reflect the (NLF-defined) popular will for the (NLF-defined) "peace, independence, neutrality, democracy, and national concord."

The NLF will define the meaning of elections held in a "really free and democratic way" and guaranteeing "genuine freedom and equality." The recent example of North Vietnam's elections serves as a model for the likely result of such elections run on a single slate basis and achieving a much trumpeted 99% "mandate."

POINT 5

The provisional coalition government would be composed of (1) PRG elements, (2) Government of Vietnam elements "really" standing for (NLF-defined "peace, independence, neutrality, and democracy." and (3) others defined by the NLF as standing for "pace, independence, neutrality and democracy."

The NLF-dominated provisional coalition government (and no other forces, countries, etc. would "implement" the agreements.

The NLF-dominated provisional coalition government would have a policy of "national concord" and "democratic" freedoms. It would "stabilize" conditions and would "organize general elections to form an official coalition government," legitimizing the provisional takeover. As in North Vietnam's Stalinist regime?

The NLF-dominated "coalition" government would be a "good neighbor" respecting the sovereignty, independence, neutrality and territorial integrity, of Laos and Cambodia. North Vietnam similarly claims to be a "good neighbor" though it has 90,000 troops in Laos and 50,000 troops in Cambodia fighting wars of aggression against those countries.

POINT 6

Vietnam is one, with reunification to be achieved step by step ("peacefully" via the NLF-dominated "coalition") and "without foreign intereference." There is no evidence whatsoever that Hanoi would agree to a truly free expression of the popular will in either North or South Vietnam regarding unification.

POINTS 7 AND 8

It is said that the aforementioned parties will together decide the measures and correctly implement the modalities and provisions agreed upon above for a cease-fire, etc. Thus the present Government of Vietnam, the U.S., the UN, and 3rd countries, etc. will have nothing to say about the modalities and implementation.

Comment on NLF "Elaboration" of Its Proposals on Vietnam

An analysis of elements in the latest Communist position for "peace" in Vietnam indicates that it is an illusion to believe that only some single unilateral act of U.S. renunciation stands between us and peace.

Instead, it can be seen that the Communists are confronting us with a *series* of demands which, though sugar-coated, represents nothing less than a demand for our acquiescence in Hanoi's take-over of South Vietnam.

In the past, the U.S. has been confronted with similar sets of demands. We have acceded, believing that our actions would bring peace.

For example, we agreed to stop the bombing of North Vietnam when we were told this would lead to serious negotiations and to peace. But Hanoi now makes further demands, and refuses even to talk to the South

Vietnamese Government although it had agreed to do so.

Moreover, the North Vietnamese negotiator in Paris, Xuan Thuy, once said that Hanoi would regard a U.S. withdrawal of 100,000 men as "significant" and as a step toward peace. Yet we have withdrawn more than twice that number, and Hanoi now wants all of the rest to leave unilaterally.

We can also recall that the North Vietnamese, as well as many people in this country, told us in the past that if we would begin to pull out of our forces or would agree to deal with the NLF, serious negotiations would begin. But these hopes too have proven false.

Those who have in the past urged us to take certain steps in order to bring peace should recall what they asked of the U.S. Government and what they promised would then result. They should recall that nothing happened, although the U.S. did what they suggested. And they should re-read the Communist negotiating position and realize that the Communists would react in the same totally negative way to the next U.S. concession which they are now proposing. Yet at that point it may well be too late for us to regain any credibility of initiative at all. We would be committed to the unilateral, total and unconditional withdrawal which they now demand, we will have no negotiating leverage left, and we will have betrayed our principles.

NLF "ELABORATION" OF ITS PROPOSALS, 84TH PARIS MEETING, SEPT. 17, 1970, STATEMENT BY MADAME BINH, BROADCAST BY HANOI RADIO IN ENGLISH, SEPT. 18, 1970

Initiatives To Make The Paris Conference Progress

To respond to the deep desire for peace of broad sectors of the people in South Viet Nam, in the United States and in the world, on the instructions of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam, I would like to further elaborate on a number of points in the 10-point overall solution as follows:

(1) The U.S. Government must put an end to its war of aggression in Viet Nam, stop the policy of "Vietnamization" of the war, totally withdraw from South Viet Nam troops, military personnel, weapons, and war materials of the United States as well as troops, military personnel, weapons, and war materials of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp, without posing any condition whatsoever, and dismantle all U.S. military bases in South Viet Nam.

In case the U.S. Government declares it will withdraw from South Vietnam all its troops and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp by June 30, 1971, the People's Liberation Armed Forces will refrain from attacking the withdrawing troops of the United States and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp, and the parties will engage at once in discussions on:

The question of ensuring safety for the total withdrawal from South Viet Nam of U.S. troops and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp.

The question of releasing captured militarymen.

(2) The question of Vietnamese armed forces in South Viet Nam shall be resolved by the Vietnamese parties among themselves.

(3) The warlike and fascist Thieu-Ky-Khiem administration, an instrument of the U.S. policy of aggression, are frantically opposing peace, striving to call for the intensification and expansion of the war, and for the prolongation of the U.S. military occupation of South Viet Nam, and are enriching themselves with the blood of the people. They are serving the U.S. imperialist aggressors who massacre their compatriots and devastate their country. They have stepped up the "pacification" campaigns to terrorize the people and hold them in the vice of their regime, set up a barbarous system of jails of the type of "tiger cages" in Can Dao and established a police regime of the utmost cruelty in South Viet Nam. They carry out ferocious repression against those who stand for peace, independence, neutrality and democracy, regardless of their social stock, political tendencies and religions. They repress even those who are not of their clan. They increase forcible pressganging and endeavor to plunder the property of the South Viet Nam people so as to serve the U.S. policy of "Vietnamization" of the war. The restoration of genuine peace in South Viet Nam necessitates the formation in Saigon of an administration without Thieu, Ky, and Khiem, an administration which stands for peace, independence, neutrality, which improves the people's living conditions, which ensures democratic liberties such as freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, freedom of belief, etc., and releases those who have been jailed for political reasons, and dissolves concentration camps so that the inmates there may return to and live in their native places. The Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam is prepared to enter into talks with such an administration on a political settlement of the South Viet Nam problem so as to put an end to the war and restore peace in Viet Nam.

(4) The South Viet Nam people will decide themselves the political regime of South Viet Nam through really free and democratic general elections, elect a national assembly, work out a constitution of a national and democratic character and set up a government reflecting the entire people's aspirations and will for peace, independence, neutrality, democracy, and national concord.

The general elections must be held in a really free and democratic way. The modalities of the elections must guarantee genuine freedom and equality during the electoral campaigns and vote proceedings to all citizens, irrespective of their political tendencies, including those who are living abroad. No party shall usurp for itself the right to organize general elections and lay down their modalities. The general elections organized by the U.S. puppet administration in Saigon at the bayonets of the U.S. occupying troops cannot be free and democratic.

A provisional government of broad coalition is indispensable for the organization of really free and democratic general elections and also for ensuring the right to self-determination of the South Viet Nam people during the transitory period between the restoration of peace and the holding of general elections.

(5) The provisional coalition government will include three components:

Persons of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet Nam.

Persons of the Saigon administration, really standing for peace, independence, neutrality, and democracy.

Persons of various political and religious forces and tendencies standing for peace, independence, neutrality, and democracy including those who, for political reasons, have to live abroad.

The provisional coalition government will implement the agreements reached by the parties.

The provisional coalition government will carry out a policy of national concord, ensure the democratic freedoms of the people, prohibit all acts of terror, reprisal, and discrimination against those who have collaborated with either side, stabilize and improve the living conditions of the people and organize general elections to form an official coalition government.

The provisional coalition government will pursue a foreign policy of peace and neutrality, practice a policy of good neighborhood with the Kingdom of Laos and the Kingdom of Cambodia, respect the sovereignty, independence, neutrality, and territorial integrity of these two countries. It will establish diplomatic relations with all countries regardless of their political regime, including the United States, in accordance with the five principles of peaceful coexistence.

(6) Viet Nam is one, the Vietnamese people is one. The reunification of Viet Nam will be achieved step by step, by peaceful means, on the basis of discussions and agreements between the two zones, without coercion or annexion from either side, without foreign interference. The time for reunification as well as all questions relating to the reunification will be discussed and agreed upon by both zones. Pending the peaceful reunification of the country, the two zones will reestablish normal relations in all fields on the basis of equality and mutual respect, and will respect each other's political regime, international and external policies.

(7) The parties will decide together measures aimed at ensuring the respect and the correct implementation of the provisions agreed upon.

(8) After the agreement on and signing of accords aimed at putting an end to the war and restoring peace in Viet Nam, the parties will implement the modalities that will have been laid down for a cease-fire in South Viet Nam.

ANY RISK HERE?

(By William H. Stringer)

A Harris opinion poll finds people deciding, 58 to 29 percent, that it is "morally wrong" to be fighting in Vietnam. Does this impressive sentiment mean that the United States should get out of Vietnam fast—set a total withdrawal date now for, say, October 1, or the end of 1971? Perhaps it does. But to assist the decision shouldn't there be a careful consideration of all that we can discover about the Vietnam problem: Hanoi's mood, Saigon's regime, Vietnamization, reaction of other Asian states to an American pullout, prospects of a bloodbath, and such like? So that we know what the United States is or is not risking.

I find it incredible that almost no one advocating a quick pullout is discussing anything about possible consequences. The "six-pack" of Democratic presidential hopefuls say nothing about such weighty matters. The prestigious professors who lend their names to full-page "we demand" advertisements say nothing about future policy. The Washington marches discuss nothing of the global impact. Even the hawks say very little. A great and responsible nation, it would seem, sees the war as so terrible that it can think of nothing but how to get out of there fast.

Of course there are some unstated assumptions. One is that the Thieu-Ky government is, or must be, utterly corrupt, worse than the Communists. Another is that the Americans are, or must be, bombing villages almost daily and creating refugees by the hundreds of thousands. But that is about as far as the conventional folklore goes. To put the best possible face on it, it's as though we decided that if we make the quick pullout, everything else will fall into place. Or that, if it doesn't, we shouldn't have been there in the first place, so it's no longer our responsibility.

Now it happens that there are some who do ponder the whole policy and picture of America and Vietnam—people in the White House, and in Henry Kissinger's office, and so forth. And they have views. Which may be wrong, or wishful thinking, or slick conclusioning. But let's just consider their views, so as to see all sides of the picture.

For one thing, they believe that setting an early definite date for total American troop withdrawal is the same as announcing that Vietnamization is to be abandoned. The immediate result, they say, would be to advise

all committed South Vietnamese to make whatever accommodations they can—to quit, develop a low profile, scuttle, attack Americans, or flee to Switzerland. This of course would end the prospect of leaving behind a viable Saigon regime or an effective army. It would negate the successful rural elections of recent years, and the parliamentary elections that were honest enough so that Buddhists got elected.

Again, if we ask whether there may be an eventual bloodbath, perpetrated by the North Vietnamese, these spokesmen point, not to the massacre at Hue as a warning, but to the killings of years ago in North Vietnam, which drove a million refugees southward. Can we be sure that Hanoi will abandon a Communist-tested formula for consolidation of power?

Impact on neighboring states? Consider Japan, the most important. Suppose Tokyo sees China and Russia as dominant in Asia, the American gone resolutely home. Will Tokyo wish to maintain its alliance with the United States? Will it continue to forgo nuclear weapons? For how long?

Recriminations back in the United States? No, not right away. But think of the possibilities for exploitation, if Saigon is ruled from Hanoi and executions do occur, or if Japan rejects the American tie-up. And if some politicians charge that scuttle-and-run let this happen, after a sacrifice of 45,000 of our young men.

These are a few "possibilities on the other side." None of the dire predictions may materialize. Southeast Asia may enter a period of development under the "benign" dictatorship of Hanoi. Hanoi might even accept a coalition regime in Saigon, though the Polish history after World War II advises otherwise. But do let us consider, let us ponder, let us be alert, to the various possible outcomes.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I have come before you more than once to relate my concerns with the Selective Service System and its effects on our young men. Though you may not have agreed with me in the past, today I speak to a problem that each of us ought to examine carefully, because it seriously affects the quality of a conscripted Armed Forces.

The Selective Service System has outlined very specific physical standards that each registrant must pass before he is inducted into the armed services. Presently, each registrant is examined at a preinduction physical, and on the day of induction. Based upon these examinations, many young men are physically disqualified for service. I would like to believe that each and every physical is thorough and complete. Yet each day, I find a number of requests for help from constituents who have been dissatisfied with the quality and/or the findings of their physicals. And, in too many of these cases, they are able to document very serious omissions during the physicals.

For security's sake, only those men physically qualified for service ought to be inducted. Yet, the Government Accounting Office estimates that for the years 1968, 1969, and 1970 the Armed Forces accepted an average of 20,000 men who should have been rejected for physical defects. Despite improvements in the process, the military spent $17.9 million in fiscal 1969 for the pay, uniforms, and travel of soldiers who were discharged because of preservice defects.

How can so many, often with obvious disabilities, slip past civilian and Army doctors. As one Army doctor explains—

> Documentation is the name of the game. Without documentation a guy just would not get out, and with it he probably will.

If the key is prior documentation, as most sources indicate, then how does one get documentation? Well one pays for it. A family that can afford proper medical care, can provide their offspring with complete medical histories dating back to birth.

College students take advantage of college health facilities, and sympathetic university personnel. But for a large number of young men, the lower middle class, the poor, the black, there is no such medical luxury. Many of these do not understand nor can they play the documentation game. If they are fortunate they have found their way to local clinics with their physical problems. But such visits are unlikely, given the condition of local and poverty health care.

And to obtain medical records from a clinic often takes several weeks and a records fee and then under no circumstances will the clinic deliver the records directly into the registrants hands. Remember too, that a person under 21 cannot even permit the release of his own medical records.

For the black community there are additional burdens. In southern black communities the asthma rate is over 50 percent, but without documentation most of these men will pass the physical.

For sickle cell anemia, an ailment peculiar to the black community, the Army provides no detection lab test at all. Psychiatric consultation is unheard of. As Dr. Tarr himself has said—

> The rising tide of medical deferments is a cause of serious concern because it is one of the real inequities left in the system.

It is a system judged inadequate by consensus. One would think any step taken to change procedures would be an improvement.

Nevertheless the Selective Service System has advanced a new set of administrative procedures that are regressive. They deny young men one of the few chances they had left to correct the results of an erroneous preinduction physical. Formerly when a young man believed that some mistake had been made during his physical he could write to his Congressman. He could write to the Selective Service System and to the Surgeon General as well, but usually these letters brought little action.

The Congressman in turn would ask the Surgeon General for a complete medical review. This could go on right up to the induction.

Although not ideal, at least my constituents received a fair review of their cases. Sometimes even consultations with specialists were arranged for those who could not afford to go to their own. Though not perfect, at least a minimal attempt was made to provide an adequate medical examination prior to induction.

On May 28, 1971, I received a memo from Dr. Tarr outlining a new system called registrant medical reevaluation and review system to be implemented. It both concerned and angered me. Instead of being an improvement, it is merely a vehicle for avoiding the whole issue of medical reevaluation. Under the new system the State director will make the first judgment on medical evidence submitted by a registrant. To my knowledge Colonel Hayes, the Maryland State director is not a doctor.

In fact he has often told me that since neither of us is a physician we ought to allow the Army doctors to make medical decisions. Now he will make the first medical decision. Only if he agrees, will new evidence be passed on to the Armed Forces entry and evaluation station doctor. This could be the same doctor who made the initial examination. Now he is asked to correct himself. Even if these two men concur that an error has been made, the final decision still has to be made by the U.S. Army Recruiting Command. And no action will be taken after an induction notice has been issued, even if an error has occurred.

It is very clear to me that this new system does nothing to insure that young men will get a better medical examination. It simply assures that any physical defect overlooked initially, will continue to be overlooked. And a man's ability to serve his country may be affected. I call on Dr. Tarr to make immediate improvements in the entire medical evaluation process. I hope that my colleagues in the House will do likewise.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of New York. I want to compliment the gentleman on his remarks. It would seem to me that it would be a not too difficult task for the Selective Service System to set up a system that would guarantee to each registrant a fair physical examination before he was inducted.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank the gentleman. I simply want to deal briefly with the matter of sickle cell anemia that I mentioned earlier. This body took action very recently in an effort to deal with sickle cell anemia.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation.

The United States leads the world in dentistry where 120,000 were registered as members of the American Dental Association in 1969.

HONOR AMERICA DAY RESOLUTION—1971

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MCCOLLISTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my good friend and colleague BILL SCHERLE introduced a resolution to recognize the significance of the upcoming Fourth of July Honor American Day celebrations. I feel strongly that the importance of this day cannot be underplayed and would at this time endorse the resolution offered by the gentleman from Iowa yesterday.

The Fourth of July is one of the important holidays we celebrate. Just as we honor those close to us on their birthdays, our mothers on Mother's Day and so on, we should not neglect paying tribute to America on her birthday. Honor America Day—the Fourth of July—is a great opportunity to join together in the unity that has made our Nation what it is today and to show our appreciation for the blessings we realize.

The fact that our celebration this year falls on a Sunday lends added significance to the day. Reverence and total faith in an idea—such as the religious beliefs that have laid a foundation for the Nation's development—are a part of our heritage we should not overlook.

Mr. Speaker, I, like my colleagues, I am sure, look forward greatly to the Honor America Day celebrations I will have the opportunity to take part in this weekend. I urge my colleagues to work for the unity that can be realized on this Fourth of July through the expression of appreciation for the blessings that are ours.

I am joined by the following Members of the House in our enthusiastic endorsement of House Concurrent Resolution 354: BURKE of Massachusetts, THONE, ASHBROOK, DENNIS, WHALLEY, JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, WHITEHURST, CAMP, PRICE of Texas, MATHIAS of California, WINN, SEBELIUS, HASTINGS, PIRNIE, ZWACH, BETTS, SHRIVER, SKUBITZ, VEYSEY, MILLER of Ohio, WARE, SANDMAN, COLLINS of Texas, and WYLIE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to insert at this point a copy of the text of the Honor America Day resolution.

Whereas the Congress wishes to lend support to the rekindling of the American spirit of patriotism and respect for the individual liberties that made America great; and

Whereas the Congress wishes to underscore the fact that though Americans face problems as individuals and as a nation they are proud of their country and welcome the opportunity to honor America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress recognizes the importance of the July 4, 1971, Honor America Day celebrations and calls upon the people of the United States to observe such celebrations with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AN AMENDMENT TO REQUIRE FEDERAL CONTRACTORS TO OBSERVE PRACTICES WHICH WILL PRESERVE AND ENHANCE THE ENVIRONMENT AND FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Environmental Policy Act of 1969—Public Law 91-190—so as to require Federal contractors to be in compliance with Federal, State, and local laws, ordinances, rules, or regulations regarding water or air pollution and other environmental matters.

The Environmental Policy Act declared that:

It is the continuing policy of the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments, to use all practical means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans.

I believe that it is within this broad mandate to require that the Federal Government conduct its procurement and other contractual business—accounting for approximately 10 percent of the GNP—in a manner protective of our environment.

The bill requires that persons or corporations submitting bids for Federal contracts in an amount that exceeds $10,000 in any fiscal year affirm that at the date of submission they are not in violation of any applicable Federal, State, or local law regarding the air, water, or other form of pollution. If it is later determined by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency that the contractor was not in compliance at the date of submission, the contract shall be terminated effective the date of the Administrator's determination.

Once a contractor receives a contract and is in the process of performance, the amendment requires that he remain in compliance with Federal, State, and local pollution laws. If the Administrator determines that the contractor has fallen out of compliance with its contractual obligations pursuant to the amendment, the contractor will be regarded as having breached the contract at that point. At such time, no further payment will be made by the Government.

Finally, the bill provides that contractors who violate their obligations under the Environmental Policy Act as amended would be barred from further Federal contracts for a 3-year period or until the Administrator certifies that the contractor has provided satisfactory assurances against further disregard of such obligations.

It is important to note that the bill provides for full administrative and judicial review of the Administrator's determinations.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government enforces basic policy decisions in its contractual business everyday. Federal contractors must now pay federally established minimum wages, not discriminate in hiring, and must provide a safe working place for their employees. The bill I am introducing today can insure that the Federal Government does not indirectly violate its own environmental standards or become a participant in the violation of State and local laws designed to protect our environment.

PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAY BILL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SEBELIUS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my colleagues Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. THONE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. POAGE, and Mr. KAZEN, Jr., I am introducing legislation to designate certain highways extending from Laredo, Tex., to the point where U.S. Highway 81 crosses the border between North Dakota and Canada as the Pan American Highway.

The roadways which would comprise the Pan American Highway already span the United States from Canada to the Mexican border, largely along the route of U.S. Highway 81.

This bill is unique. It does not require expenditure of Federal funds but would improve inter-American good will, hemispheric relations, and understanding and cooperation between all people of the Western Hemisphere.

The Pan American Highway route, when completed, will reach from the southern tip of South America through Central America, Mexico, the United States, and Canada to Alaska. This ribbon of highway can represent communication and understanding between these sister states of the Americas and their diverse and great peoples.

In addition to its diplomatic importance, this route carries more traffic than any other north-south route across the Nation. Official sanction and further development of this 14,000-mile system will enhance commerce and economic development throughout the Great Plains, particularly in our rural and smalltown areas.

In view of the rural migration and problems relating to overpopulation in our cities, further development of this route promises new economic opportunity for rural and smalltown America, so necessary to achieve a better distribution of our population and improved conditions throughout our Nation.

Since completion of the southern link is imminent, I think it is appropriate that Congress endorse this effort and recognize the Pan American Highway as a symbol of unity in the Western Hemisphere. This fact, coupled with the economic benefits for the Great Plains, certainly justifies prompt consideration of this proposal.

BUSING CRISIS IN WINSTON-SALEM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MIZELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, the city of Winston-Salem, N.C., and Forsyth County, which encompasses the city, are bracing now for a crisis this fall that will place a severe strain on the fiscal integrity of those local governments, on the public education system in that area, and, not least, on thousands of school-age children.

The crisis is a court-ordered imple-

mentation of massive forced busing and student redistribution to overcome racial imbalance in the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County schools.

The plan, as submitted by the city-county school board Tuesday to the U.S. district court, requires the busing of 15,821 more students than were bused in the school term just ended. This massive busing would require 157 new buses if staggered hours for the beginning of school were instituted, and 314 new buses if a uniform beginning hour is adopted.

In addition, the plan calls for an extraordinarily complex system of pupil assignment, including the institution of a rather bizarre school grade arrangement creating "lower elementary schools," incorporating grades 1–4, "upper elementary schools," grades 5–6, junior high, grades 7–8, "lower high school," grades 9–10, and "upper high school," grades 11–12.

The problem of student redistribution is so massive, according to the local school superintendent, that the school board has given serious consideration to using railroads to get some children to school.

That is right; railroads.

Planners now estimate the plan, if approved, would cost an additional $2 million a year, and require the imposition of a 1-cent addition to the local sales tax.

And even with all of this upheaval, there is no guarantee that this plan will meet with the approval of the court to which it has been submitted.

Mr. Speaker, surely we can see the folly in all of this—students being bused, or railroaded, several miles from their homes each day; having to go to as many as five different schools in their primary-secondary education career; imposing an increased sales tax on the people most adversely affected by such a tax and saying it is for their good; buying as many as 314 more school buses, or perhaps a combination of buses and boxcars.

The logic in all of this escapes me and several thousand more people in the Winston-Salem area.

It is significant to note that many of the people who share my view of this situation are black. News reports from recent days indicated that there is widespread dissatisfaction among the black community, as well as the white community, with the prospect of young children being transported many miles to achieve an "acceptable" degree of racial balance.

It seems infinitely more logical to us to upgrade the quality of public education by using these busing funds for better school facilities and equipment, and higher teaching salaries to attract and keep well-qualified instructors.

It is for this reason that I have introduced a constitutional amendment providing that no public school student shall be assigned to, or required to attend, a particular school on the basis of race, color, creed, or national origin. And it is for the same reason that I continue to call for hearings on this resolution.

To fully explain the situation as it exists in Winston-Salem now, I am inserting into the RECORD at this time two articles, appearing in the Winston-Salem Journal of Wednesday, June 30, 1971, which outline the really incredible provisions the school board has been forced to recommend in order to placate the Federal court.

As my colleagues read these articles, which I am sure will prove interesting and instructive, I ask that they think seriously about the possibility of this situation spreading to their own constituencies, and join with me in a vigorous effort to see this crisis alleviated.

The articles follow:

SCHOOL PLAN SUBMITTED; MEANS MAJOR CHANGES—REQUIRES BUSING 15,000 STUDENTS

(By Tom Dillon)

A new desegregation plan adopted by the school board here means major changes, both sociological and practical, for almost all schools in the city-county school system.

The plan, finally submitted to the U.S. District Court yesterday, creates as nearly as possible a racial balance in all schools, administrators say. Marvin Ward, school superintendent, said the ratio of black students to white will be from 18 to 36 per cent in each school.

He said the plan, approved by the school board at a closed meeting Saturday night, will cause major financial problems. Not all of them have been solved yet, he said, and solutions for some will be difficult.

He declined, in answer to questions, to call the plan "educationally unsound." He said this will have to be determined with time.

Ward said Judge Eugene A. Gordon of the U.S. District Court will hold a hearing on the plan by July 9, possibly as early as July 7, to determine whether to implement it.

The plan basically divides the present 6–3–3 school arrangement (elementary, junior high and senior high) into a 4–2–2–2–2 arrangement (lower elementary, upper elementary, junior high, lower high school and high school).

Ward explained the plan yesterday afternoon at a press conference at the WSJS television studios. It was also presented yesterday to the school principals.

The version given to the court says the plan is a "good faith effort" to comply with a June 22 court order saying there can be no less desegregation here than was ordered in Charlotte.

At the same time, however, it says the plan is "not sound or desirable, and should not be required. The residential patterns here make racial balance impossible without massive, expensive busing," the plan says.

MORE BUSES NEEDED

Ward said the plan will require 157 more school buses if school opening hours are staggered. If they are not staggered, he said, 314 buses will be needed. In all, 16,821 more students will need bus transportation than last year.

The problem is so massive, he said, that the school board has even discussed using railroads to get some children to school.

One school official said there are a number of railroad lines near schools which will require much transportation for students. He said this has been considered a way to keep school buses off expressways at peak hours.

MIGHT DISCUSS

Ward, asked about the proposal yesterday, replied: "I think we might discuss it with the railroad companies to see if there are any possibilities."

He said the state has something like 350 excess school buses, but the schools may not be able to get more than 100 of them. The alternative is leasing buses from Safe or Piedmont Bus companies, he said.

Ward took exception yesterday to complaints that the plan puts the burden on numbers of students going into the center city and coming out," he said. "An equal number of blacks and whites will be bused."

MINIMUM BUSING

He contended that the plan is more equitable and fair than one proposed by the plaintiffs in the local desegregation suit, and said it will cause the minimum amount of busing necessary to integrate all schools.

Among other things, he said, the schools are planning considerable expansion of human relations programs. "We're not far enough along to give details," he said, "but efforts will be continued and expanded."

He noted problems getting sales tax revenue for the schools, something that may be needed to finance the plan. But he said the schools may receive money from the Nixon Administration's Emergency School Assistance Program.

This program has put aside $1.5 billion to help Southern school districts undergoing desegregation. Schools here got $250,000 from it last year.

The plan itself calls for five 11th- and 12th-grade high schools—Reynolds, Parkland, West, East and North. Two high schools, Mount Tabor and Atkins, will revert to ninth- and 10th-grade "lower high schools."

One school, Fourteenth Street, will operate as an early childhood education center, and another, Moore, will operate as a laboratory school. Classes for talented and retarded students will continue to operate where they are, but classes for emotionally disturbed students will move to Ardmore.

ARDMORE PROGRAM

The extended year program at Ardmore will be closed out. A school official said yesterday that parents of students in it have been encouraged to apply to Moore.

Officials are considering moving a kindergarten program now at North Elementary, the Model Cities "model school," to another area. But present planning is for the model school program to operate with only grades five and six.

School sources said yesterday there had been criticism that Atkins, the city's major black high school, would be demoted. But they said the decision of where to put the five senior high programs was based solely on which had the best facilities.

SCHOOL BOARD FINDS ITS PLAN DISTASTEFUL

The city-county school board made it clear yesterday that it does not like its new desegregation plan.

In a resolution accompanying the plan submitted to U.S. Middle District Court, the board said:

". . . The Board feels compelled to advise the court that even though this is the least expensive, least disruptive, least burdensome and most equitable plan the board has been able to devise and still accomplish the required objective of achieving a racial balance in the public schools of Forsyth County which will be acceptable to the court, it is not a sound or desirable plan, and should not be required, because the residential pattern of Forsyth County makes the accomplishment of such objective impossible without massive, expensive busing which imposes an otherwise unnecessary financial burden on the public and a tremendous burden of inconvenience and time consumption on pupils and parents and traffic hazard on pupils."

The board said it does not know whether it will be able to provide the necessary transportation because it has neither the buses nor the money to do so.

The resolution said the board is still trying to get the county commissioners to come up with $1.3 million which the county manager has recommended be cut from the proposed school budget.

The board said the money is "desperately needed" to provide a satisfactory educational program.

At a press conference at which the plan was announced yesterday, Marvin Ward, the

school superintendent, was asked if this attitude of "we will if we have to" is healthy.

Ward bristled and said he wouldn't answer the question because the school board had made its decision and expressed its opinion.

He said the board and the school staff are working on a human relations program to ease racial tensions which might arise because of increased desegregation.

In its resolution the board said it had acted in good faith to satisfy court orders on school desegregation.

CANNIKAN—A POTENTIAL BABY KILLER?

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article from the June 30 edition of the Washington Daily News concerning the discovery of a possible link between the recent rise in the infant mortality rate in the United States and underground nuclear testing.

Dr. Ernest Sternglass, professor of radiology at Pittsburgh University, revealed on Tuesday that radiation leaked from an underground nuclear test in Nevada last year contributed to the deaths of hundreds of newborn infants in 13 nearby States. Apparently, the radiation reduced the infants' ability to resist disease and resulted in deaths initially attributed to respiratory infection, influenza, and pneumonia.

There was "absolutely an epidemic of infant mortality where the fallout descended," Dr. Sternglass pointed out. He also predicted that "the worst is yet to come."

Mr. Speaker, before the AEC proceeds with its underground nuclear test program, we should fully explore this question of a link between the tests and the infant mortality rate. In particular, we should answer this question before the AEC conducts its planned 5-megaton test at Amchitka Island next fall.

The proposed test, called "Cannikan," will be the largest ever conducted by the United States. Reportedly, the $190,000,000 test program at Amchitka is in support of the development of the Spartan antiballistic missile—a weapon that may even now be obsolete.

Project Cannikan is veritably loaded with unanswered questions. Of particular concern to seismologists and scientists is the possibility that the test may trigger a disastrous earthquake or tsunami. The AEC itself admits that it is not possible to predict the probability of this result with certainty.

In a recent report on Cannikan, the AEC revealed that a pocket of radioactive material will remain frozen in subterranean rocks at the blast site for an indefinite period of time. What effect will this pocket of radioactivity have on the future use of Amchitka—now part of a wildlife refuge? Will some of the radioactive material eventually escape into the island's groundwaters, creating a hazard for both humans and animals, born and yet unborn?

Will Cannikan jeopardize our chances of reaching any agreement with the Soviet Union and other nations on the limitation of strategic nuclear weapons such as the antiballistic missile system?

All of these questions should be fully considered by the administration before proceeding with Cannikan.

The article from the Washington Daily News follows:

BABIES' DEATHS BLAMED ON RADIATION

Radiation leaked from an underground nuclear test in Nevada last December, contributed to the deaths of hundreds of newborn infants in 13 states, a professor of radiology has concluded.

Dr. Ernest Sternglass said yesterday the radiation reduced the infants' ability to resist disease and resulted in deaths attributed mainly to respiratory infection, influenza and pneumonia.

LOCAL RAINFALL

"It is absolutely an epidemic of infant mortality where the fallout descended," Dr. Sternglass, of the University of Pittsburgh, told a news conference here.

He said the degree to which a state was affected depended on its distance from the test site and local rainfall. Radiation traceable to the Dec. 17 accident was found in Nevada, Montana, Wyoming, Arizona, California, Oregon, North Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Idaho, Kansas and Nebraska.

Dr. Sternglass said he based his conclusions, and a prediction that "the worst is yet to come," on previous studies linking infant mortality with nuclear testing, and on the latest Bureau of Statistic figures.

These showed that infant deaths in Idaho for the first quarter of 1970 were 16.5 per 1,000 live births while for the comparable period this year it increased to 23.3. In Montana, infant deaths were 19.2 per 1,000 in 1970 and 24 per 1,000 in 1971.

STRONG ENOUGH

Dr. Sternglass said that infant mortality rates had generally declined since the end of atmospheric nuclear testing early in the 1960s. He called for a halt to underground testing as well.

"We are all strong enough to kill each other 100 times over with nuclear weapons," said Dr. Sternglass. "This underground testing is perfectly useless."

PANAMA CANAL TREATY SITUATION: REPREHENSIBLE JOURNALISM ANTIDOTE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address before this body in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 26, 1971, on "Panama Canal Treaty Situation: Reprehensible Journalism," I quoted a newsstory written in Panama, R.P., by Jeremiah O'Leary, and published in the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., on May 13. In my introductory remarks, I described it as not only "superficial, erroneous, and misleading" but also as "irresponsible, reprehensible, and vicious." For those interested in reading the full text of the O'Leary newsstory from Panama, it was quoted in full in my May 26 address.

As a student and close observer of Isthmian canal history and problems who has consulted citizens of Panama as well as residents of the Canal Zone, I read with pleasure two letters to the editor in the June 26, 1971, issue of the Evening Star by James R. Hendel and R. G. Martin. Accompanying them is an editor's note stating that correspondent O'Leary obtained his information from what he considered responsible United States and Panamanian Government sources and that he stands by the basic premise of his article.

In regard to the editor's statement, there are on the Isthmus many sources in and out of government service that are available to newsmen as well as on the site observation. From the mistakes of facts pointed out in my May 26 address and in the two Henkel-Martin letters as having been made in the O'Leary newsstory, it must be evident that he consulted wholly unreliable sources.

As all Members of the Congress concerned with Panama questions will find the indicated letters informative and helpful, especially in the evaluation of newsstories about the Panama Canal, I quote both as parts of my remarks:

TROUBLE IN PANAMA

SIR: I felt it my obligation to write in response to a recent interpretive report titled "Trouble Brewing in Panama." This particular article disturbed me mainly because my wife and I presently live in Panama, and I serve in the Canal Zone.

I was further disturbed by a news report of this nature appearing in a reputable newspaper charged with the responsibility of giving the American people truthful, factual and complete news coverage. The abovementioned article failed to meet these measures of good news reporting. The readers of The Star suffer because of this kind of misleading, opinionated and one-sided news reporting. The headline, "Trouble Brewing in Panama," is harsh, wild, reckless, irresponsible, and should be retracted by The Star.

Staff writer Jeremiah O'Leary said nothing new or intelligent that gives a basis to any "new trouble" in Panama. Sure, there are irritants between the United States and Panama, as there always have been and probably always will be. This surely can't be a problem particular to relations between the United States and Panama. There must be irritants between all countries which deal together. To give substance to his headline, O'Leary merely stated in the opening paragraph, ". . . anti-American violence is regarded as a distinct possibility by level-headed people of both nationalities here in the narrows of America . . ." On this basis, he built a three-column article to tell us "trouble is brewing in Panama." He never told us who these level-headed people are; it's a weak statement to support such a heavy headline. O'Leary merely went on to list irritants that have existed before and after 1964 and never mentioned the one main irritant that set off the 1964 disturbances, which he relates the present situation to (the Panamanian flag was not flown in the Canal Zone until after and as a result of the 1964 disturbances). The article gave details on irritants between the United States and Panama, and still didn't give support to the headline about brewing trouble. However, at least a complete and truthful account could have been given of these irritants.

FRANCE FIELD STILL USED

O'Leary stated that "France Field, a naval air station on the Atlantic side of the Zone, has not been used by the U.S. since World War II . . ." This is not true. Since April, 1970, I personally have taken off or landed on that air strip on four different occasions. France Field is constantly utilized by Airborne units stationed in the Canal Zone for parachute jumps on the Atlantic side. It is the only paved air strip of any size on the Atlantic side of the Canal Zone. Not only did O'Leary fail here to be truthful and factual, but also he failed to be complete. He failed to mention the U.S.-built air field at Rio Hato, Panama. This particular field is probably the

best in all of Panama and in August of last year the United States handed it over to the Panamanian government (they now use it for car racing; the Panamanian government doesn't own enough planes to fully utilize the Rio Hato air strip).

O'Leary also stated that the Albrook Field is not used by the U.S., which is again untrue. He mentioned it is little more than a private flying club, which I know nothing about. I do know, however, that Albrook Air Force Base is the center of most helicopter operations in the entire Southern Command.

You would have to live here to truly appreciate how utterly astonishing O'Leary's comments about the U.S. maintenance of roads in Panama and the Canal Zone were. Also, let me include his comments about the hiring of Panamanians by the Canal Zone. A stretch of road between Arraijan and La Chorrera in the Republic is mentioned and the failure of the United States to maintain its part which is in the Canal Zone. Anyone can look at a map and see that this is also untrue. The road which links these two cities is totally within the Republic of Panama, not to mention that it is also a link in the Pan-American Highway, which is the best maintained road in all of Central America.

O'Leary failed to talk about the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway. This is the only road link between the Atlantic and Pacific sides of the Canal and of the Republic of Panama. Panamanians have totally free use of this highway, including large heavily-overloaded tractor-trailer trucks and fuel tankers shipping between Colon and Panama City. This heavy cargo and traffic constantly tears this road apart, especially during the rainy season when the water softens the roadbed. This road was built, and to this day is maintained by the U.S. Army Engineers, utilizing Panamanian workers at U.S. wages.

The statement that the Canal Zone shies away from hiring Panamanians because they would have to pay them U.S. minimum wage is also untrue. My wife cannot get a job here for two reasons. First, the Canal Zone will hire Panamanians first. Secondly, she would be required to obtain a working visa by the Panamanian government, costing over $400.

There were some truths in this article because there are irritants. But, this could go on and on and I think I've made my point about this article. If there is trouble brewing in Panama such that a headline of this nature warrants broadcasting it, The Star should have justified it by substantial evidence.

JAMES R. HENKEL.

FT. DAVIS, CANAL ZONE.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. O'Leary wrote from information obtained from what he considered responsible U.S. and Panamanian government sources. He stands by the basic premise of the article and the items listed as irritants.)

* * * * *

SIR: As a long-time resident of Panama and a recent subscriber to your paper, based on your reputation of responsible reporting, I am deeply disturbed at the article on "impasses that pour fuel on what smolders" in Panama. Consider these items:

Unused air bases: The U.S. Army Southern Command uses Albrook AFB for light aircraft and helicopters. The reason it is not used for heavier traffic by the USAF is safety; there is a high school, attended by U.S. and Panamanian citizens, located approximately 600 yards from the end of the runway. France Field is used for emergency landings, aero club activities and military training exercises, and is the only air field at the Caribbean entrance to the canal. (There is no overland route through the Canal Zone other than the Panama Railroad.)

Justice: Panama at this time has no adequate, unbiased court system. Panama is governed by dictatorial edits, and constitutional rights are applied at the whim of the junta.

Taxes: During the Eisenhower administration, the U.S. Government agreed to collect, at our expense, Panamanian income taxes to be submitted annually. If Panama wishes to change this policy, I suggest it be submitted in the next treaty, which is presently being reviewed for approval.

Roads: The five-mile stretch of road cited is indicative of 95 percent of surfaced roads within the Republic. But during my residency, the road to the border of Arraijan was in excellent repair. The road from Arraijan to La Chorrera is one of the worst 15 miles of "maintained" road in the country.

Shopping facilities: The commissaries in the Canal Zone, open to all Canal Zone employees, regardless of citizenship, are not subsidized by the U.S. Government. The prices of items in the commissaries are higher than U.S. prices for like items, and provide a profit for the Panama Canal Co., is this what was meant by subsidizing?

Further comment upon the distorted facts in this article would be a waste of time. However, it does appear that the article was based on information received from dubious sources, and an on-site study by a responsible reporter would have revealed these distortions, and these findings would have precluded the publication of this article.

R. G. MARTIN.

THIRTY MEMBERS JOIN IN CALLING FOR COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE U.S. POLICY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 30 colleagues join me today in sponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 342—my proposal to establish a joint House-Senate committee for a searching investigation into the policy decisions that have mired us deep in Southeast Asia.

I have already discussed this legislation at length; my remarks today will be brief and to the point.

Everyone agrees that the public's right to know is nothing less than vital to this country's democratic system—indeed, to its very way of life. Safeguarding this right, the Supreme Court ruled just yesterday that newspapers may resume publication of the now-celebrated Pentagon papers. This study has left the people perplexed—even bewildered.

Does it, as some contend, betray duplicity and dissimulation in Government?

Or, on the other hand, is it merely a hurried and uneven outline of the military contingency plans that proliferated wildly during the 1960's?

I think we can reach one conclusion, at the very least. The study shows—and shows plainly—that the people were denied the total candor our democracy demands. It is now time to restore that candor. The joint committee I suggest, composed of House and Senate Members alike, would give the American people the information they need to make prudent judgment on the war.

It would put the McNamara study into historical perspective, revealing just what policy decisions led us into a war that has already cost us more than 50,000 American lives and more than $250 billion.

If we are to learn from our mistakes, we must begin now.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, the new joint committee would not be a tribunal to expose villainy.

Its only goal would be a fair and sober evaluation of our Southeast Asia policies—an evaluation that would teach us how to avoid squandering our resources on another Vietnam.

Here are the Members joining me in sponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 342:

SPONSORS FOR HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 342

1. Abzug, Bella (N.Y.).
2. Adams, Brock (Wash.).
3. Anderson, William R. (Tenn.).
4. Begich, Nick (Alaska).
5. Biaggi, Mario (N.Y.).
6. Burton, Phillip (Calif.).
7. Clark, Frank M. (Pa.).
8. Cotter, William R. (Conn.).
9. Derwinski, Edward J. (Ill.).
10. Donohue, Harold D. (Mass.).
11. Drinan, Robert F. (Mass.).
12. Gibbons, Sam (Fla.).
13. Grasso, Ella T. (Conn.).
14. Halpern, Seymour (N.Y.).
15. Harrington, Michael (Mass.).
16. Hathaway, William D. (Maine).
17. Karth, Joseph E. (Minn.).
18. Koch, Edward I. (N.Y.).
19. Leggett, Robert L. (Calif.).
20. Mazzoli, Romano (Ky.).
21. Minish, Joseph G. (N.J.).
22. Nix, Robert N. C. (Pa.).
23. Podell, Bertram L. (N.Y.).
24. Quie, Albert H. (Minn.).
25. Riegle, Donald W. Jr. (Mich.).
26. Ryan, William F. (N.Y.).
27. Stokes, Louis (Ohio).
28. Udall, Morris K. (Ariz.).
29. Wolff, Lester L. (N.Y.).
30. Yates, Sidney R. (Ill.).

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the events of the last 2 weeks concerning the publication of Pentagon papers has brought before the American people a variety of facts and documents about our long and futile involvement in Southeast Asia. While these papers have been revealing for the information released to the public, they are, at the same time, a source of deep discouragement.

The Pentagon documents and their handling have shown to the people of this country the consistent attempts of past administrations, as well as the present one, to maintain an atmosphere of secrecy when discussing the war in Vietnam. The unsuccessful attempts of the Nixon administration to stifle the efforts of newspapers to print these documents has greatly added to my own disillusionment with the Government's policy in Vietnamese affairs. It is this constant denial of vital information that has kept the people of this country unaware of many of the facts of the Vietnam war while the Government pursued its foreign policy of war in Southeast Asia with a free and heavy hand.

When dealing with an area of public affairs that has assumed such great importance in the past 5 years, it seems inconceivable to me to allow the American people to remain ignorant of any of the facts surrounding our presence in South Vietnam. Yesterday's Supreme Court decision to release for publication the Pentagon documents will certainly add to the public knowledge and understanding of the war in Southeast Asia. I feel, however, that it is necessary at this time,

that the public know not only the actions of the past administration in Vietnam, but the activities of every administration, right up to and including the present one, that has had anything to do with the war in Southeast Asia. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I have decided to cosponsor a bill. House Concurrent Resolution 342, introduced by Mr. BOLAND, which would create a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study into the reasons for, and the course of, the United States involvement in Vietnam. I include the concurrent resolution at this point in the RECORD:

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 subpena (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.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's decision yesterday in the case of the Pentagon Papers was clearly a milestone in this country's tradition of free speech and free press. Once again, the Nation's highest court has upheld the independence of the press and instructed the Government to respect the rights granted every citizen by the first amendment. This is as it should be, for no country could call itself free if the Government is empowered to restrain publications on the basis of vague charges that "national security" is at stake.

The case of the United States against The New York Times and The Washington Post is closed and the papers are now free to publish the Pentagon documents. But the issues and questions raised by information contained in the documents are still with us and clearly deserve the close study of the Congress.

It would serve no purpose to repeat now the tragic history of Vietnam or the stark statistics that tell of the blood and treasure we have expended in the last two decades in Southeast Asia. But it is imperative that we in the Congress—given the constitutional right and duty to make war and peace—learn well the lessons of Vietnam, not to point the finger of guilt at any individual or administration, but to understand our mistakes and prepare ourselves not to repeat them. The experience of the United States in Vietnam is of historic dimensions, for history is as often tragedy as it is triumph. We will compound the tragedy if we refuse to learn from it.

This is the purpose of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND). I am proud to be associated with that resolution and I urge other Members to examine it closely and to give it their support.

The resolution would establish a joint House-Senate committee to conduct a thorough and sober investigation into the history of the Vietnam War and the origins of our involvement in it. A joint committee is clearly the proper body to conduct such an investigation, for the Vietnam war is of abiding concern to all Members of both the House and Senate. A joint committee also would avoid the costly duplication of separate investigations by the House and Senate.

The Pentagon papers, most of which have or will be published shortly, provide a good beginning for such an investigation. The newspapers have performed a public service by publishing portions of the documents, but they have had to do so rapidly and amid much controversy. The daily publication of portions of the documents by several newspapers scattered throughout the country has left little time to reflect on the information contained in them. Yet the raw materials—the documents and analyses—are available for the deliberate and careful study of the Congress.

It has been charged that the Pentagon documents offer only a partial, and therefore, distorted view of our involvement in Vietnam. This may well be so, which makes it all the more important that the Congress seek the full story. There are other documents and reports locked in the files of the State Department and other Government agencies that ought to be available to the Congress and the public.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is so important and the cost has been so high that the Congress no longer can allow access to this information to only a few selected officials of the executive branch. The Supreme Court yesterday made clear that—short of a clear threat to national security—the public has a right to know the kind of information contained in the Pentagon papers. It is our duty to press for that right.

By establishing this joint committee and pressing for the maximum openness in government, we can demonstrate that we already have learned one lesson from the Vietnam experience. Justice Stewart, in his opinion yesterday, described that lesson very well.

In deciding how and what Government information to keep secret, he wrote;

> I should suppose that moral, political, and practical considerations would dictate that a very first principle of that wisdom would be an insistence upon avoiding secrecy for its own sake. For when everything is classified, then nothing is classified, and the system becomes one to be disregarded by the cynical or the careless and to be manipulated by those intent on self-promotion. I should suppose, in short, that the hallmark of a truly effective internal security system would be the maximum possible disclosure.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, democracy cannot function in the shadows of Government secrecy. Unless people have access to the facts, democratic government is a sham.

To hide vital information from the public because it may embarrass a political leader or party is not the work of a democracy. At the same time we all know that rational public analysis needs more than slogans or headlines.

For these reasons, I am a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 342 calling for a joint committee to study our involvement in the Indochina war. We must know the facts and present them rationally to the American people, if we are to avoid future Vietnams. A nation which ignores its history is doomed to repeat its mistakes.

It is up to Congress to help sort out myth from reality and present the truth to the American public. It is time for Congress to launch a coordinated review of our foreign policy, particularly our Southeast Asian policy. For too long, we have neglected our responsibilities in foreign affairs and have deferred to the Executive. If democracy is to function and if the public's trust in their government is to be restored, we must act immediately and in complete honesty. Too much has been hidden for too long.

The issue is too important to leave to bureaucratic hedging or newspaper head-

lines. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and provide the American people with the truth about our Vietnamese involvement.

If the Congress does not do this, who will?

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, no subject in recent memory has been the source of such bitterness and division in this country as the war in Vietnam. Now, as we look toward a complete withdrawal of American troops from Indochina, there is a danger that we will look back over the tragic history of this war merely to assign guilt to those people or institutions responsible for our involvement in Southeast Asia.

This must not happen. We must take a calm and balanced look over the entire history of the Vietnam war, not to place blame, but to learn from our mistakes. We should be less concerned with who got us into Vietnam than how it all happened—so that we can make sure that it will not happen again.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to make a sober appraisal of all of the facts and history behind the U.S. participation in the Vietnam war. This is especially urgent in the light of the current furor over the Pentagon papers. Though the manner in which these documents reached the press was illegal, they have now opened whole new areas of public discussion on the history of the Vietnam conflict. Congress must now arrive at its independent judgment as to whether the Pentagon papers have been represented accurately in the press, and whether these documents themselves provide an accurate account of the event they purport to portray.

But the problem of understanding how we got into Vietnam is far broader than the question of the Pentagon papers. It is time we examined the basic assumptions of the American foreign policy since World War II, taking new stock of our experience in the post-war world and the proper role of the world's most powerful nation in today's international system. All of these questions are central to the study of our involvement in Vietnam.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 342, which provides for the establishment of a joint Senate-House Committee "to investigate the reasons for, and the course of, the involvement of the United States in Vietnam." The composition of this committee, as specified by the provisions of this resolution, would be balanced and representative of the broad spectrum of opinion in the House and the Senate. No report could emerge from such a committee that was not fair, even-handed, and true to the facts.

It is time for us in the legislative branch to assume our sworn responsibility and lay the facts of the Vietnam war before the people of the United States. Nothing could help more to restore the impaired credibility of government in this country than a complete historical housecleaning on the subject of Indochina by both Houses of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that the forum for such an investigation be a joint body composed of an equal number of Members from both Houses of Congress, as provided by House Concurrent Resolution 342, rather than by any body of lesser stature.

There is ample historical precedent for such joint Senate-House investigations, especially with relation to war policy.

In May and June of 1951, the Joint Committee on Armed Services and Foreign Relations conducted an investigation into the military situation in the Far East.

From November 1945, until May 1946, there was an investigation by a special joint committee on Pearl Harbor.

In April and May 1945, there were hearings by a special joint committee to investigate German concentration camps.

And as far back as December 1861, there was a special joint committee on the conduct of the war, which issued a report in 1863.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the consideration and passage of House Concurrent Resolution 342 to set up a joint committee to investigate the involvement of the United States in the war in Vietnam. Our people have borne with honor the heavy costs of this war. It is their right to know how it all came about.

NIXONOMICS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as is its practice on the first Friday of each month, will release the dismal unemployment statistics for the last month.

Those statistics almost certainly will reflect a national rate of unemployment in excess of 6 percent.

Unemployment has suffered an almost constant increase since Mr. Nixon assumed the Presidency. In the last year in particular since the economics of Mr. Nixon have had an opportunity to take hold on the Nation, there has been a steady deterioration in almost every facet of our economic life.

During the fifties, columnists, economists, and private citizens like myself marveled at the unique achievement of an earlier Republican administration which managed somehow to couple, in defiance of all rules of economics, substantial levels of unemployment with devastating rates of inflation.

That achievement of the Eisenhower years has been surpassed as Mr. Nixon has refined the economics of his predecessor. He has perfected inaction. He has glorified the lack of leadership. Just this week his new Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Connally, reaffirmed his intention of doing nothing. We may expect, on the basis of Mr. Connally's announcement, a continuation by this administration of economic policies that can only be characterized as doctrinaire confusion and economic ignorance.

The Nation may expect in the coming months continuing high levels of unemployment, continuing erosion of the value of the dollar, continuing lack of confidence on the part of the consumer and the investor and a continuing rise in the number of families whose economic situation puts them below the poverty index.

Thanks to Robert McNamara, the New York Times, and the U.S. Supreme Court, the American people are going to have the opportunity to review the history of the national tragedy that has evolved in the Vietnam war.

Thanks to Evans and Novak and the Atlantic Monthly the American public can now learn the history of the evolvement of our domestic economic tragedy. That history is documented in an article in this month's issue of the Atlantic Monthly entitled "Nixonomics: How the Game Plan Went Wrong."

In order that my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD may have an opportunity to study that history, I insert the article in the RECORD for all to see:

NIXONOMICS: HOW THE GAME PLAN WENT WRONG

(By Rowland Evans, Jr., and Robert D. Novak)

(Nixonomics means that all the things that should go up—the stock market, corporate profits, real spendable income, productivity—go down, and all the things that should go down—unemployment, prices, interest rates—go up—Lawrence F. O'Brien, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, on May 21, 1970.)

In early April, 1969, Richard Nixon called Representative Wilbur D. Mills of Arkansas, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, to the White House to reveal his plans for fiscal austerity. He had managed to cut some $4 billion, the new President informed Mills, from Lyndon Johnson's last and "uncuttable" budget. No member of Congress was more disturbed than Mills by the way federal spending had gone out of control under Johnson, and he was pleased by the reduction. But he wanted more—say another $4 billion?

"Oh, no! We can't do that," said Nixon. "We can't cut so deep that we start a recession."

Mills was puzzled. As he understood it, Nixon's economic strategy—or "game plan" as it was known, in deference to the football-loving President—called for slowing down inflation in 1969 at the regrettable expense of some temporary unemployment. Thus, Nixon seemed to be saying that he was willing to slow down the economy enough to cause some unemployment but not enough to cause a recession. To Mills, this ambivalence made no sense. On the question of how much to slow down the economy, the ambivalence was deeply ingrained, born not of mere skepticism of economic orthodoxy but of two deeply embedded, conflicting impulses that Nixon carried with him into the White House.

Early in 1968, before the series of heart attacks that were to end his life a year later, General Dwight D. Eisenhower discussed the first impulse candidly. "I think Dick's going to be elected President," he told one of Nixon's political advisers, "but I think he's going to be a one-term President. I think he's really going to fight inflation, and that will kill him politically." To Eisenhower as well as to most orthodox Republicans, that would be the worthy sacrifice of a courageous political martyr. For the old General there was no higher imperative for a new Republican President than to curb the torrent of inflation that had been loosed on the economy since full U.S. intervention in the Vietnam War in 1965. To them, at stake was nothing less than the value of the dollar, the role of the United States as a great power, and the very quality of life in this country. To save all this entailed sacrifice. Attempting a reduction in the rate of inflation from 1953 through 1960 (considerably less virulent than the present siege), President Eisenhower's economic policy induced three recessions; these had three disastrous consequences for

the Republican Party. First came the Democratic landslide in the elections of 1958, which ended the previous postwar pattern of a virtually even balance between the parties in Congress and established huge Democratic majorities (which persisted even when Nixon was elected President a decade later). Second was the election of Democrat John F. Kennedy for President in 1960. Finally, and perhaps worst of all, the Republican image, formed in the days of Herbert Hoover, as the party of bad times was reinforced in the voters' minds. Now, eight years later, blessed with not a fraction of Eisenhower's unlimited popularity, Nixon would have to take more unpopular actions to fight a worse inflation. The resulting unemployment, business slowdown, and stock market decline almost surely would prevent his re-election in 1972, Eisenhower speculated. But considering the deeds he would be performing in the service of his nation, Eisenhower felt the sacrifice not only would be worthwhile but would assure Nixon a place in history.

Nixon, too, regarded inflation as something more than a campaign issue handy for attacking the Democrats. Some two weeks before the election of 1968 in a paid address over the CBS Network, Nixon declared: "Inflation penalizes thrift and encourages speculation. Because it is a national and perverse force—dramatically affecting individuals but beyond their power to influence—inflation is a source of frustration for all who lack great economic power." That is, in Nixon's diagnosis, inflation was a virus affecting not just the health of the economy but the frame of mind of the entire country. He fully agreed with the assessment by Theodore White as the Nixon Administration took office that "inflation, in the past four years of American life, has ravaged our standards of behavior." [1] There was, then, reason to suspect that General Eisenhower's assessment was correct.

There was also, however, a conflicting impulse in Nixon. During that difficult decade after his defeat in 1960, aides and close friends had heard Nixon say privately time after time that had President Eisenhower only taken his and Arthur Burn's advice early in 1960 and moved rapidly toward stimulating the economy, he—not Jack Kennedy—would have been elected President. The implication, not quite stated flatly, was that Richard Nixon, if he had the power, would never again go into a presidential election with the economy in a state of deflation.

The closest Nixon came to putting this view on the public record was in a passage from *Six Crises*, his autobiographical work published in 1962. Nixonologists in the world of business cited the passage to their colleagues as the true test of what they could expect in the next few years. After telling of Burns's failure in 1960 to convince Eisenhower to act, Nixon writes this memorable assessment of the election that year, unable fully to restrain his bitterness:

"Unfortunately, Arthur Burns turned out to be a good prophet. The bottom of the 1960 dip did come in October and the economy started to move up again in November—after it was too late to affect the election returns. In October, usually a month of rising employment, the jobless rolls increased by 452,000. All the speeches, television broadcasts, and precinct work in the world could not counteract that one hard fact."

Here, then, was the source of the ambivalence perceived by Wilbur Mills in April 1969. Should Nixon be the self-abnegating statesman sacrificing his personal future to save the republic from inner rot, or the pragmatic politician finally removing from the Republican Party the curse of Herbert Hoover? Whether or not this ambivalence was appreciated by Richard Nixon in his own inner thoughts, it did not surface in the early meetings on the economy in his new Administration.

Those meetings were concerned almost exclusively with the problem of inflation which had dropped the value of the 1957–1959 dollar to 81.1 cents as Nixon took office. Presiding occasionally at meetings of the Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy, of the Quadriad, and of the Troika,[2] Nixon made obvious his deep commitment to curbing inflation. Nixon as President could engage his full attention on only three or four large items at one time, and inflation was the only domestic issue that had that level of presidential attention as his Administration began. In private conversations with his staff, Nixon asserted he must deal rapidly and decisively with two principal crises: the Vietnam War and inflation. Furthermore, those few members of his economic team who also had served President Eisenhower noted with satisfaction that Nixon had an incomparably more sophisticated grasp of economics than did the General.

But that scarcely qualified Nixon as an economist. "That is not his long suit," "this is not his cup of tea," "this is not his background," are the remarkably similar assessments of Nixon the economist by three separate members of his economic team. More serious than lack of technical competence, however, was Nixon's lack of emotional commitment. Though he intellectually understood the seriousness of inflation, the Dismal Science did not capture his imagination as did the Vietnam War, détente with the Soviets, or rehabilitation of the Western Alliance.

Given these deficiencies in both his knowledge of and interest in economics, his first-string economic team, the Quadriad, was of peculiar importance. For the first year of Nixon's presidency, this was the Quadriad:

William McChesney Martin, sixty-two, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board (then completing his eighteenth and last year in charge of the nation's central bank. Martin (a nominal Democrat) had not for some years been the dynamic proponent of economic conservatism that he was during the Eisenhower and Kennedy Administrations and was now a somewhat dispirited lame duck. He had no personal relationship with Nixon and did not develop one.

David Kennedy, sixty-three, Secretary of the Treasury. Named on the recommendation of banking interests and Wall Street men, this distinguished Chicago banker, unskilled in macroeconomics, conceived of himself more as manager than policymaker. His relations with Nixon were scarcely any more intimate the day he left the Treasury than the day he entered.

Robert Mayo, fifty-two, director of the Bureau of the Budget. After nineteen years as a career government economist at the Treasury, he joined the banking business as a subordinate to David Kennedy, who recommended him to Nixon for the Budget Bureau. In the government, too, Mayo seemed more Secretary Kennedy's subordinate than Nixon's. Not in recent memory had a Budget Director been more distant from the President.

Paul McCracken, fifty-three, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. This cool, unflappable, unfailingly gracious economics professor from the University of Michigan had been a member of the Council in Eisenhower's second term and was so well regarded professionally that despite his conservatism, his appointment was hailed by liberal economists. Recommended for the post by Arthur Burns, he was to be the principal author of Nixon's economic game plan and the dominant member of the Quadriad through 1969. But he, too, would never achieve an intimate relationship with the President. McCracken was the essence of the pedagogue, his presentations to the President having the bloodless quality of professional lectures in Economics 100. As McCracken unfolded historical background and explored every conceivable side of the subject, Nixon's eyes would glaze over. McCracken bored him stiff.

In contrast to the rest of Nixon's domestic policy team, the Quadriad was older, more professionally qualified, better known to the outside world, and more distinguished generally. But it was also less dynamic and less able to penetrate the Haldeman-Ehrlichman Berlin Wall. There was in the Quadriad no John Mitchell, Melvin Laird, Patrick Moynihan, George Shultz, or John Volpe who, for one reason or other, could enchant, convince, or pester the President into accepting his point of view or, at least, actively engage Nixon's interest.

Present at the White House as Counselor to the President, of course, was an economist who was an old Nixon intimate: Arthur Burns (who did sometimes sit with the economic team as "the Quadriad Plus One"). But Burns was eager not to be looking over the shoulder of Paul McCracken, the man he had recommended, and felt his post as Counselor required as much devotion to noneconomic as economic questions in the domestic area.

With these men, Nixon knew that inflation was a crisis ripping at the innards of America. But he lacked consuming interest in the subject, and his economic team neither stimulated nor influenced him. What nobody could realize in January, 1969, was that inflation would prove to be Nixon's most intractable problem (far worse than Vietnam), would lead to wrenching Republican disappointments in the 1970 midterm elections, and by 1971 would make General Eisenhower's prediction of a one-term presidency seem very real indeed.

In 1942, four years before he ran for Congress and ten years before he was elected Vice President of the United States, Richard Nixon spent ten months in wartime Washington as a lawyer for the Office of Price Administration. It was an experience which seared his soul, as he revealed early in his presidency, on February 14, 1969, while attempting to give an inspirational address to personnel at the Treasury. Speaking without a text, Nixon wanted to establish empathy with the bureaucrats by recalling the days when he was one himself. What came out, however, was more melancholy reminiscence than nostalgia:

"I was once a P–3 when they had that. Some of you will remember that. A P–3 lawyer in the OPA in 1942 was a very low form of life, I can assure you.

"I remember then the task that I had of preparing form letters and also preparing Congressional mail to be signed by the President of the United States on tire rationing.

"It seemed to me to be a very boring job at times."

Dick Nixon, P–3 lawyer, was then twenty-nine, working in a dead-end bureaucratic job in Tempo D, a dreary wooden shack left over from World War I—without money, without family connections, without much in the way of prospects, and certainly without political ambition. His own unhappy condition might be one reason he carried from OPA such an uncharacteristically dogmatic opposition to wage and price controls of any kind. Although the wartime OPA in retrospect had been given generally high grades for its performance of a difficult and onerous but necessary task, Nixon's personal recollection was otherwise. In private conversations over the years, he talked of the corruption, the cheating by the public, and the unhappy consequences when a government seeks to control the private economic decisions of private citizens.

Nixon the supreme pragmatist was inflexible about economic controls; however much his interest might flag in discussion of other

---

Footnotes at end of article.

economic questions, his enthusiastic advocacy on this point was constant. Nor was Nixon adamant simply against outright government controls. He was equally opposed to a return to the policy instituted by President Kennedy in 1961: voluntary guideposts issued by the government to limit wage and price increases—what is called an incomes policy in Great Britain and Canada. The guideposts had been plowed over and abandoned in the inflationary surge of 1966 following President Johnson's full-scale intervention in Vietnam. But late in 1968, Johnson's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability recommended a return to official guideposts (based on a maximum 5 percent wage increase in 1969), and Hubert Humphrey almost surely would have followed the recommendation had he been elected. But a guideposts policy would work, Nixon believed, only if the government used muscle to enforce it—as when John F. Kennedy forced the steel industry to roll back a price increase in 1962. That, to Nixon, was nothing more than mandatory wage-price controls without statutory sanction. Finally, Nixon ruled out even those admonitions by a President and other federal officials called "jawboning," used by Kennedy-Johnson officials both in conjunction with a guideposts policy and after the guideposts had been abandoned.

Fatefully, Nixon's prejudices happened to coincide perfectly with the expert opinion of his advisers. The entire Quadriad plus Burns agreed with Nixon's opposition to controls, to an incomes policy, to jawboning. This further coincided with the prevalent opinion in the business community, which had so raptuously given its support to Nixon against Humphrey. Following the eight prosperous years of the Kennedy-Johnson era uninterrupted by a genuine recession, business was riding high in January, 1969. With its goal of quick profits and an ever expanding economy, business wanted nothing more than to be left alone by the government.[3] That is precisely what Nixon's campaign promised business, and to be left alone meant not only easing federal control of regulated industries (including the stock exchange) but also a moratorium on nagging about higher wages and higher prices.

Consequently, there had been no previous great debate, either inside or outside the new Administration, when Nixon told his first press conference on the morning of January 27:

"I do not go along with the suggestion that inflation can be effectively controlled by exhorting labor and management and industry to follow certain guidelines. I think that is a very laudable objective for labor and management to follow. But I think I am aware of the fact that the leaders of labor and the leaders of management, much as they might personally want to do what is in the best interests of the nation, have to be guided by the interests of the organization they represent.

"So the primary responsibility for controlling inflation rests with the national administration and its handling of fiscal and monetary affairs."

With those comments, the new President was reflecting a view widely held not only by his own advisers but by economists generally: the inflation roaring wildly in January, 1969, was essentially caused by the federal government. The record of the Federal Reserve Board in controlling the nation's money supply in the second half of the 1960s was a sorry one. Having choked off the money supply as an anti-inflation device in 1966 so tightly that it produced a serious slump in housing and construction (called by some a "mini-recession"), the central bank started pouring out money too quickly and too generously in 1967 and thereby spoon-fed a new inflation. The Federal Reserve's culpability, however, did not approach Lyndon B. Johnson's. Refusing to ask Congress for a tax increase to finance the Vietnam War when he intervened in 1965, President Johnson piled up huge inflationary budget deficits climaxed by $28.4 billion in red ink for the year ending July 1, 1968. To compensate for these governmental excesses, the Nixon game plan was to hold down the money supply by means of monetary policy and achieve a budget surplus through fiscal policy.

But the business community interpreted Nixon's comments of January 27 in slightly different fashion. What it thought Nixon was saying was this: Fighting inflation is our business, not yours; you fellows have no responsibility to do anything in the way of self-restraint. Even before Nixon's January 27 press conference, businessmen were being told authoritatively that Washington was now laissez-faire on prices. Dr. Pierre Rinfret, an influential economic consultant in New York in close touch with the Nixon team, advised his clients to raise their prices and raise them *now;* because everything else was going up, they would get no backlash from Washington, and besides, the responsibility for fighting inflation was the government's, not theirs. So, unwittingly, Nixon's abandonment of jawboning helped to generate the inflationary psychology he was trying to control and imposed a still greater burden on the government's monetary and fiscal policy.

Monetary policy was no immediate problem. William McChesney Martin and the rest of the Federal Reserve Board had instituted a tight-money regime in 1968 and were keeping the screws tightened.

Fiscal policy was another matter. As he entered the White House, Nixon was undecided about requesting an extension of the 10 percent income tax surcharge proposed by President Johnson in 1967 and finally passed by Congress in 1968. Burns and the Quadriad were unanimous in advising Nixon that letting the surtax lapse (along with its $10 billion a year in revenue) was sheer madness. But Nixon had his doubts. He was on record with a somewhat wishy-washy commitment during the 1968 campaign to repeal the surtax, and a great many Republican candidates for Congress had made a stronger commitment. Besides, Nixon was not happy about the LBJ label on the surtax. But in the end, he reluctantly agreed to propose re-enactment.

There still remained the more difficult basic problem of putting a rein on federal expenditures, bloated by the Vietnam War. The results were disclosed by the President in a message to Congress on April 12. The expenditure estimate of $195.3 billion contained in Johnson's final budget (for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1970) was spurious, the Nixon men found. The more realistic figure was $196.9 billion. The President then reduced this by $4 billion, to give him a projected surplus of $5.8 billion, which Nixon quickly labeled the largest surplus in eighteen years and the fourth largest in history.[4] Seemingly, Nixon had moved quickly and masterfully to bring the budget under control; a step toward victory in his fight against inflation.

In truth, however, the budget balancers in the Administration were defeated. Arthur Burns, in particular, felt that Nixon had lost the golden opportunity to check federal spending. He realized that the highly publicized budget cuts were largely cosmetic without seriously drawing back long-range spending programs. As Budget Director, Mayo tried to bring the budget into line but failed. Part of the trouble stemmed from the inability of Mayo, the gentlemanly ex-Treasury bureaucrat, to force deep cuts in expenditures on Nixon's department and agency heads, who now were championing the causes of their new bureaucratic constituencies. But the blame cannot be placed solely on Mayo. Many of his most important initiatives to cut expenditures were not backed up by the President. The reduction of $1.1 billion for the Pentagon would have been still larger had Nixon sided with Mayo instead of Laird. Nor was the space exploration program cut to Mayo's specifications. Nixon overruled Mayo's attempt to eliminate the costly supersonic-transport (SST) subsidy program. And he lost his argument with the President that the proposed new program of income maintenance for the poor, whatever its long-range savings was fiscally irresponsible in the short range.

Mayo's failure is traceable in part to the peculiarities of the Nixon presidency. A stolid fellow lacking the ability to entrance Nixon, Mayo had no standing in the White House. He could not compete with a Pat Moynihan persuading the President to support income maintenance, or a John Volpe drumming up arguments for the SST. His only budget-cutting ally in the White House was Arthur Burns, who was having his own trouble influencing the President. Indeed, before long Mayo lost all physical contact with Nixon. By late 1969, he was getting his instructions from the President via John Ehrlichman and relaying his proposals to the President via John Ehrlichman—an unprecedented ignominy for a Budget Director that he should not have tolerated.

Beyond personalities, however, there was also Nixon's fear as expressed to Wilbur Mills that too great a budget reduction would induce a whopper of a recession. The result was a policy enunciated by Dr. McCracken as "gradualism"—gradually reducing inflationary pressures by moderate, not precipitate, pruning of federal spending. That McCracken and just about every other Nixon adviser (with the conspicuous exception of Burns) agreed that gradualism was the proper antidote testifies to how badly they underestimated the force of inflation.

McCracken's concept of the power of gradualism was succinctly described by Hobart Rowen in his column in the Washington *Post* on March 22:

"At some point . . . probably suddenly and without advance notice, big and little people are going to decide that prices (including the price of money) are too high.

"At that point (and Mr. Nixon's people hope it will arrive soon), plant expansion projections will ease off, consumers will start to save a little more and spend a little less, and the exaggerated pace of the economy will settle back to earth."

On March 22, 1969, Richard Nixon seemed to have put all his own faith in the game plan of gradualism. Four months later the chilling doubts set in.

Pierre Rinfret, a flamboyant Canadian-born economist, was an early Nixon-for-President enthusiast, and joined the team of advisers at Mission Bay, California, making campaign strategy following Nixon's nomination for President in the summer of 1968. After the election, a Nixon aide sounded out Rinfret on the possibility of his becoming a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, but Rinfret replied that he would not give up his lucrative New York-based consulting firm for any federal post. Although McCracken and the other Council members tended to look down their noses at his professional credentials, Rinfret remained in close and amiable contact with several figures in the Administration, including Arthur Burns.

But by July 3, Rinfret had become so disaffected that he distributed to clients of his firm a two-page confidential memorandum titled "We Accuse" which said: "We accuse this Administration of incompetence."

In attempting to curb inflation, charged Rinfret, the Administration (in collaboration with the Federal Reserve Board) was promoting "the current mood of economic and financial terror." In Pierre Rinfret's view,

Footnotes at end of article.

the Administration had started badly and was steadily getting worse. "We accuse the Administration of totally miscalculating the need for advance economic planning before it got into office and for being totally unprepared once it did. It went into office with slogans and little else." Most of all, it erred in thinking "that inflation could easily be turned off" and therefore did not sufficiently cut federal spending. Instead, it was risking a financial panic by relying on the Federal Reserve Board's tight-money policy as the first line in the war against inflation. The Administration was "fostering, abetting and creating inflation while it has advocated deflation" because "the first thing it did was to announce the abandonment of the wage and price guidelines, which created 'open sesame' on prices and wages."

Rinfret's harsh language typified the startlingly rapid turn of sentiment against Richard Nixon in the business community during those first five months. On July 3, the President's ratings in the polls were still high, the peace movement had not stirred, and the Democrats had scarcely pinked him. But his supporters in the world of business had turned against him with the ferocity of a friend betrayed. Under the man they had supported for President, the business climate was becoming a bad dream: stock market down and falling; interest rates up and rising; money so tight that some businessmen were unable to operate; a recession on the horizon; and finally, that precious commodity, business confidence, failing. And yet, all this had not brought an end to inflation. On June 11, David Kennedy, using language more candid than that of other members of the Quadriad, told a meeting of the Advertising Council in Washington that the nation was on the brink "of a runaway inflation." [5]

Kennedy's candor was unusual. According to the Nixon party line, the game plan was working and everybody should be patient. But by the time of Pierre Rinfret's broadside, Nixon's economic team—though probably not Nixon himself—knew it had underestimated inflation, and so far had not brought it under control. The further cold reality was that current policies would produce a moderate recession in 1970 whether or not they stopped inflation. The Nixon Administration faced the nightmare of *simultaneous* inflation and recession for the first time in modern economic history.

At the White House, Arthur Burns was clearly less than pleased with McCracken, the man he chose to be the President's chief economic adviser. He confided to friends that McCracken was talking too much publicly about stopping inflation and not talking hard enough privately about cutting back on federal spending. Burns fought for greater budget austerity and in August came up with a notable success. He won Nixon's approval for an immediate cutback of 75 percent in all federal construction, including the massive interstate highway program. To Burns, the shock value of this move might just jolt the inflationary psychology still gripping the nation. One political obstacle, however, was the predictable outrage of the state governors, now overwhelmingly Republican. To deal gently with the governors, announcement of Nixon's move was delayed until the first week in September, when they would all be together at their annual national conference in Colorado Springs, Colorado. Burns would be there to do the explaining.

What followed was one of those strange attacks of indecisiveness, compounded by failure of communications, that sometimes undermined the best domestic intentions of Richard Nixon.

Nixon arrived in Colorado Springs on the afternoon of September 1, 1969, from his beach house at San Clemente, California, where he was spending much of the summer. Scheduled to address the governors' black tie banquet at the Broadmoor Hotel that night, the President might have taken the opportunity to slip the governors the bad news about the construction cutback and urge them to keep a stiff upper lip for the good of the republic. Instead, Nixon delivered a conventional jeremiad against social welfare spending under Johnson during the past five years ($250 billion that had "reaped a harvest of dissatisfaction, frustration and bitter division") without revealing his new plans for austerity, and returned to San Clemente that night.

The reason he left without mentioning the cutbacks was that his politically conscious advisers persuaded him of the adverse impact on the governors from such talk. Vice President Spiro T. Agnew, only seven months out of the governorship of Maryland and now playing a liaison role with his former colleagues, told the President the governors were far more worried about recession than inflation and would rise up in wrath against a flat-out cutback. He was backed by Volpe, who as governor of Massachusetts had led a delegation to the White House in 1967 to protest a highway-construction freeze imposed by Lyndon Johnson. Agnew's alternative: delay the cutback on federal grants to the states for six months, until April, giving them a chance to inventory federally financed projects and to select which ones to cut back.

With *Air Force* shuttling the President back and forth between California and Colorado, with key officials of the government scattered across the continent between Washington, San Clemente, and Colorado Springs, the difficulty in communications at top levels of the Administration was compounded. Agnew thought he had Nixon's agreement to the six-month delay.[6] The White House thought no such thing. On the afternoon of September 2, Agnew privately briefed the governors about the impending cutback plans, adding that there would be a six-month reprieve on federal-state projects. In Colorado Springs, when Arthur Burns learned about Agnew's retreat, he was furious. Now, having promised the governors a six-month reprieve, there could be no immediate cutback, the essential shock value had disappeared, and worst of all, the press and the politicians would believe that Nixon did not have the stomach to deal courageously with inflation. That bothered Burns the most.

Two days later at San Clemente Nixon issued a statement ordering an immediate 75 percent cutback in new federal construction. In view of Agnew's intervention, he temporized about federal grants to states, urging state and local governments "to follow the example of the Federal Government by cuting back temporarily on their own construction plans." He warned that he himself would reduce federal grants an undetermined amount "if the response proves insufficient," but even in that event, said the President, "the states and localities will, of course, be given due notice, so that they can adjust their affairs properly." Predictably, the state and municipalities did not heed the President's admonition; predictably, the President, did not make good on his threat, even with the Agnew formula included. So ended still another effort by Arthur Burns for a drastic slowdown in federal spending.

Even before that defeat, however, Burns concluded that this Administration was not going to curb federal spending enough to hold down inflationary pressures. By August, he had come to believe something else was necessary, and that something else was an incomes policy—a return to wage-price guideposts rejected by Nixon on January 27. Throughout his career as an economist, Burns, like most conservatives, had opposed the concept of an incomes policy. He firmly believed that mandatory government controls on wages and prices were incompatible with a free society and that an incomes policy was but a way station to controls. In the late summer of 1969, however, Burns was changing his mind. He noted that an incomes policy had been instituted in Canada, the Netherlands, and the United States (the Kennedy era guideposts), and had not been followed by controls. For Burns, at age sixty-four popularly considered one of the most doctrinaire conservatives in the Administration, to have abandoned his position reflects just how anxious he felt. Burns had allied with him a good part of the Cabinet concerned with economic policy: Kennedy, Romney, Volpe, Postmaster General Blount, but not McCracken or the rest of the Council of Economic Advisers. And, most important, not the President.

In an October 17 radio address to the nation on inflation, the President rejected an incomes policy, rejected any substantial change in his economic game plan, and rejected any suggestion of failure. "We are not going to change our game plan at the end of the first quarter of the game, particularly at a time that we feel we are ahead," he said. Recalling yet again his experience with OPA in World War II ("rationing, black markets, regimentation"), he rejected not only direct controls but the guideposts that Burns had been urging on him—describing guideposts as "putting the government into the business of telling the workingman how much he should charge for his services or how much the businessman should charge for his goods." The President's dogmatism on the wage-price question had not been diluted by nine months of failure. He even reiterated his objection to jawboning: "Instead of relying on our jawbone, we have put some backbone in government's determination to hold the line for the consumer." In fact, however, he did engage in a very benign form of jawboning. Pledging that the government would stick to a strict anti-inflationary policy, Nixon asserted that "by responding to the changed conditions," labor and management "will be following their self-interest and helping the national interest as well." This was a perceptible departure from his January 27 implication that labor and management had no stake in the national welfare, but it was far from what Burns wanted.

Even that minimum of jawboning was forgotten little more than a month later. On November 27, the Administration assembled some 1600 top-rank American business leaders to hear Nixon and his economic team give an off-the-record briefing at Washington's Sheraton Park Hotel. Not a word urging price restraint came from the President or anybody else. It was the same old line: The government means business about curbing inflation. "Those who bet on inflation will lose their bets, but those who bet on a cooling off will win, because we're committed," said the President.

There was one attempted change in the game plan in the closing months of 1969. In August, just when Burns was changing his mind about an incomes policy, a campagin against the tight-money policy of the Federal Reserve Board was being waged by an influential Republican economist outside the government: Professor Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago. In his column in *Newsweek*, in discussions with key figures in the Administration, and even in one telephone conversation with William McChesney Martin, Friedman argued that the Federal Reserve had now kept the money supply choked off for so long that further restrictions threatened a severe recession. Friedman's arguments made no impact on Martin or other members of the Quadriad, but he did pick up one influential disciple, George Shultz, Friedman's former colleague at Chicago and now a rising figure in the Adminis-

Footnotes at end of article.

tration. Shultz took the view that Friedman had studied the money supply with greater care and perception than anybody in the Administration had and deserved to be listened to. After taking this line in private conversations through the early autumn, Shultz surfaced with it in Nixon's presence at a mid-October meeting of the Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy.

There was no immediate support for Shultz at that meeting, but it was not long in coming. By November, McCracken believed the tight-money policy must be ended (though, for public consumption, he denied it lest he give the impression the Administration was backing away from the fight against inflation). In a meeting of the Quadriad, McCracken asked William McChesney Martin what the prospects were for loosening the money screws. Martin, scheduled to be replaced on January 31 by Burns, was unresponsive. But the Federal Reserve did switch to a less restrictive policy late in the year—far too late in the opinion of many economists.

Thus, 1969 ended with the President's economic game plan disintegrating, his advisers split, and the economy falling. By year's end, the value of the 1957–1959 dollar had slipped from 81.1 cents when Nixon took power to 76.7 cents. And though inflation was not curbed, unemployment was rising fast, and a recession loomed. Yet there was no sense of crisis in the Oval Office. Buoyed by his continued high popularity, by his successes abroad, and by scattered off-year Republican election victories, Richard Nixon could not focus on the specter of economic crisis confronting him. Economic policy continued to be made in casual manner with little regard for consequences. The tax bill he signed to end the year on December 30 was proof enough of that.

When Nixon early in 1969 joined the swelling demand for tax reform, there was little thought of economic consequences. Tax reform concerned equity. It was not part of the fight against inflation. Yet in pursuing tax reform, the Administration could not avoid making vitally important economic decisions. But instead of approaching this task judiciously, it made these decisions in slapdash fashion, with rueful consequences. What happened is another story, but in the end, at a time when Nixon was trying his best to fight inflation and avoid recession, he had signed a bill that was *both* inflationary (because it increased personal exemptions, and thus deficit spending) and recessionary (because it repealed the investment tax credit first sponsored by President Kennedy in 1962). This had happened because the President's economic team concentrated on the economic aspects of tax reform only belatedly, and then in a haphazard manner that proved totally ineffective. Throughout the late summer and autumn when the Democratic Congress was transmuting tax reform into tax relief, the President was remote from the struggle, ineffective and irresolute. Then came his unfulfilled threat to veto an out-of-balance tax bill. By allowing his bluff to be called, the President had suffered a loss of prestige almost as great as he would have if Congress had overridden one of his vetoes.

On the evening of January 30, 1970, Richard Nixon's first press conference of the new year was opened by Douglas B. Cornell of the Associated Press, whose question graphically revealed how much the economic outlook had changed in the month since the President had signed the tax bill:

"Mr. President, for several days I have been collecting some headlines that sort of point up the question I would like to put to you. . . .

" 'Big firms' 1969 profits down.' 'Dow average hits new low for three years.' 'GNP rise halted.' 'Ford joins GM and Chrysler in work cutbacks.' 'Wholesale prices show sharp rise.' 'U.S. Steel will raise sheet prices February 1.'

"The question is: how, sir, do you assess the possibility that we may be in for perhaps the worst possible sort of economic conditions—inflation and a recession?"

Indeed key economic indicators—industrial production, personal income, business sales, real Gross National Product—were down. So was the slumping stock market. Unemployment was on the rise. But at the same time, interest rates and prices continued to climb. Dr. Walter Heller, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers in Kennedy-Johnson days, had a name for this combination of bad economic news never before experienced in America: Nixonomics.

MrCracken, Kennedy, and Treasury Undersecretary Dr. Charls Walker, who spent 1969 promising that an end to inflation was just around the corner, now not only reiterated those promises but pledged as well that there would be no recession—their credibility undermined by every unfulfilled promise. Nixon joined the parade of sunshine talkers. In answer to Cornell's press-conference question, he said:

"Our policies have been planned to avoid a recession. I do expect that the present rate of inflation, which was less in the second half of 1969 than in the first half, will continue to decline and that we will be able to control inflation without recession."

Specifically, the President promised that three days later, he would offer a bare-bones budget for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1971. The new budget, he promised, "will be a major blow in stopping the inflation psychology." That budget, in fact, was a much more serious attempt at austerity than his first one a year earlier, and that represented a major, though temporary, victory for Arthur Burns.

Late in December, 1969, Budget Director Mayo had reported to the President at San Clemente that there was no possible way to cut expenditures deeply enough to balance the new budget. But there simply had to be a balanced budget. Everybody in the Administration now agreed with Milton Friedman that the Federal Reserve Board's tight-money policy must be loosened or the economy would strangle. But Dr. Burns, who would replace William McChesney Martin as chairman at the Federal Reserve on January 31, had made clear he could not counternance an easier monetary policy unless *fiscal* policy were tight—that is, at the bare minimum, a balanced budget. With Mayo pleading inability to cut expenditures enough, new revenue would be needed for a balance. The Treasury came up with a $4.5 billion painless tax package: a speedup in estate- and gift-tax collections and higher excises on liquor, tobacco, and gasoline. Nixon promptly bought the package.

But not Arthur Burns. To make fiscal policy properly tight enough was not only a matter of a balanced budget but of a *properly* balanced budget, he told the President, and not a budget balanced through some patchwork tax gimmicks. The implication was clear. There would be no easing of policy at the Federal Reserve unless the last drop of blood was squeezed out of expenditures. Nixon had already made up his mind to go the Burns route when he returned to Washington from San Clemente in time for a January 13 meeting of the Cabinet. Although it lasted three and one-half hours, it was a *pro forma* affair. Mayo pleaded that the budget was uncuttable, supported by Kennedy. Burns's position was voiced with great passion by his usual acolyte, George Romney, who exhorted his colleagues to cut even deeper into their own budgets and capped his plea by an astonishing sermon calling on all members of the Cabinet, *and* the President, to take a 25 percent pay cut. "This is going to make me as popular as a skunk at a Sunday school picnic," he said, and he was right.[7] Soon after the meeting, Nixon ordered anguished department heads to make still greater cuts to achieve a Burns-style balance. When the budget was sent to Congress on Feburary 2, it called for a $1.3 billion surplus.

Arthur Burns had demonstrated that, blessed with the massive power of the Federal Reserve System, he now had leverage with the President that he never had as Counselor. But the victory was one year too late. Nixon, Burns, and everybody else sitting around the Cabinet table on January 13 refused to face the grim reality that there was no possible way to balance the budget, either the Mayo-Kennedy way or the Burns-Romney way. The economic rot of recession was at so advanced a stage that tax receipts were already falling precipitately, which explained why the fat $5.6 billion budget surplus projected by Nixon in his first budget for the year ending July 1, 1970, had disappeared and would end up as a $2.8 billion deficit. As for the 1971 budget, the $1.3 billion surplus bullied through by Burns never had a chance. The recession-induced loss of revenue would, instead, create a deficit to rival Lyndon Johnson's worst.

The President would not admit it, but the game plan was dead. Even before Burns formally replaced Martin, the tight-money policy at the Federal Reserve was quietly abandoned. Burns; in charge made sure that the badly needed money kept flowing into the banking ssytem. By early spring, it was obvious that a massive budget deficit, in excess of $15 billion, was in the works (though Administration officials still piously denied it). If a recession loomed and neither the Federal Reserve nor the budget was now being used to fight inflation, what could be done? More and more, Nixon's economic team was doing what would have been inconceivable a year earlier—looking hard at an incomes policy.

Burn's move to the Federal Reserve Board had not stopped him from lobbying for an incomes policy, vigorously supported by Romney. By May, the combination of rising unemployment and rising inflation led to a desperate attempt to change the game plan toward adopting a modest incomes policy. The President had decided to deliver an address to the nation on the economy in mid-June, and this could be the vehicle for a major turn in policy.

Arthur Burns led off the campaign on May 19 with a major policy speech to the American Bankers Association's Monetary Conference in Hot Springs, Virginia, urging a form of voluntary controls as the only way to fight inflation without risking "a very serious business recession." Second- and third-level officials of the Treasury and the Budget Bureau, meeting with their counterparts from the Council of Economic Advisers (in groups called Troika II and Troika III), began pressing for an incomes policy. On May 28, Dr. Walker went on NBC's *Today* show to say he saw "merit" in a bill by Senator Jacob Javits of New York that would instruct the Council of Economic Advisers to analyze and publicize wage and price decisions to spotlight inflationary increases—the rudimentary start of an incomes policy.

On June 5, Maurice Mann, a professional economist and political independent who had been recruited by Mayo from the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland to become Assistant Budget Director, addressed a Washington meeting of the Rural Electric Cooperative Association and brought out what was happening inside the Administration. Speaking without notes, Mann described the government economists as divided into two camps—one camp for continued tight fiscal and monetary policy, the other camp for attacking inflation with an incomes policy because the present policy was "an abysmal failure." Mann left no doubt he was in the second group. Not until he had finished speaking did he realize that a reporter, Murray Seeger of the Los Angeles *Times*, was present.

Hobart Rowen, business and financial edi-

tor of the Washington *Post*, read Seeger's story on the Los Angeles *Times* news wire and cornered Mann two days later at the District of Columbia Bankers Association's annual convention in Hot Springs, Virginia. Mann then clearly told Rowen what no Administration official had dared to admit up to that point: the Nixon game plan had slowed down the economy without stopping inflation, and "an additional step"—that is, a moderate incomes policy—would be helpful.

To the outside world, all this sound and fury surely was a preliminary barrage preparing everyone for a radical shift, to be revealed in the mid-June speech. But the outside world little knew how the Nixon Administration functioned. In fact, most of the agitation for an incomes policy came from second-echelon officials at the Treasury and Budget Bureau operating without the sanction of their bosses. Walker endorsed the Javits bill without telling Kennedy; Mann did not have Mayo's backing when he publicly endorsed an incomes policy (in fact, his knuckles were later rapped in a telephone call from White House aide Peter Flanigan).

Among officials with direct access to the President, only Burns favored an incomes policy, and he made no progress in early May when he again proposed voluntary controls to the President. Kennedy and Mayo were passive and seemingly uninterested in the entire debate. Paul McCracken publicly denounced Burns's initiative. He admitted privately it might have merit but protested vigorously that the Council was not equipped to oversee wage-price decisions as envisioned in the Javits bill. If Nixon needed any further justification for opposing Burns, it came from Secretary of Labor George Shultz. By the spring of 1970, Shultz's unsmiling, slightly intimidating manner had made him a force to reckon with. Now the Secretary turned his new influence with the President against an incomes policy. It would not work, he argued, and besides that, it would lead to shameful abandonment of the game plan by tending to justify a reckless binge of deficit spending. Indeed, Shultz told Nixon, the Hot Springs speech by Burns advocating an incomes policy was inflationary in itself. It would impel businessmen to raise prices quickly *before* an incomes policy was instituted.

With that lineup, the final draft of the speech handed Nixon for his final editing and rewriting did not contain anything that even went so far in the direction of an incomes policy as the very mild Javits bill. A baby step was the announcement of periodic Inflation Alerts to be issued by the Council of Economic Advisers "to call attention to outstanding cases of price or wage increase"—in other words, jawboning *after* the fact.[8] It was a slight departure from total laissez-faire on wages and prices but a bitter disappointment for many who had hoped for a major departure. In his speech to the nation over radio and television at noon on June 17, the President once again indulged his deeply felt bias against government interference in wage-price decisions in prose unmistakably his own.

"Now, I realize that there are some people who get satisfaction out of seeing an individual businessman or labor leader called on the carpet and brow-beaten by Government officials. But we cannot protect the value of the dollar by passing the buck. That sort of grandstanding distracts attention from the real cause of inflation and it can be a dangerous misuse of the power of Government."

It was as if the past eighteen months of deepening failure had not occurred, as if Arthur Burns had not made serious proposals that had nothing to do with "brow-beating" anybody or "grandstanding," as if serious economists in his own Administration were not turning toward an incomes policy. Never did the failure of communication between the President and the experts in his own Administration come through more clearly.

A few days before that speech, the President took a step that further militated against an incomes policy in the foreseeable future.

In December, 1969, Nixon had briefed Robert Mayo on the details of a major reorganization of the Executive Office of the President, not to be publicly disclosed until the next spring, that would transform the Bureau of the Budget into a new Office of Management and Budget (OMB), with greatly enhanced authority for managing the entire federal government. In one of those countless misunderstandings, derived from Nixon's often oblique manner of conversation, Mayo got the idea that the job would be his. In fact, however, the President had no intention of giving a post of such vast and pervasive power to a man with whom he had little rapport and in whom he had no great confidence. But he said nothing of this to Mayo. Mayo did not learn the President's real frame of mind until he received a telephone call from a White House aide on June 8, 1970. The aide bluntly informed Mayo that the President on June 10 would name George Shultz as director of OMB, with Mayo shunted off with the title of Counselor (retaining Cabinet rank), obviously a way station while he found other employment.[9] There was no telephone call from Nixon himself.

The humiliation of Robert Mayo was transcended by the elevation of George Shultz. Having managed to impress the President and shape his policies while operating from the bureaucratic backwater of the Labor Department, he now had unlimited possibilities functioning from the White House as general manager for the entire federal government. Replacing Mayo on the Quadriad, he would become the dominant force whose influence would far eclipse that of McCracken, Kennedy, and Burns. Behind his back, some of the government's top economists belittled Shultz, describing him as an academic proficient in the study of wage structuring but not in macroeconomics. They questioned his competence to be the President's most influential adviser on what had become his most serious domestic problem. But that Shultz *was* his most influential economic adviser could be denied by nobody. In terms of mid-1970, that meant an end to any immediate hopes for a meaningful incomes policy, because Shultz's doctrinaire opposition to it would only reinforce Nixon's emotional bias against it. Maurice Mann, one of the most forceful advocates of an incomes policy, quickly perceived the incompatibility of his own economic views and Shultz's, and quietly left the Budget Bureau and the government. Walker and other Treasury officials pushing for an incomes policy went underground. At the Federal Reserve, Arthur Burns bided his time.

Through the summer and autumn of 1970, inflation and recession worsened together to stunt hopes for significant Republican gains in November. By summer, nothing could be done in time for that year's elections about either inflation or recession. In all fairness to Nixon and his economic advisers, they had inherited from Lyndon Johnson a raging inflation that might have persisted against any proposed remedy, including an incomes policy. Nor was the intensity of the recession wholly attributable to the Nixon game plan: the United Auto Workers struck the General Motors Corporation on September 14, closing plants for the rest of the year and deepening economic distress.

Yet, pervading all the bad luck was a certain thoughtless separation between dream and reality.

In November 5, 1970, two days after the congressional elections, signals began pouring out of the President's Council of Economic Advisers that a change in the economic game plan was in order. "Economic policy like other (policies) has to be responsive to the nation will," said Paul McCracken, chairman of the Council. Two days later, another member of the Council, Herbert Stein, flatly predicted a return to full employment by mid-1972. What the Council members were proposing was clear enough: a switch to an expansionary economic policy to fight the recession and give up the struggle against inflation. That would be an attack on one of the two serpent heads of Nixonomics—the one that had caused by far the most damage in the just completed election. Republican politicians who had suffered badly in 1970 and feared even worse for 1972 were pleading for an all-out attack on the recession.

At the Treasury, Secretary Kennedy and Under-secretary Walker were appalled. They argued privately that victory over inflation was in sight if only the government did not panic by throwing more fuel on the fire. After all, the Treasury men reasoned, the recession that had been induced in a so far unsuccessful effort to slow down inflation had already done its damage to the President and the party. Why make the switch now after the election lossses? There would be enough time to step up the economy, if need be, before the 1972 election. That line only showed how out of touch with the White House David Kennedy had become. For in fact, McCracken and Stein were reflecting Richard Nixon's views. These had hardened long before the election, but the President had kept silent about them.

In part, the change was due to the growing influence of George Shultz, who had taken over as director of the newly reorganized Office of Management and Budget on July 1. A clue to the revised standings in relative power at the White House came in late summer during a visit to Nixon by Senator Robert Dole of Kansas. Dole expressed chagrin at his inability to contact Presidential Counsel John Ehrlichman and told Nixon he would like to meet him some day. "Ehrlichman?" retorted the President. "Don't worry about him." Then, picking up his telephone, he said: "I'll put you in touch with somebody who really counts: George Shultz."

As one who really counted, Shultz was able to implant his economic views on Nixon as nobody else had in the first two years of the Nixon Administration. By November, 1970. Shultz had convinced Nixon of the worth of these economic views:

Full-Employment Budget: An old proposal by liberal economists for the past generation, in envisioned the budget being balanced when expenditures were no higher than revenue would be *if* there were full employment (that is, unemployment no higher than about 4 percent). Thus, with unemployment well over 6 percent, the President could claim a budget balanced on the full-employment theory, even though, in fact, there would be a substantial budget deficit—sheer heresy for a conservative Republican.

Money-Supply Expansion: As a doctrinaire exponent of Professor Milton Friedman's theories, Shultz wanted the money supply expanded at a steady rate and at a faster rate than the Federal Reserve Board under Arthur Burn's leadership was approving.

Incomes Policy: In a slight break with Nixon's iron opposition to any incomes policy of significance, Shultz was advocating an attempt to hold down prices and wages by withdrawing artificial government supports—such as import quotas and labor union privileges—but in no other way. That meant continued opposition to Burn's proposal for a return to wage-price guideposts.

Long before election day, Nixon was committed to an expansionary policy that would run a considerable deficit, saying nothing about it only because of his adamant political position that conceding that anything at all

Footnotes at end of article.

was wrong with the economy would be playing into Democratic hands. The Treasury's post-election opposition crumpled quickly.

But the Nixon-Shultz plans for money-supply expansion and incomes policy ran into trouble from Arthur Burns, who had recommended George Shultz as Secretary of Labor but felt him inadequate as an economist to be grand designer of the nation's economic policy. On the morning of November 20 in a meeting at the White House, Nixon, reflecting Shultz's viewpoint, urged Burns to expand the money supply at a faster rate. In response, Burns reiterated his old position that some incomes policy, some government restraint on wages and prices, was necessary. As a specific example, he urged presidential suspension of the Davis-Bacon Act, ensuring that construction workers on federal projects get the high prevailing union wage rates. That suspension would be a big stick to pressure the building trades unions to hold down their inflationary wage settlements.

In the early months of 1971, Nixon edged ever so cautiously closer to a working incomes policy. He forced a partial rollback of a Bethlehem Steel price increase by threatening to end the import quota on foreign steel, a withdrawal of artificial government aid that would have fallen within the boundaries of Shultz's doctrinal approval. Nixon finally did suspend Davis-Bacon after first weighing a flat freeze on construction-industry wages and prices proposed by James Hodgson—Shultz's hand-picked successor as Secretary of Labor—but opposed by Shultz. This ended Nixon's adamant opposition through his first two years as President to intervention in wage-price decisions but was nowhere near a full-scale policy to hold down wages and prices on a systematic basis.

The question posed nearly two years earlier, whether Richard Nixon would rather fight inflation than be elected to a second term, was now being answered. While defending the battered old game plan and declaring that "the worst of inflation is over," the President was really abandoning the game plan and saying that inflation was far the lesser evil when compared with recession. The way in which the fight against inflation was being placed in a secondary position became clear when the budget for the year ending July 1, 1972, was submitted to Congress on January 29, 1971. The deficit was calculated at $11.6 billion (under the full-employment budget concept, it would have brought a surplus of $100 million had the country been at full employment, said the President). But this was based on revenue generated by an economy at the level of a $1065 billion Gross National Product—a ludicrously high figure, in the opinion of most economists. In truth, everybody was sure that the deficit would be around $20 billion, producing some $40 billion in red-ink spending for two years, with the budget running wild, out of control, for the years ahead. That was the true extent of the game plan's abandonment.

Equally important as this switch to an expansionary policy in its implications for the future was a change of vast importance in Nixon's economic team made just after the election. The President determined that David Kennedy's disappointing tenure at the Treasury had to come to an end. Kennedy, scarcely a Hickel or a Romney in his self-effacing manner, was happy enough to leave a post that had become increasingly unpleasant. To replace him, Nixon wanted somebody who could dynamically and actively sell his new, expansive economic program (along with his new legislative proposals) to the press, the Congress, the business community, and the nation. Dr. Charls Walker, who in two years had performed most of Kennedy's duties in dealing with Congress and the press, fit that description perfectly and was eager for the advancement. But the tax reform fight had left bad blood between Walker and White House aides John Ehrlichman and Peter Flanigan, who successfully convinced Nixon that Walker would be a mistake. They wanted a prominent bank president from Wall Street or the West Coast. But after the David Kennedy experience, the President was wary of bankers. Besides, with his love for novelty, and frustrated by the premature detonation of the bombshell he had hoped to set off by making Patrick Moynihan ambassador to the United Nations, Nixon wanted a surprise that would stun Washington and, perhaps, energize his drowsy Administration for the two years ahead.

John B. Connally's performance on the Ash Council on Government Reorganization impressed the President. Like John Mitchell, Connally has the imperious air of authority, self-possession, and masterfulness that Nixon lacks, and therefore so admires in others. Soon after the 1970 election, the President began commenting to close aides about Connally and asking their opinion of him. But nobody faintly guessed that the President was thinking about the Treasury. After ten days and three meetings, Connally, who first refused the job, finally said yes. On December 14, Nixon had his stunning surprise.

From Nixon's standpoint it made sense. He finally had a Democrat in the Cabinet, albeit a very conservative Democrat who for the past decade had led the Tory wing of the Texas Democratic Party. Texas Republicans gasped at the betrayal by Nixon in bestowing this honor on their great enemy, but Connally's presence in the Nixon Administration could only help the President's chances to carry Texas in 1972, which might be vital to his re-election. He added strength to a Cabinet that was weak and would become weaker when Mitchell resigned to become campaign manager for 1972. And here was a Stetson-wearing supersalesman who could make Nixon's economic-progress game plan plausible to the Nation. The only drawback was John Connally's lack of qualification to be Secretary of the Treasury. An able lawyer, businessman, and politician, he had no familiarity with fiscal and monetary affairs. But that was scarcely relevant; there had not for a long time been a Secretary better qualified than David Kennedy, and look what happened to him.

In the spring of 1971, nobody could be sure whether the mistakes of 1969 and 1970 would cost Richard Nixon a second term. Despite all the heavy deficit spending, unemployment remained over 6 percent in early May and the business recovery was sluggish. Not even optimists felt that unemployment would fall below 5 percent before election day, 1972. The best news was the economic consensus that 1972 would be a pretty good year, though how good was a matter of sharp debate. The Davis-Bacon suspension was called off in return for construction labor's agreement to negotiate limits on wage increases, perhaps the thin end of a wedge on the incomes policy that Nixon had resisted for so long. The rate of inflation had slowed, but not noticeably so in the opinion of the consumer (the 1957–1959 dollar now having dropped in value to 71.8 cents compared with 81.1 cents when Nixon took office). At the Federal Reserve, Arthur Burns was being forced to slow down the rate of money expansion with the attendant danger of boosting interest rates and slowing down the recovery. It was a mixed picture, better than the previous dreary autumn but not as good as it could be.

Nor were the personal power relationships clear. Connally was now the only noneconomist, the only businessman, and the only politician on a Quadriad of strong men, joining economists Shultz, Burns, and McCracken. Unlike them, his mind was open on almost all economic questions. (Arthur Burns confided to friends that he thought Connally was "educable.") How he would act in crisis was anbody's guess. He sided with Burns and against McCracken and Shultz in being willing to propose personal tax reductions and a reinstatement of the business investment tax credit if necessary to stimulate the economy. In late April, Connally sharply criticized a prime-interest-rate increase by the nation's banks while it was being defended by McCracken. But he was so concerned with emergency assignments (such as the controversial plan to bail out the beleaguered Lockheed Corporation) that his overall power position was uncertain. His strength against Shultz had not really been tested. Nevertheless, with his direct access to the President assured, the certainty was that he would act and act unfettered by doctrine. That would be something new in President Nixon's management of the economy.

FOOTNOTES

[1] In an eloquent passage in *The Making of the President: 1968*, White gave his own views of inflation: "As in other inflations I have lived through, notably those in China during the war, and Germany and France after the war, the beginning ravages are almost unnoticeable, indeed, pleasant. As inflation continues, however, it changes moralities, it destroys reason itself. Prosperity opens opportunities; inflation urges haste in using them. Not saving, but shrewd spending becomes the mark of wisdom in planning; the 'operators,' not the creators, thrive. It divides those who can manipulate from those locked into fixed incomes who see their resources dwindling and their savings shrinking, who are helpless to recapture their share of rising well-being. Above all, it victimizes the poor, the old and those who have planned ahead. Inflation is, at the beginning, a technical problem of public finance—and in the end raises problems of morality, of the disciplining of indulgences artificially incubated by the disappearance of values."

[2] The Quadriad consists of the four top economic officials of the government: the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, the Secretary of the Treasury, the director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. The Troika consists of the three top economic officials of the Administration: the Quadriad less the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, an independent official serving a fixed term and not a member of the Administration.

[3] This euphoric mood of high incomes and quick profits made it difficult for Nixon's talent scouts to lure young business executives to middle-level government jobs after the 1968 election. "The money tree is running in New York, and the young fellows want to tap it rather than come down to Washington," said one such talent scout.

[4] Actually, the size of the surplus was exaggerated by a new accounting method (recommended by a citizens' commission headed by David Kennedy) that had taken effect on January 1, 1968, and for the first time counted Social Security trust funds as part of the budgetary picture. For example, Johnson's calamitous $28.1 billion deficit would have been $25.1 under the new system.

[5] In the same speech, Kennedy warned that wage and price controls might be used as the ultimate weapon to curb inflation if all else failed. Since Nixon had unequivocally ruled out such controls, the White House was not pleased with Kennedy's attempt to dramatize the Administration's concern with the situation.

[6] The six-month reprieve scarcely blunted the fury of the governors at Colorado Springs. Typical was the reaction of Governor Tom McCall of Oregon, a Republican, who said he was "horrified" by the cutback, then added: "It would stop inflation, but it might also stop the economy in its tracks."

[7] Romney voluntarily took the 25 percent pay reduction though no other Cabinet mem-

ber followed his example. On May 20, his wife, Lenore, told the Detroit press that it had resulted in some penny-pinching: "We don't take vacations, we don't have a maid and George helps me with the dishes."

[8] McCracken issued the first Inflation Alert on August 8, 1970, a 123-page document describing wage increases in the trucking and construction industries and price increases for cigarettes, rubber, and electric power as contributing to the cost of living. Its impact on public opinion was invisible.

[9] This now made four Cabinet-rank Counselors at the White House with no duties or responsibilities: Bryce Harlow, Moynihan, Robert Finch, and Mayo. However, on July 18, Mayo announced he was resigning to become president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago.

CONGRESS OFFERS HOPE FOR BLACKS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BYRNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a fine article by my colleague and neighbor, ROBERT NIX, appeared in the June 29 edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer. Discussed in the incisive manner for which Mr. NIX is known are the important subjects of the President's use of his veto power and the withholding of $12 billion in funds appropriated by this Congress. I commend my colleague's splendid article to the Members of the House:

BLACK CAUCUS VERSUS THE ADMINISTRATION: CONGRESS OFFERS HOPE FOR BLACKS

(By ROBERT N. C. NIX)

President Nixon and the Congressional Black Caucus exchanged three voluminous documents in the past few months seeking to ascertain the efficacy of the administration's response to the nation's most serious domestic problems.

The result of these exchanges, by no means satisfying, was wholly predictable.

The President, as expected, defended his administration's languid performance in domestic affairs by treating the caucus' 60 areas of concern as an exercise in rebuttal.

Asked to initiate innovative and imaginative new programs and release at least part of the $12 billion in withheld funds to expand successful projects, he chose instead to codify the painfully inadequate programs of federal assistance with an occasional hint of some future nuance in policy.

The President's specious response should have surprised few who have followed the administration's intransigent domestic policies—especially my 12 colleagues of the caucus.

While I am in general agreement with the ideas and points expressed by the caucus, I am concerned that we do not become so enraptured by rhetorical exercises with the President that we forget where our real power lies.

That power is with the Congress and its ability to respond even when faced with obdurate opposition from the executive branch. We have seen two very recent examples of Congressional initiative.

Specifically, these were the $5.5 billion Economic Development bill and the $1 billion Public Service Employment legislation. The latter measure would create more than 150,000 public service jobs in a time of high unemployment, 7000 of which would be available in metropolitan Philadelphia.

Both of these measures cleared the House of Representatives over administration objections and both are responsive to the crisis caused by a national unemployment rate of 6.2 percent.

As in the last Congress there is every likelihood that the President will exercise his veto power. He must not be permitted to succeed and it is toward this end that the energies of the caucus can best be expended.

Last March, when the caucus obtained its long-awaited meeting with the President and his advisers, I suggested that the effect of the nine principal vetoes of the last Congress was to make life a little less tolerable for the nation's disadvantaged.

Those vetoes, to name a few, prevented:

A 34 percent increase in appropriations for vocational education and a doubling of funds to $3.6 billion for educationally deprived children.

An emergency employment act to create 300,000 public service jobs at a time when the unemployment rate was steadily climbing to its present unacceptable rate of 6.2 percent of the total work force.

An additional $350 million to the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist cities in the purchase of water and sewer systems.

To these vetoed bills can be added billions of dollars appropriated by the Congress but withheld by the administration. These include:

$942 million for low rent public housing.

$583 million for Model Cities programs.

$300 million for urban mass transit.

$31 million in Federal assistance to education.

It can be supposed that the unprecedented withholding of $12 billion in appropriated federal funds is yet added pressure on the Congress to adopt the administration's general revenue sharing plan.

The Congress, however, has voiced serious concerns to the administration's concept, especially since the counterproposal offered by Wilbur Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, which would funnel funds directly to the cities where the need is the greatest.

As is too often the case, the effect of this disagreement between the administration and the Congress is to delay assistance to the disadvantaged in our society.

As the caucus noted in its report of May 24:

"By not spending urban fiscal funds appropriated for this fiscal year until next fiscal year . . . (the) administration is prepared to accept the suffering of millions of poor people in order that it may strategically release funds at some other time."

Reflecting on the disturbing collection of Presidential vetoes and the unconstitutional withholding of duly appropriated funds—much of which touch on some aspect of federal assistance to the disadvantaged—I believe it is fair to question just where the heart of this administration lies.

It does not appear to reside with the interest of the poor, the unskilled, the uneducated, the disadvantaged.

THE SHARPSTOWN FOLLIES—IX

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, at curtain time yesterday, we saw the great Sharp fish swimming off down the river, having escaped the nets of the Department of Justice. You will recall that the prosecutors in the Department decided that the nets should be cut, so that the great Sharp fish would be assured of getting away. And so he did.

The Sharp fish, you may recall, succeeded in diminishing various fortunes by about $12 million. He did this by systematic looting of the companies he controlled, by stock manipulations, and by assorted other schemes large and small.

The Department of Justice, rather than going after that Sharp, has decided to seek out all the smaller fish in his schemes. They seem to have been trying to tell us that the best way to catch the little fish is to let the big one off the hook. It is sort of like pretending that you have the big Sharp when in fact all you have got is a mess of pilot fish, barnacles, and assorted other lesser creatures.

Now you might ask why the Department of Justice cut its own nets. The reason is that they fear that if they had made any effort to catch the great Sharp, they would have also caught one of their own, or at least embarrassed him. Rather than do that, they made a deal with Sharp, and decided to settle for going after smaller fish.

You see, Will Wilson, the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, was not very long ago a close member of the school that swam along with Sharp.

Mr. Wilson advised Sharp, set up some of his biggest deals, owned stock in his enterprises, and served as counsel for a couple of Sharp's biggest companies. As a matter of fact, Wilson's law firm did perhaps the bulk of its business for Sharp.

Of course, no lawyer works for free. Mr. Wilson was on a retainer from Sharp. I should say retainers, because he had several of them. His income from these retainers was substantial. Just from those basic retainers, and not counting any of his other income, perquisites or emoluments from the Sharp enterprises, Will Wilson was earning about $40,000 a year.

Mr. Wilson has of course been silent about his relationship with Mr. Sharp. Silence is golden, they say—and his taciturnity in this matter surely is golden.

In a few days I will begin telling just what Mr. Wilson did to earn all that money from Mr. Sharp.

For the present, however, I want to dwell on just how incredible the deal was that let Mr. Sharp go.

The U.S. attorney must prosecute many cases. You might expect—I expect—and average citizens expect that the law will be equally applied to all. Now if an ordinary citizen goes out and robs a store we are not surprised if he is tried and sentenced to 10 years or 20 years or more. We are not shocked to see petty criminals jailed for a long period of time. We are not surprised too much when an interstate chicken thief gets a 3-year residency in the Federal jail. But we ought to be surprised, shocked, and angered when a man can steal literally millions of dollars and get a probated sentence, and a fine. In exchange for a plea of guilty on a couple of his very smallest crimes, the multimillion-dollar swindler gets complete immunity—at the request, no less, of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Frank Sharp made many deals, but this deal with the Justice Department was the biggest bargain he ever got.

The only loser in this case is the concept of equal justice. You and I know that

this man was no ordinary thief. He got extraordinary treatment. We have a right to know why.

I am asking why, and I will keep asking until the truth is fully known and exposed.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply shocked at the administration's utter disregard for our Nation's economic problems. Unemployment now stands above 6 percent, the highest in almost 10 years, prices are still rising at more than 5 percent, and yet the administration is just sitting on the fence, not really doing anything effective about either unemployment or inflation. We have a new term to describe the present state of our economy: Stagflation.

President Nixon was elected on the promise of eliminating inflation without increasing unemployment. When questioned as to the possibility of such results on election eve in 1968, Mr. Nixon stated that the only person he wanted to see unemployed was President Johnson's chief economic adviser. But since his election, over 2,400,000 have been added to the unemployment rolls, and there is no indication that inflation has been controlled.

In order to reduce unemployment the real output must increase more than 4½ percent this year. Presently, it is growing at approximately 3½ percent and, if this continues, unemployment will increase. The President's attempts to stimulate the economy are a dismal failure, even according to his own projections made in February of this year. The second quarter figures for GNP were a full $10 billion short of the administration forecast, derived from what most professional economists call the White House magic monetary model.

In hearings before the Joint Economic Committee in February, administration witnesses repeatedly defended the model and the $1,065 billion figure for GNP. No professional outside economists gave a projection of over $1,050 billion. On Tuesday of this week the administration finally admitted that their forecast was wrong and revised their figures downward to match those of the professional outside economists.

The President's own economic advisers now admit the economy needs a strong stimulus; he has refused to follow this advice.

Similarly, administration witnesses previously claimed the President's budget was expansionary and provided plenty of fiscal stimulus to get the stagnated economy going again. But anyone who looks at the budget can see it is not any more stimulative than the 1971 fiscal budget that brought on the recession. The full employment surplus in both budgets is almost exactly the same.

The majority of professional economists outside the administration point out the budget needs an additional $8 to $12 billion stimulus to get unemployment down to 4½ percent by the middle of next year. The administration's hope for success is based upon a so-called "jack-in-the-box" theory, which, simply put, means that all of a sudden, sometime in the last half of 1971, consumer demand will instantly spurt upward. Unfortunately, there is nothing to indicate that this will take place. One cannot talk the economy out of a recession. It is necessary to take action, and some strong fiscal stimulus is presently in order.

Thursday's veto of the public works bill clearly demonstrates the President's utter disregard for our Nation's unemployed. The decision can be termed only as callous, and clearly demonstrates a stubborn refusal on his part to admit that his economic policies have been unsuccessful. Secretary of the Treasury Connally now tells us we have to have a war to enjoy full employment. The President has told the American people that the unemployment is resulting from the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. This proposition, that we cannot have peace and prosperity, is patently absurd. Japan is a shining example of how a country can be extremely prosperous and yet spend almost nothing on defense.

The President's anti-inflation policies have done no better. They have reduced the rising price level by only 1 percent at a cost of 2½ million more unemployed. The President should realize by now that you cannot beat the inflation out of the economy by simply raising unemployment. Sound economic policy is not that easy given the structure of our economy.

Given the power of both big business and labor, it is impossible to reduce the inflationary pressure without some intervention on the part of the administration into the wage-price decisions. This so-called jawboning was very effective during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, but President Nixon refuses to take such action. Thus we find entire industries, even with sales falling off, raising their prices in spite of foreign competition, and unions getting whopping wage increases in industries with unusually high unemployment.

The time to solve our economic problems is long past due. The budget must be made more stimulative and the administration must get involved in the major wage-price decisions while they are being made, not after the fact.

Providing the proper temporary fiscal stimulus is very difficult because of delays and time lags in implementation. Both taxing and spending policies designed to curb recessions may be too late, or become permanent and cannot be adjusted to fit the need of the economy at any time. All of us will agree that public works projects should not depend upon whether we are in a recession or at full employment, but should be decided on their merits.

What is necessary is to introduce some new automatic stabilizers into our fiscal policy programs. These stabilizers are temporary and would increase expenditures automatically when unemployment increased, and disappear when the economy approaches full employment. The word temporary is important, and these measures are much better than accelerated depreciation allowances the administration has proposed. Similarly, an across-the-board tax cut would continue to add stimulation to the economy until the taxes are raised again, and we all know how difficult that is.

Presently, there are many factors that prolong recession. As unemployment rises, States pay out more benefits while receiving smaller tax receipts. To make up for the loss they are forced to raise taxes, leaving the workers with less take-home pay and less to spend on consumer goods, reducing the demand for consumer items, and finally causing more unemployment. There are many other similar examples.

Today I will list six measures we can take to solve our unemployment woes. These measures are unique in that they will disappear at full employment. These measures are designed to give a temporary stimulus to the economy, while at the same time, through wage-price policies, checking inflation.

First, we should advance the already enacted personal income tax changes, scheduled to go into effect in 1973.

I suggest we make retroactive to January 1, 1971, the scheduled $750 personal exemption, the low-income allowance, and the increase in the standard deduction presently scheduled to go into effect in 1973. The IRS could change the withholding rates in less than a month and the desired effects would come immediately thereafter. Since these changes have already been legislated it would be a small task to simply advance their implementation. The Treasury Tax Study Division has told me this would reduce income tax collecting and thereby stimulate the economy by approximately $5.6 billion in the present fiscal year.

Second, we should delay for 1 year the scheduled increase in social security taxes. The social security tax ceiling has been increased from $7,800 to $9,000. A delay would produce an additional stimulus of $3 billion during the second half of the calendar year.

Third, we should increase unemployment compensation to the men being discharged from our Armed Forces. Their present high unemployment rates are clearly a national tragedy. Their unemployment benefits run out after 26 weeks and average only $52 per week.

Presently, there are 110,000 recently discharged veterans receiving unemployment compensation and who knows how many more whose benefits have run out. One current measure before the House would increase the weekly benefits and increase the length of time a veteran can receive these benefits. I urge that we adopt the measure.

Fourth, we should formulate grants-in-aid so that they work as automatic stabilizers. These grants could be triggered into effect when the national unemployment rate exceeds 4.5 percent for 3 consecutive months.

During a recession States pay out—un-

employment benefits, welfare costs, et cetera—more than they take in—unemployment taxes, income, and sales taxes, et cetera. This puts them in a budget squeeze which causes them to either reduce State expenditures or raise taxes. Either of these options tends to prolong the recession as either decreases the demand for goods and services.

If States would receive Federal payments which would automatically kick in on the outset or a recession and kick out at full employment this unhappy choice could be avoided and the economy would not be further depressced.

Fifth, we must override the President's veto of the accelerated public works bill. This proposal also triggers automatically into action when the unemployment rates go over 4.5 percent for 3 consecutive months.

Sixth, but in no way least, the administration must start jawboning business and labor to reduce the inflationary impact of wage and price decisions. As I have stated today, it is time for action. We must force the administration to get off the fence and into getting the economy back on a stable growth path.

What is needed is the kind of temporary stimulus I have recommended here along with some forceful wage-price guidelines to deal with the inflation. It is time for some policies that make good, sound economic sense.

THE CONSERVATIVE REVOLT

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, now is the time for all good Republicans to come to the aid of their country. Trite? Yes, but nevertheless true. Indeed, it is a time for all good men—Republican or not—to do so.

Why? I could point to any number of reasons, but the one which really concerns me, the one which I feel holds such great danger for the future of our country that I must comment on it, is the recent passage of the bill H.R. 1 containing the so-called family assistance plan for reforming welfare.

Given the bill's complexity, the short time Members had after it was reported to study it in any depth before it was considered on the floor, and the array of top-level bipartisan support it had—or appeared to have—the crucial 234 to 187 vote by which the welfare reform proposals survived in the House was a relatively narrow margin. It indicates extensive dissatisfaction with H.R. 1's approach. An even narrower escape occurred on the 200 to 172 vote on the effort of opponents of FAP to open the rule to amendment. As Senator CARL CURTIS recently pointed out in his analysis of the House action, half of the Republican Members deserted the administration on that procedural vote.

I have carefully reviewed President Nixon's speeches and remarks outlining what he desires in the way of welfare reform. I find myself in virtually complete agreement with my President on this issue, except at the point where he identifies H.R. 1 as carrying out his desires. I have carefully reviewed the bill, the report, and the debate which occurred prior to the passage of H.R. 1 by the House, and try as I will I am unable to see how this measure can possibly be counted upon to accomplish the things the President has said he wants in the way of welfare reform.

I am convinced that there is a rational, though admittedly very discouraging, explanation for this. I am satisfied that people around the President—both in the White House and in the Executive agencies—are deliberately misleading him as to the actual content of this measure and shielding him from the true nature and extent of the opposition to this ill-conceived and potentially catastrophic piece of legislation.

I realize this is a serious charge. And I find it very disheartening to have arrived at such a conclusion. It is indeed distressing to think that there are those in powerful advisory positions who would encourage the President to put his stamp of approval on a measure which is not only contrary to the best interests of the people it purports to help, but is destructive of the philosophy and hence of the success of the Republican Party, which the President heads and, more importantly, destructive of the very foundations and cornerstones of the American federal system.

But legislation which seeks to aid the poor and improve the welfare system by putting twice as many people on the dole and "welfarizing" the working poor, who heretofore have taken pride in the fact that they are caring for themselves, can hardly be conceived of as being in their best interests.

The upward mobility which exists in our still relatively free economy and society has enabled us to move from a level of 22.4 percent of our people living at or below the poverty level in 1959 to only 12.8 percent in 1968. This indicates that we ought to be aiming at improving the economy and opening up new job markets rather than burdening the taxpayers of America with a $5 billion additional welfare burden. This cannot be in the best interests of the American taxpayer or the American economy.

Legislation which turns over to the Federal Government entire responsibility for administering a program whose present faults it is largely responsible for and which destroys the concept of federalism by forcing uniformity on a program which by its very nature must permit recognition of local and regional geographic, economic, and social differences, cannot be in the best interests of our country.

And a bill which is destructive of all these things cannot be in the best interests of the President or his party, in either the long or short range. One need only read the debate on the bill, including many of the remarks of its advocates, to find an abundance of additional objections to it. I have highlighted only the most obvious and powerful ones.

Why, then, do we find administration endorsement of such legislation? I can only conclude that it is because there are people around the President who are either incompetent to determine the economic, social, or political meaning and impact of a measure which admittedly has been largely refashioned by the Democratic chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, or else they are deliberately leading the President down the primrose path.

I would like to include in the RECORD at the close of my remarks the June 29 column of Kevin P. Phillips which appeared in the Washington Post. I believe Mr. Phillips' column lends credence to my analysis of what is happening and, if it is true, there is nothing trite in a plea for all men, and especially all good Republicans, to come to the aid of their country.

It is my sincere hope that the Senate Finance Committee will take a long, hard look at the very useful and viable alternative to welfare reform which has been introduced in the form of the Curtis-Duncan bill. This alternative adapts the concept of revenue sharing as a solution to the current welfare problems. It is a measure which is not only sensible and practicable, but one which carries out the expressed desires of the President on both welfare reform and revenue sharing and, thus, should be one which the administration could easily support, if and when it recognizes or admits the truth about H.R. 1 and will open its mind to an alternative that is even more reflective of the goals it has consistently espoused.

The article follows:

THE CONSERVATIVE REVOLT

(By Kevin P. Phillips)

Signs of a conservative revolt against President Nixon appear to be cropping up. It reaches from New York City to the halls of Congress and beyond to the South and to California, and is gathering a momentum that may yet produce tremors in White House complacency.

Item: On June 14, a half dozen of the young men whose 1967-68 efforts helped to put Richard Nixon in the White House met secretly in Washington to translate their disillusionment with the administration into an action blueprint. Others, not at the meeting, are keeping close liaison. These angry young men—some of whom now worry that the Nixon Administration may be blighting conservative prospects—include four or five names from "The Making of the President 1968."

Item: Top 1968 and 1970 campaign strategists for Vice President Agnew, including former presidential counselor Bryce Harlow, are urging Agnew to fight for his career just as Mr. Nixon did in 1965 (when President Eisenhower wanted to dump him). Agnew's friends are telling him to okay a Committee to Reelect the Vice President and to begin mobilizing party grassroots and organizational support.

Item: The editors and associates of National Review met several weeks ago in New York to discuss their growing unhappiness with the administration. NR editor and columnist William F. Buckley, for one, is deeply disturbed about the White House's weak military preparedness posture. Another NR editor is talking to the N.Y. Conservative Party about refusing to endorse the President in 1972.

Item: The anti-Nixonism of The New Guard and Battle Line (journals of Young

Americans for Freedom and the American Conservative Union) has now spread to the conservative newspaper Human Events, which intends to launch a series of blasts against the White House and its top staff.

Item: Leaders of the "Regular Republican" group in the House of Representatives—a bloc of 70 to 80 conservatives—have decided to step up their fight against liberal Nixon domestic programs. With Rep. Samuel Devine of Ohio and Rep. Edward Derwinski of Illinois calling the shots, the Regulars bucked the entire House GOP leadership and sought to open up the gag rule under which the administration's multi-billion dollar welfare bill was to be considered with no amendments being allowed. This maneuver on June 21 caught the White House and congressional leadership off guard, and failed only by the surprisingly close vote of 200 to 172. Emboldened, the Regulars intend to escalate their attack.

Item: Mississippi GOP Chairman Clarke Reed, leader of the Association of Southern Republican Chairmen, is considering calling a regional conference of party leaders to convey Dixie's anger over the new school busing requirements being imposed by the Nixon administration. Sen. William E. Brock of Tennessee, a close associate in the 1968 Nixon campaign, has also begun to part company with the White House over the schools issue.

Item: J. Daniel Mahoney, chairman of the New York State Conservative Party, is unhappy with the administration, and is under increasing pressure from his party executive committee to "stay loose" on endorsing Mr. Nixon in 1972. In 1968, Mahoney had to work hard to overcome party worker's sentiment for running their own presidential candidate on the Conservative line.

On the plus side for Mr. Nixon, though, is the general belief in conservative circles that California Governor Ronald Reagan has made his deal with the President, and, at least for the moment, is not extending meaningful support to any insurgency.

Previous conservative "revolts" have come to little, and this one may follow suit. The White House is preoccupied with Reagan, and Nixon strategists believe that without the Governor, the conservatives have nowhere to go. Perhaps. Yet a deeper anger may be brewing.

The disgruntled men and factions do not represent a common point of view. Some pine for a return to the obsolete philosophy of the McKinley era, while others are irked because the administration has refused to develop a positive "neo-conservative" philosophy with which to appeal to Middle America.

But they do share a common feeling that the President has abandoned too many Republican and/or conservative principles and gained or built nothing in the process.

ROLL CALL VOTES ON APPROPRIATIONS MEASURES

(Mr. DELLENBACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, during the month of June, the House of Representatives has moved in a most commendable manner by completing action on seven of the major annual appropriation bills.

However, one aspect of the consideration of these bills has caused me great concern. That is the final passage by simple voice vote of several of these major appropriation measures.

This procedure is in conflict with the goals of congressional reform that a very considerable majority of the House supported last year and still supports. If we are to be good legislators, and worthwhile Representatives of our constituencies, then the public has a right to know where we stand on all major issues coming before the House.

The concepts of accountability and full disclosure of a Member's views cannot help but clash with the silent anonymity of a voice vote. The lateness of the hour, or a desire to avoid public disclosure of an unpopular stand, are slight obstacles to the goal of our individual constituencies knowing how we voted on major pieces of legislation.

Far too frequently, as took place very recently in connection with the Agriculture and HUD appropriations, measures authorizing the spending of billions of dollars passed the House on voice votes with no record of where each Member of Congress stood on the issues.

Surely we wish to eliminate in the minds of the American public any question that the House of Representatives is reluctant to have each Member make exactly clear his stand on all issues. It is especially critical that the public know where Members stand on vitally important appropriations bills.

There may be a few Members who do not want to take a firm and open position on an appropriation bill, but it is my firm belief that the vast majority of the Members of the House want our constituents and the American public in general to know exactly where we stand on these measures.

I intend to continue to seek a recorded vote on the final passage vote of each appropriation bill.

Thank you.

GENERAL SYNOD OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST PETITIONS GOVERNMENTAL LEADERS TO RELEASE PENTAGON PAPERS AND END WAR

(Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker the United Church of Christ is a denomination of more than 2,000,000 members, and its biennial general synod is currently meeting in Grand Rapids, Mich.

By a vote of 614 to 23, the assembled representatives of the United Church of Christ adopted a background paper and resolution of concern regarding the war in Indochina generally and the release of the Pentagon papers specifically. The date of this action was June 28, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, both the background paper and the resolution are timely and significant, and I include them in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT ON RESOLUTION ON THE PENTAGON PAPERS AND THE INDOCHINA WAR ADOPTED BY THE EIGHTH GENERAL SYNOD OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., JUNE 28, 1971

I. BACKGROUND

The publication of previously secret Pentagon papers on the United States involvement in Indochina has provided evidence that American constitutional controls are breaking down. Decisions were taken by presidents and their advisers behind a smokescreen of misleading statements. Words of hope and peace covered secret "scenarios" in which powerful groups planned military escalation. One season's contingency plan became the next season's obsessive deed.

The representatives of the people in the Congress were so skillfully manipulated and managed that for the past 20 years they have—often with little information and less debate—given each Administration a blank check to pursue its undisclosed diplomatic and military strategy with all necessary funds. Most members of the Congress have quietly acquiesced in this usurpation of the executive branch, failing to support their colleagues who insisted that the Congress exercise effectively its power of the purse, of giving or withholding consent in foreign affairs, and of declaring or not declaring war.

The communications media, with few exceptions, have failed to alert the public to the systematic erosion of democratic constitutional control over foreign and military policy. They have commonly been satisfied to project the official version of Indochina events with only minor corrections rather than run the risk of serving as the watchdog of the people's interest through rigorous, sustained and investigative reporting on the obviously widening war.

The Administration, the Congress and the communications media have felt no effective corrective pressure from the public during these years of self-delusion as to the nature of the Indochina conflict and the limited right and capacity of the United States to influence its outcome. Motivated by an abhorrence of communism, most of our citizens have assented to any diplomatic line, military intervention and defense appropriation which successive administrations have claimed would "stop communism". The majority of the American people, and most of their religious institutions, have uncritically assumed that the United States had a moral obligation to keep not only itself but other nations from "going communist", and consequently have been unwilling to look hard at the means—however counterproductive—that their government was using to fight communism in Indochina and elsewhere.

Now that newspapers, television and radio have begun to furnish information from Pentagon archives, confirming what many sources have tried to tell the world, the current Administration has employed personal pressure and law suits to block further release of historical materials that belong to the people and are indispensable to the informed exercise of citizen responsibilities. In spite of the deepening crisis in our government's handling of the war, no assurance has been given that the President will release to the nation a full account of how the United States got into it, or how it is going to get completely out.

The Pentagon documents show how successive American presidents arrogated to themselves the power to make war or negotiate peace, powers which the constitution requires them to share with the Congress. They reveal how the presidential bureaucracy erred in the use of the power it had usurped. United Nations judgment was scorned. Peace movement insights were disdained, independent scholarly advice resented, and intimate church knowledge of Indochinese realities was ignored. The pressure of critics, Congressional and private, was turned aside. Vietnamese political and military leaders were dealt with as pawns in the pursuit of United States goals for Vietnam.

The well being of the Indochinese peoples is given a weight of ten percent in a 1965 memorandum on United States war aims. The attack on the North was prepared through a series of provocations. It was assumed that the United States was so powerful that it could impose its vision of the future of South

Vietnam, and could avoid negotiations until the Saigon regime became so entrenched that the other side would have no option but surrender. As this dream faded, the White House, the Pentagon and the State Department focussed on saving United States prestige from defeat, and keeping South Vietnam from entering the sphere of influence of the Peoples Republic of China.

The Eighth General Synod of the United Church of Christ has the opportunity to bear witness on the Indochina war in the perspective of the new evidence.

II. RESOLUTION

Preamble: The delegates to the Eighth General Synod of the United Church of Christ, acknowledging our gratitude to all the faithful witnesses for peace who have consistently raised up by word and deed the ways that make for peace, acknowledge also our own guilt by electoral consent and inattentiveness to legislative process for the involvement of the United States in what has been widely judged to be an immoral war in Indochina, prayerfully call upon our fellow Christians to join us in earnest petition of our governmental leaders to bring an end to this conflict in keeping with the provisions of this resolution. We make these recommendations also out of a love for our country, and an appreciation of its worth, and a desire that no such criticism should deteriorate into a destructive hatred of the United States.

The Eighth General Synod of the United Church of Christ:

1. Calls upon the membership, congregations, Conferences and Instrumentalities of the United Church of Christ to weigh the increasing evidence disclosed in the Pentagon papers and similar studies that the war aims and strategies of the United States Government in Indochina, having been conceived out of a mistaken notion of United States' interest and capacity, developed with cruel disregard for Indochinese lives and social patterns, implemented with persistent deception of the American people, are unjust and must, even as battlefield atrocities, be condemned by the Christian conscience.

2. Asks President Nixon to stop efforts to impose prior restraint on the publication of political information and opinions, including documents that have been classified as secret, but that do not bear directly on current military operations.

3. Asks the Congress in the hearings announced by Senator Mansfield and Congressman Moorhead on the issues of Indochina policy raised by the Pentagon papers and similar studies:

(a) To consider the problems of deception in Government and to develop procedures for classifying government reports and communications so as to insure the public's access to essential information;

(b) To determine whether there be cause to censure high government officials found guilty of deception of the nation in the conduct of this war;

(c) To use the disclosures as a basis for a new definition of national interest and commitment and as the basis for a clear shift in United States policy in Indochina to one of diplomatic initiatives to end the killing and promote a political settlement.

4. Calls upon the President and the Congress jointly to acknowledge the great responsibility of the United States Government for enlarging the Indochina conflict in the past, with consequent massive destruction of human life and humane values, and to make a unilateral announcement that the United States is now ceasing all bombing missions, aggressive ground combat operations, and support for military operations by South Vietnam on the territories of its neighbors.

5. Calls upon the President and the Congress jointly to renounce the strategy of partial United States disengagement from a war that is being immorally protracted under the mask of a racist "Vietnamization" supported by residual United States forces, war materials, and funds.

6. Urges the President, in consultation with the Congress, immediately to submit fresh proposals for the negotiation in Paris of a compromise end to the war within the next six to nine months:

(a) Based on a United States pledge of total withdrawal of all troops, and military assistance, according to an agreed timetable;

(b) Aimed at synchronizing the end of United States participation in the war with:

I. The establishment of a general ceasefire;

II. The release of all war and political prisoners;

III. The organization of open and free elections in South Vietnam under such international supervision as the Government of Vietnam (Saigon) and the Provisional Revolutionary Government in South Vietnam (Front) concur to invite, and international acceptance of whatever government is so elected.

7. Urges United States officials to be ready to commit substantial funds for the rebuilding of wartorn countries if requested by the governments of Indochina.

CONGRESSMAN MEEDS INTRODUCES NAVIGABLE WATERS AND SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT OF 1971

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the devastating effects of oil spills on our oceans and inland waterways. From San Francisco Bay, the Gulf Coast, Chesapeake Bay, Long Island and most recently, Puget Sound, there have come discouragingly repetitious reports of spreading slicks, suffocated seabirds, warning of long-range ecological damage, and endless recriminations over responsibility.

It is in an attempt to prevent more of these destructive nightmares that I am introducing, on behalf of myself and 21 cosponsors, the Navigable Waters and Safety and Environmental Quality Act of 1971. I hope that favorable consideration on this bill will promote the safe handling of bulk liquid cargoes through our ports, harbors, lakes, and seashores.

These spills are a direct consequence of our national reliance on oil and its transportation in bulk by ship. Annual U.S. oil consumption has increased by more than 35 percent in the last 5 years alone. Congress acted last year to deal with the aftereffects of oil spills by setting the liability for spills and cleanup.

I believe the best cleanup technique is prevention. This bill, which was introducted by the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON in the Senate as S. 2074, would allow strict construction and operation standards for tankers and other vessels carrying bulk liquid cargoes. The Secretary in charge of the department housing the Coast Guard would be empowered to set construction, maintenance and operating standards to protect against environment damage.

It would set down the clear intent of Congress that potential damage to waterways, shorelines, fish life and wildlife should be taken into consideration in setting these standards, as are dangers to life and property under existing law. The cargoes covered would include not only oil, but any combustible or flammable liquids and those designated hazardous substances under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The second section of this legislation is similar to H. R. 8140, now pending before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which would strengthen Coast Guard control over congested harbor traffic. During the 1960 to 1970 period, there were 550 tanker collisions in U.S. waters, 80 percent of which involved ships entering or leaving ports.

In my own congressional district, where a 250,000 gallon diesel fuel spill threatened an area of unique beauty not very long ago, tanker traffic is likely to increase sharply with completion of the trans-Alaska pipeline. Refineries to handle this oil are already under construction.

Prompt action now could help to stave off further irreparable damage to our already polluted navigable waters.

WILLIAM E. COLBY—A GREAT AMERICAN

(Mr. CASEY of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.)

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to publicly say thank you to a great American, who also happens to be a neighbor of mine, for his sacrifices that have been for too long overlooked. I am speaking of William E. Colby who is returning home after two and a half years of duty in Saigon as chief of the pacification program. His accomplishments are not only a credit to him, but his fine family which has been ably handled by his lovely wife Barbara during the trying years of his absence.

Barbara Colby and the Colby children have made their sacrifices for our country, too, by quietly and proudly awaiting Bill Colby's return.

To give the Members some idea of how deep Bill's dedication to this country runs, there is a news article by George Sherman that appeared in the June 29 edition of the Washington Evening Star that I include at this point in the RECORD:

PACIFICATION CHIEF LEAVING VIET POST

(By George Sherman)

William E. Colby, chief of the American pacification program in Vietnam, is leaving his post in Saigon and will return to Washington on Friday.

According to informed sources, Colby's return—under preparation for some time—is mainly due to serious illness in his immediate family. But he is to be reassigned to a still unannounced intelligence job in Washington which, according to these sources, makes special use of his "expertise" on Vietnam.

Colby, No. 3 man in Saigon with the rank of ambassador, has been head of the pacification program since February 1969. This program—known as CORDS, "Civil Operation and Revolutionary Development Support"—has reportedly made big strides under his direction, mainly in the Mekong Delta.

48-059 O - 72 - pt. 18 - 7

But Colby, who is dedicated to the belief that the real battle in Vietnam is for the peasantry, has not been given to what turned out to be exaggerated optimism of his predecessors in the Johnson administration. He is said to agree with those in Washington who have adopted a "wait-and-see" attitude toward the permanence of pacification, once American forces are out.

Colby's history, before the pacification assignment, was tied to the Central Intelligence Agency and, before that, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) in World War II. From 1962 until April 1968, he was head of the Far Eastern Division of the CIA.

His successor in Saigon has not been named. Two leading candidates under consideration are Joseph Mendenhall and George Jacobson, Colby's current deputy.

Both Jacobson and Mendenhall are experienced foreign service officers.

THE POWER ELITE NEEDS TO BE DEFUSED AND DEMOCRATIZED

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, John O. Marsh, a former Democratic Member of the Congress, put many of my thoughts about the war in Vietnam into a succinct statement. His timely and thoughtful address on June 26, 1971, during the installation banquet of the Lynchburg, Va., Jaycees should be read by every Member of the Congress.

The irreplaceable loss the Nation has suffered by this history of deception and mismanagement of the Vietnam war reflected in the leaked documents is a loss that can only be told in the suffering and agony of the dead and wounded on these battlefields half a world away.

The manner in which these documents were made public cannot be condoned, but they do show us a classic, but reoccurring example of the age-old fallacy of the "power elite" and all its weaknesses. The whole episode reeks with the arrogance of power exercised by a selected few, rather than decisions made by the elected. The tragedy is the contemptuous disregard this little clique of planners had for the people of the Nation they were expected to serve. The disdain they had for the opinion of the people, was also reflected in their disregard for those the people had elected.

They were convinced, in their assumed superior intellect, the war could be managed. The people need only pay their taxes for the costs of war and send their sons to the battlefield, yet play no part in either the policyshaping or the decisionmaking process. This is not the view of the intellectual, but of the pseudointellectual. It is a view that is also antiliberal and antidemocratic.

Today, many of these architects of a policy that failed appeal to the public conscience to undermine the present national effort to end our presence in Vietnam in a way that has the best chance of securing a stable peace.

Further evidence of this arrogance is demonstrated in the total disregard of security restrictions that are designed to safeguard the national welfare by wholesale leaking of documents to the press. It is just another example of relegating to yourself the right to decide what the people should or should not know.

We made many mistakes in the whole approach to our problems in Southeast Asia in a military, political, and diplomatic sense but each day that passes is further proof that no greater mistake was made than the failure to mobilize public opinion and seek the support of our citizens for our efforts at the very beginning of our commitment to Southeast Asia. Had this been done I believe the war would have long since ended. However, I am convinced there was a conscious decision not to do this and the disclosures we are now seeing confirms it.

The highhanded and arbitrary procedures followed were a disservice to the President because he was compelled to make decisions based on the limited views of a relative handful of powerful advisers who relied largely on their own intellect yet who were out of touch with the people.

The real danger we see is not the act of unauthorized distribution of documents, bad as it may be, nor even the damage to our national interest which might ultimately occur, regrettable as it is, but rather the danger is in an inadequate system of formulating policy which enabled a few to make life and death decisions that affect the Nation—a system which we see has neither safeguards nor the fail-safe mechanisms consistent with a representative form of government.

Although the military have been criticized, and have come in for their share of blame in the tactics and approach to waging the conflict, by and large it was civilians rather than military personnel who were formulating the policy of involvement and rules of engagement. The fundamental principle of civilian supremacy of the military remained intact. The question that is raised now is the quality of that civilian supremacy and their accountability to the citizenry. Dr. Strangelove was replaced by "Dr. Knowmore."

During the years of buildup and later when the Vietnam war raged, Members of the Congress can cite instances of being rebuffed in their efforts to find ways for the American people to express their support of the war. Suggestions also for the employment of different policies in its prosecution usually fell on deaf ears. The United States was trying to do the right thing but in the wrong way.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

It is obvious that ways and means must be found to give the American people a window into the policymaking apparatus of the national government. New mechanisms must be developed to incorporate the private sector into the public endeavor. A thorough congressional investigation of the entire episode will be most helpful. However, it is suggested that the President appoint a blue-ribbon commission to review the whole matter with two major purposes—

First, a complete review of the preparation, content and unauthorized distribution of the report. These findings should be made available to the people. Recommendations on the opening of more files of the Departments of State and Defense for research purposes should be considered.

Second, both the system for formulating policy and the decisionmaking process in the executive branch should be studied and recommendations made for changes to increase its effectiveness and to assure that it functions in a manner that is consistent with representative government.

Ultimately the Congress will have to adopt those legislative measures and establish the procedures to insure that those in the executive branch perform in a manner that is consistent with the interest and desires of the people of the United States. This may require changes also in congressional procedures; however, we must do those things necessary to preserve the checks and balance system to make government responsive to the people and insure it is always their servant and never their master.

We cannot permit a situation to exist whereby through an inadequacy of the policymaking apparatus a selected few individuals in key posts can subvert the representative process and conduct the Nation's affairs with blatant disregard for the people of the United States, regardless of how well intentioned the motives of that selected few might be.

CHAPTER VI—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 sixth in a series of articles on children and youth and maternal and infant care programs. Support of H.R. 7657 as amended is increasing. At a recent meeting, the American Medical Association's board of trustees endorsed an extension for an additional 5 years children and youth and maternal and infant care programs of the Social Security Act and called on HEW to increase funds for these projects to the full level of authorization for fiscal year 1972. The American Academy of Pediatrics has also endorsed this extention. The bill which would extend for an additional 5 years the children and youth and maternal and infant care comprehensive health projects which are now slated for oblivion as of June 30, 1972, has at this time 69 House cosponsors, and 16 cosponsors in the Senate.

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 descriptions of six children and youth programs.

The material follows:

CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 602–1, ROXBURY, MASS.

The future of this nation depends on the manner in which it cares for and rears its young. Poor health and poverty in childhood are ingredients for the witch's brew which leads to delinquency, drug addiction, chronic illness and dependence on public welfare. Roxbury, Massachusetts had all the features; inadequate housing, low income, high crime rate, and lack of health facilities, to make it an ideal location for the Beth Israel Hospital to set up its Children and Youth Project in 1966. Prior to the opening of the Unit, the Boston City Hospital's outpatient clinics and emergency wards were obligated to provide most of the medical care which was, at best, fragmented, demeaning, lacking in the human touch and devoid of follow-up.

The Project provides in a dignified setting, round-the-clock, comprehensive, family oriented health care to almost 6000 children living in a 9 census tract section of Roxbury. This area has a population of 43,000 people, the majority of whom are black, with 12,699 children under age 14. For 1966 the infant mortality rate in Roxbury was 32.3 per 1000 live births, compared to a rate of 19, for some of the nearby suburbs. At least 50% of the Project's registered children come from one parent families and 60% are on welfare or in familes at Medicaid level incomes. The lack of local practitioners creates a critical situation. Since 1960, five practicing physicians have either died or retired leaving incredibly only four physicians (average age over 60) to cover the entire area, with no replacements in sight.

If the C & Y Projects are not refunded it would be tragic for this community to lose forever the services of the highly qualified and motivated pediatric specialists, psychiatrists, psychologists, nurses, social workers and others who have been assembled at great effort over the last 5 years. The full implication of such short-sightedness is even more evident if one considers that the Project would become financially self sustaining through the medium of the National Health Insurance which is expected to be operational within a short time.

Less tangible, but more devastating, would be the sense of loss experienced by a community which feels that at last it has a health facility sensitive to its particular needs.

Aside from the loss of basic medical care, there would be other equally important detrimental effects to the community as is evident from the following list of Project operations:

1. Three federally aided Community Free Schools are dependent on the C & Y Project for their health care, as is the recently created Pre-School Project for Handicapped Children.

2. Nine public schools in the area use the C & Y program as a referral source and avail themselves of the consultative services of staff personnel.

3. The clinic is, at present, desensitizing almost 40 children with chronic asthma who had never received treatment before.

4. Free Sickle Cell testing is offered to any member of the community.

5. The senior pediatric staff is available 24 hours a day for telephone advice to any registrant of the program. This has been of major value to concerned parents who use this service freely and with confidence particularly during the night.

6. The Project utilizes 60 volunteer graduate and undergraduate college students in varying one-to-one roles such as tutoring, Big Brother, and psychiatric aides. This innovative program received wide acclaim at the 1971 National Education Association meeting.

7. Staff members of the Project are leaders in group work with teen-agers.

8. During the past year the Social Service section has been involved actively and in depth with 501 Project families who are in need of help.

9. The unit is the keystone of the Dimock Health Center, a health complex including several programs which are partially dependent on the stability of the C & Y Project.

The C & Y Program with its emphasis on the sociological and psychological aspects of medical care is endeavoring to help as many children as possible, regardless of race, color or economic status, to realize their full potential.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 631, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Children's Bureau approved the proposal for a C&Y Project submitted by the District of Columbia Department of Public Health in March 1967. The Project was then funded to the sum of $1,273,000 with Federal funds for the fifteen month period, April 1, 1967 through June 30, 1968, and was the 31st Project approved in the 600 Series of Projects Authorized under PL/97, the 1965 Amendments to the Social Security Act. This section of the legislation was designed to support the provision of comprehensive pediatric care services of a high quality, to children of low income families who reside in a defined geographic area.

The geographic area selected for the D.C. Department of Public Health Project in 1967 covers area C of the Health Service Area Map (attached). The seven statistical areas numbered VII, IX, X, XIII, XIV, XV, and XVI are included in Area C. Demographic data has shown that families living in this section of the city are mainly at the lower end of the socio-economic scale. Public transportation to existing hospitals and clinics is inadequate, and has probably been a deterrent from seeking care, particularly of a preventive nature.

Our studies of Census estimates of 1960 revealed that the number of children residing in the geographic area covered by the project who are under 15 years of age was 91,964, a more recent estimate (1968) revealed estimates of the same area to be 111,400.

The age limit established by our project is 4 years and an estimate of 33,200 of this group reside in our project area.

We have considered that the multidisciplinary approach is the most realistic way to meet the various needs of children from situations where deprivation is evident. Emphasis within our project has been placed upon continuity of services and adequate follow-up, the lack of which have been prominent reasons for incomplete and fragmented care patterns in the past.

The program offered under the District of Columbia Community Health Services Administration's C&Y Project offers services through two specially designed new clinic buildings (Health Centers for Mothers and Children) within the Project Area Community.

The second floor of these identical buildings is devoted to pediatrics, and comprehensive care is provided through a variety of specialty clinics which are staffed by personnel who are well versed in their own discipline and experienced in the team approach in the evaluation and Management of Children.

Our Sick Child Clinic provides medical care for conditions which do not require hospital facilities.

Diagnostic and treatment programs in the areas of vision and speech and hearing are available.

We have available and have used opportunities to give appraisals for groups of children seeking admission to camp, nursery schools, Head Start programs and day care centers.

A bus works between the two centers providing patient transportation to the Hospital, other health facilities and to transport patients to scheduled speech therapy classes.

Activities in the Community have been carried out by Nursing, Nutrition, Social Work, and Health Education.

At the Centers, the Children and Youth Project has reduced fragmentation of care and has provided a comprehensive service at a regional neighborhood level within a defined area of the city.

The Children and Youth Project is providing back-up services to the Community Health Services Administrations Neighborhood Health Center Program, providing eyeglasses, hearing aids, etc. to children up to the age of 18 years within our project area. From July 1, 1969 through March 31, 1970, over 1,000 patients received the above mentioned services.

Within our facilities we provide X-ray services for the Neighborhood Centers and provide space for the distribution of supplemental foods to eligible patients. A loss of the Children and Youth Project in the Community Health Services Administration would result in a tremendous loss to the Area C Community and the District of Columbia as a whole.

We urge the introduction of legislation extending Federal jurisdiction over the Children and Youth Projects enabling this Project to continue its worthwhile contribution to the Health Services within the District of Columbia.

CHILDREN & YOUTH PROJECT No. 657, NORFOLK, VA.

On March 1, 1968, the Virginia State Department of Health and the Norfolk City Health Department received the approval to start a Children and Youth Project to be located in Norfolk, Virginia.

By April 16, 1970, we were occupying three buildings which contain about 8,000 square feet of space to serve the Project's registrants. All buildings are located at 425–427 West 35th Street, Norfolk, Virginia.

All children throughout the city of Norfolk who meet our criteria are eligible for our services. A study shows that approximately 40% of our registrants come from the Model Cities areas and that over 40% come from the Park Place Rehabilitation areas where our buildings are located. This is a mixed racial area which the city fathers and state political elements are trying to stabilize with the help of federal aid.

We have about 2,469 registrants on our rolls and are taking on new registrants at the rate of 2 per working day.

Our objective is to give total health care to that portion of the population who need it the most, with special attention being given to pregnant teenagers, newborns, and preschool children.

Some examples for the need of this project continuing to demonstrate comprehensive care is indicated by the following:

1. The loss of this project would mean the end of the first demonstration HMO in this region. All informed people in the health planning field are looking towards the concept of health maintenance as a deterrent to ever increasing medical costs, as a way of using trained professionals more efficiently (money-wise) and more effectively, and as a way to offer health careers to many people who will not be able financially or academically to qualify for the more skilled professional areas. Politically, in our own immediate area this would mean the loss of a very potent factor in the stabilization of a racially mixed neighborhood, Park Place Rehabilitation Area.

2. Socially, the loss of this project would have a great impact on the lives of parents and children who have found in our many innovative programs a chance to enhance feelings of self-pride, self-esteem, and self-dignity. We have developed parent study groups with the fathers and mothers who in turn have involved their neighbors in neighborhood councils. Their goal is to strengthen family life through understand-

ing, patience, and involvement. They are able to relate this type of family unity to a healthier child physically and emotionally in the school and community which ultimately should be a stabilizing force in the American society.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 623, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

St. Christopher's Hospital for Children is a nonsectarian medical center for children which serves as the Department of Pediatrics of Temple University School of Medicine. It is located in the Model Cities area of North Philadelphia, and serves a population characterized by high representation of minority groups, and high prevalence of the problems of the inner city.

In 1966 St. Christopher's Hospital for Children developed with the help of a Children's Bureau Grant a program for Comprehensive Health Services to Children and Youth (C&Y) in a building about a half mile away from the Hospital, to serve the catchment area of a local elementary school. In the course of the development of this program, which has registered about 4,000 children and receives 12,000 visits per year, the C&Y Project has become deeply embedded in the community, and has proved to be a catalyst for other forms of community activity. It was at least partly through the initiative of the C&Y Project that a satellite unit was created of Temple University Hospital's OEO Program and placed in the same building as the C&Y Program, in order to supply services to the adults in the same catchment area served by C&Y for children.

The relationship between C&Y and OEO clinics at Comprehensive Group Health Services (CGHS), as the joint venture is now known, has afforded a unique opportunity for study of problems of delivery of care in a deprived neighborhood. The relationship is in active evolution at the present time, and we feel that the C&Y Program has every reason to maintain its identity and integrity in such a way that the quality of services for children can be kept at the highest possible level.

The C&Y Program at St. Christopher's Hospital for Children is a chief instrument through which the Hospital has become more deeply embedded in the community within the past few years than its previous long history of service to the neighborhood. There is an Advisory Group to the program consisting of citizens of the neighborhood, who have both been kept informed and have given direction to the formation of policy and other activities of the C&Y Program. A well qualified member of the C&Y Community Board has been elected to represent the community on the Board of Managers of St. Christopher's Hospital for Children, along with other representatives of the community served by the Hospital.

It is our judgment that the C&Y Program has been a very effective instrument and model for delivery of child health services in a deprived community, that it has the confidence of the community, and that it has served in major ways as a catalyst for other activities in the community which are having the effect of improving the quality of life and of expectation of the citizenry. We urgently hope that support for the C&Y Program, and for others like it, will continue for an additional period of time long enough so that the promise of these programs as models and innovaters can be fully realized.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECT No. 660, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.

Project No. 660 was funded effective May 1, 1970, to provide extended comprehensive health care to children and youth of Nueces County, Texas, and a 23 county region defined as South Texas. The definitive project area, geographically most of northwest Nueces County, contains approximately 12,000 to 13,000 project eligibles, estimated to be approximately 90% Mexican-American, and 8% Black. The average yearly income per family in this geographic area is $2,000. Average family size is 5.3 persons. The area is considered to be a major pocket of rural poverty.

Much of the rest of South Texas is similar, or less well off. Project No. 660 was based upon a clear-cut need for increased health services. The poverty problem is compounded by the general lack of health care personnel in the region. Even if funds were available to purchase care on an open market (National Health Insurance), the delivery system would be inadequate to cope with the demand. It is therefore anticipated that funding from present plans before Congress will not suffice in the forseeable future (10–20 years).

Project growth has outstripped the limited funding of the project. Local acceptance in the community is such that elaborate plans for outreach have not been implemented because of the rapid rate of growth in the first three months of full operation of the satellite clinic. The number of family units registered doubled over the previous eight months of operation while the number of patients registered tripled.

Public information regarding the project has been well received and public support for the project through a variety of community leaders in the target area has been excellent. Significant input to the project by target area population has been extensive. Direct services to patients continue to increase at a rapid rate.

Virtually no services had been available to the bulk of these patients prior to the inception of the C & Y Projects. Infant morbidity and mortality statistics and childhood death rates, as well as the presence of undiagnosed handicapping conditions, are monumental. It is impossible to estimate on any reasonable basis the impact of loss of project operations on this particular community. Even in its limited period of operation the project has had a major impact on the target population it seeks to serve.

While operations are not fully developed or definitive, the project has in fact begun to fulfill its purpose: to serve as a demonstration for a new mechanism for the delivery of comprehensive health services to children and youth, in an area that drastically needs health care assistance of the type defined as the mandate for the C & Y Program in the original legislation.

CHILDREN & YOUTH PROJECT No. 655, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Changes are occurring in the health field, where an increasing number of physicians have left and are leaving the "Inner City" ghettos; and where underprivileged children in the society are becoming the victims of poor health, poor housing and poor education to an ever increasing degree.

Charles Drew Neighborhood Health Center was conceived in late 1966; and was funded in July of that year by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This Center serves a population of 145,000 persons. We recognize our role as an integral unit in an everwidening system for delivering health services.

Our effects, at the Charles Drew Health Center, are dedicated to the achievement of comprehensive health care services for the family, which is complete, personal and on a continuous team basis.

The Center grew from infancy to adolescence; caring for more than 30,000 patients in 1970 as compared to 1,000 visits in earlier years. The components of this comprehensive child health care include OB/GYN, Family Planning, Pediatrics, Nursing, home care, Dental, Pharmacy, Mental Hygiene, Social Service, X-Ray, Laboratory and Health Education. Special attention is being paid to keep families on individual team basis where families and physicians are given the chance to become well acquainted with each other.

Diagnostic tests are performed on all patients in risk categories and the knowledge of such test results has made it mandatory to screen all children against anemia, lead poisoning and tuberculosis—common diseases in our area. All school children are given eye test, and vision is corrected where the need arises.

The term "risk child" is no longer categorized by disease, but applies to any child living and born in a ghetto; as they are all potential risks. Our data from last year reveals that 20,406 children and youths (0–18 years) were scheduled and 22,186 were seen. The first quarter of 1971 shows 8,263 children's visits, 7,750 of which were by appointment. This reflects the community's *Acceptance* and *Confidence* in our Center, which we are proud of.

Most pre-school children in our target area do not have basic immunization against the preventable diseases (measles, polio, diptheria, tetanus), and greater emphasis is given toward preventive medicine and teaching parents about well baby care, diet and nutrition. School children are routinely checked regarding educational performance. Those who appear to be doing poorly are referred to psychologists for psychometric analysis; and efforts are made to place them in the proper school and/or rehabilitational and vocational programs.

Due to the peculiar problems of teenagers, we opened an Adolescent Clinic one-half day per week where drugs, sex, venereal diseases, family planning, etc. are discussed and preventive measures are taught to this group; as these are prevalent problems among the youth in our target area.

It is interesting to note, that in these days of rising medical costs, we have cut down the days of hospitalization and still maintain a high quality of health care through a team approach ambulatory care system, utilizing the ancillary and para-medical staff from within the community; who know the ghetto problems and are not strangers to the patients from the community.

The need for a sufficient Federal Grant, without which no long-range plans can be made, cannot be overemphasized. The dedication and efforts of the staff and community must not be allowed to go down the drain; and we must not allow the clock to turn back to the vicious cycle of disease, poor nutrition, poverty and ignorance which is a self-perpetuating phenomena of inner city ghettos where the majority of our children live.

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SOVIET JEWRY

(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, I have received a resolution passed in support of Soviet Jewry passed by the executive committee of the Village Independent Democrats. That club, of which I was a founding member in 1956, has become one of the leading Democratic clubs in the country. Its first major claim to fame was its defeat of Carmine DeSapio in Greenwich Village.

The VID has been in the forefront in support of the rights of people in our own country and throughout the world. Its latest resolution in support of Soviet Jewry is one more positive measure it has taken to advance human dignity.

RESOLUTION

"Jews in the Soviet Union are denied the rights granted other nationalities. There is not a single Jewish school in the U.S.S.R.

and many who privately studied Hebrew, such as Ruth Alexandrovich of Riga, are now in prison charged with anti-Soviet activities. Others, such as Raiza Palatnik of Odessa, are incarcerated in mental institutions. The government does not allow the publication of works of authentic Jewish expression, including Hebrew bibles.

Set apart as Jews, but not allowed to live as Jews, increasing numbers have made a single request—that they be allowed to emigrate. The right of free emigration is guaranteed by the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, endorsed by the U.S.S.R. Yet, in seeking to fulfill their dream, Jews are publicly branded as traitors and many are jailed.

. . . . in the words of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.: 'The denial of human rights anywhere is a threat to the affirmation of human rights everywhere. . . . The sincere and genuine concern felt by so many people around the world for the problem of Soviet Jewry should impel the Soviet government not only to effect a solution but to do so with all deliberate speed.' "

KISHINEV POGROM—SOVIET STYLE

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the modern day pogrom of the Soviet Union continues. Yesterday the Mulavian Supreme Court convicted nine Jews in Kishinev and sentenced them to prison camp terms ranging from 1 to 5 years. Thirty-four persons, all but two of them Jews, have now been convicted since June 1970. You will recall Mr. Speaker, that 11 defendants received terms of 4 to 5 years last December in Leningrad—and the death sentences of two of them were commuted to 15 years—one received 10 years in a Leningrad court-martial in January and nine received terms of up to 3 years in Leningrad in May of this year with four getting terms of up to 3 years in Riga last month.

The principal charges against most of those convicted were based on their involvement with their coreligionists who sought to teach their children in Yiddish and Hebrew, their public expression of the difficulties that Jews encounter every day in the Soviet Union, their efforts to lead a Jewish cultural life in the U.S.S.R. and lastly their attempts—pursuant to the very law of the U.S.S.R.—to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel.

The Soviet Union continues the history of Russian anti-semitic policies just as they were conducted under the Czars. Today however, the Soviet Union gives these pogroms the color of law by using its courts to lynch instead of its cossacks.

Mr. Speaker, I happen now to be reading a book which I commend to our colleagues, The Israelis by Amos Elon. Mr. Elon points out that hundreds of thousands of Jews left Czarist Russia because of the pogroms which took place in the 1800–1900s. One infamous pogrom took place in Kishinev in 1903. One more pogrom took place in Kishinev in June 1971.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1880's the chief advisor of Czar Alexander III was Pobedomostsev who gave his formula under the Czars for solving the Jewish problem. As Mr. Elon states in his book:

It was simple and in its time quite famous: "one-third emigration, one-third conversion, and for one-third, death."

The Soviet formula is simpler and more refined. It is to send the leaders of the Jewish community to prison camps and to end, not the physical life of the Jews, but their spiritual and cultural life.

How long Mr. Speaker, will the world sit silently by and permit the Soviet Union to continue with its anti-Semitic practices intended to kill the soul of the Jews. Jews from time immemorial have been known as "the people of the book" and the Soviet Union seeks to destroy that book. They shall not succeed.

BAN ON MILITARY SUPPLIES TO PAKISTAN

(Mr. MORSE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would ban all deliveries of military supplies to Pakistan including all equipment in the supply pipeline. Senator MATHIAS will introduce the same legislation in the other body in view of the urgent need for immediate action by both the House and the Senate.

The civil war in Pakistan is one of the great human dramas of this century, all the more tragic because of the enormous loss of life, the unparalleled misery for millions of refugees, and the intractability of communal hatreds in that part of the world.

I have long held that the Congress must be an active partner in the formulation of this Nation's foreign policy. For this reason alone the Congress should express its views on the Pakistan crisis. But in the face of human suffering of such magnitude, further silence by Congress would be unconscionable.

The origin of my resolution is the April 23 letter of the Department of State to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which stated:

We have been informed by the Department of Defense that no military items have been provided to the Government of Pakistan or its agents since the outbreak of fighting in East Pakistan and nothing is now scheduled for delivery.

I interpret this statement as a decision by the administration to avoid U.S. interference and involvement in the civil war in Pakistan.

By formalizing the ban on all military aid, sales or deliveries to Pakistan, my resolution would constitute solid Congressional support for a policy of non-interference and non-involvement. But by specifically addressing itself to pipeline aid or sales, it would also close an appalling, and I believe unintended, loophole which has developed in the administration's position; namely, the continued flow to Pakistan of military equipment already in the supply pipeline as of March 25.

According to an unconfirmed report in the New York Times of June 22, the amounts involved may be as high as $20 million. In any event, we know from statements made by administration officials in April 1971 that in past years sales of military equipment to Pakistan have averaged around $10 million and are presumably at this level or higher today.

I suspect precise knowledge of the amounts involved is not immediately available even to the bureaucracy. In recent testimony before the other body, administration officials acknowledged that we are unfortunately having difficulty in verifying even what is being sent. Bills of lading often list only a specified number of boxes of undefined military equipment.

Whatever the amounts involved or the kind of equipment being sent, already the existence of this loophole is causing the United States acute diplomatic embarrassment. It leads to misunderstanding in Pakistan regarding our position. It troubles our relations with Pakistan's neighbors. Recently, a group of Indian MP's in New Delhi picketed the American Embassy when they learned that the *Padma*, a ship under Pakistani flag, was leaving New York Harbor for Pakistan, loaded with military equipment. According to latest reports, the Canadian Government has stopped this shipment in Montreal where the *Padma* is docked.

Another ship is reportedly scheduled to leave the United States on July 2. Four to five more ships with military supplies will sail from the United States to Pakistan in July and August. No one knows if these shipments will exhaust the pipeline.

In my judgment, each time one of those ships leaves American shores the United States will face a major diplomatic crisis with the parties involved as well as serious political controversy in this country.

This is one important reason why both the House of Representatives and the Senate should act immediately on my resolution.

In a letter on June 17 to Secretary of State Rogers, I also made clear my reservations in regard to providing a country in the midst of a civil war with economic aid. But I recognize that opinion in the Congress on the question of economic aid may not have crystallized. Above all, Members of Congress are anxious that the people of Pakistan not suffer further. I therefore confine the resolution today to military aid and sales.

I am convinced that a majority of the Members of Congress do not want to see the United States give or sell arms to a nation now in the holocaust of a civil war. I am convinced that a majority of the Members of Congress are as appalled as I am at news of the existence of the pipeline loophole.

I am hopeful that a majority in both Houses will support this resolution.

CLEANING A DIRTY WORLD

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has noted that there are no jurisdictional boundaries recognized by pollution. Thus, international solutions are needed if we are to clean up our dirty world.

Thus, I commend to my colleagues an editorial from the Sunday Star, June 13, that asks for a setting aside of "traditional nationalism and established ideo-

logical rivalry" which otherwise could disrupt the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. The meeting is planned for next June in Stockholm.

My activities as a member of the House Government Operations' Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee and chairman of the World Environment and International Cooperation Committee of Members of Congress for Peace through Law have led me to have similar concerns. Because of this I was pleased by a letter published by the Star from Russell E. Train, chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, in response to the editorial.

Chairman Train writes that the administration is developing a U.S. position that will emphasize the interests of developing nations. He also assures us that the administration will work to keep politics out of the Stockholm meeting. I commend Chairman Train and the Nixon administration for this point of view.

The editorial and letter follow:

INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

It is clear that man's ability to survive in the age of potential instant annihiliation depends on his ability to communicate. Reason must be substituted for rage in international affairs, lest a minor conflict should escalate into this century's third and final world war.

But atomic extermination is not the only threat to continued life on the planet. The end can come more quietly, more slowly and more agonizingly—not with the bang of a thermonuclear exchange, but with the whimper of a poisoned environment. Men and nations must, therefore, accept the fact that pollution is everybody's business. It is a global problem, demanding corrective actions that will, to some degree, violate traditional concepts of national sovereignty. Men must start communicating on the international problems of pollution with the same sense of urgency that led to the creation of the United Nations, the negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms, the Paris peace talks and the international efforts to defuse the Middle East.

In theory, there should be no need for international agreements and cooperation to counter the threat of pollution. Certainly it is to everyone's advantage to clean up his own yard, and no aid of advice from the neighbors should be required. It's a reasonable theory. Unfortunately, it doesn't work. When it comes to the environment, one country's livelihood is apt to be another country's pollution.

The preliminary attempts that have been made to reach international accord on pollution control have not been encouraging. Developing nations tend to consider warnings about uncontrolled technology as a plot by the developed nations to impede their progress toward first-class world citizenship. Attempts by the industrial leaders to convince the have-nots that they should do as we tell them, not as we do, are apt to generate a common answer: First, let us clean up the economy, then we'll worry about the ecology.

That answer is frustrating to those who have recently converted to the religion of environmental salvation. With missionary zeal, the converts recite the newly learned ecological litany; the congregation keeps coming up with the wrong responses. And yet it must be acknowledged that the attitude of developing nations is not devoid of logic. It is, after all, the present industrialized societies that have led the world into peril. It is not enough for them to ask others not to follow down the poisoned garden path. Their first responsibility is to find the way back. And, in practical terms, the primary threat to survival does not lie in the potentially lethal contributions of the emerging nations. The proliferation of industrialization is not taking place at a rate to cause alarm. The fault is not in those who would copy us. It is in ourselves.

It is logical to suppose that the developed nations, each of which has begun the struggle to undo the damage wrought by carefree application of science, would welcome a chance to give and to receive advice. All men now know that they are fellow voyagers on Spaceship Earth, all dependent on the same life-support system. There is no such thing as localized pollution. The industry that poisons the air of Newark diminishes the quality of life in Novosibirsk. The multitudes of persistent poisons that are the by-products of man's domination eventually find their way into the oceans, that 75 percent of the earth's surface unaffected by political boundaries and ideological divisions.

All nations face a common problem. All nations should, therefore, seek a common solution. And yet attempts to bring the industrial countries together to coordinate the effort to control pollution have been few, progress has been negligible and traditional concepts of global politics have taken precedence over survival.

A classic example of the clash between traditional politics and environmental hopes took place this spring. The Economic Commission for Europe composed of 31 members planned a meeting to open May 3 in Prague to discuss the problems of pollution in the industrial centers of Europe. A prestigious team, headed by top administration advisers, was scheduled to represent the United States. Then up popped politics. The nations of Eastern Europe insisted that East Germany—which ranks high on anybody's list of leading polluters—be included as a full delegate. The U.S. backed by the Western Europeans, protested, seeing the maneuver as an attempt to fortify East Germany's claim to recognition as a legitimate and independent nation. The East insisted. Washington withdrew its high-powered delegation. The international meeting finally was reduced to a 10-day paper-reading session. No recommendations were forthcoming. No progress was discernible.

Today, plans are well under way for the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. That meeting, scheduled for June 1972 in Stockholm, repersents man's first attempt to deal with the problem of global pollution on a truly global scale. If the precedents of the immediate past are followed—if Prague was indeed prologue to Stockholm—it could be man's last attempt.

Three years of planning have already gone into the Stockholm meeting, and still there is no assurance that the U.N. conference will not founder on the rocks of traditional nationalism and established ideological rivalry. But if man is serious about survival, failure is not acceptable. The only course, then is to devote the remaining time in a concerted effort to improve the chances of success.

For the United States, that means a readjustment of official thinking, an acceptance of the fact that the international search for environmental solutions must be divorced from international politics. Delegations should be accepted not according to rigid standards of traditional diplomacy, but solely on the basis of interest. Specifically, participation by East Germany and the People's Republic of China should be actively solicited by the United Nations members, including the United States. Both are major industrial polluters. Both—and China in particular—have demonstrated a growing awareness of the problem. Both have much to learn and possibly much to contribute. Both should participate, irrespective of their diplomatic acceptability and U.N. membership status in 1972.

The most than can be hoped for from the conference is that a beginning can be made on the vast, multifaceted, interlocking problems of global pollution. There are no instant solutions. But there can be a new understanding that the danger that is shared by all nations supersedes nationalism. There can be the establishment of a permanent international forum for the sharing of the technology that is being developed to erase the errors of the past. There can be the first world-wide exchange of opinion and information on the problem of overpopulation—the problem that, left unchecked, will defeat every effort to salvage the environment.

That is the most that can be realistically hoped for. It is also the least that can be accepted. Anything less would be persuasive evidence that men are not yet willing to accept the reality of the environmental crisis, that they continue to reject the concept of concerted action, that they prefer to face the rising storm still clinging to shattered fragments of outmoded nationalism.

LETTER FROM RUSSELL E. TRAIN

SIR: I read your recent editorial, "International Politics in a Dirty World," with great interest. Your emphasis on the need for "international agreement and cooperation to counter the threat of pollution" is very welcome. Too often we forget the international side of environmental quality and concentrate on our own domestic problems.

Your comments on the attitude of developed nations towards pollution control and developing nations and the unfortunate injection of politics in last month's Economics Commission for Europe meeting are well taken. In our preparations for the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in 1972 we are developing a United States position emphasizing the interests of the developing nations. While the ECE meeting was restructured as a symposium, rather than as a high-level meeting, it did serve as a useful opportunity for East-West cooperation on the environment.

The United States Government has been extremely active in international environmental affairs. President Nixon, in his "United States Foreign Policy for the 70s" report to the Congress in February, clearly expressed our national policy:

"No nation can keep its pollution to itself. Wastes discharged into the air and water in fact befoul a common resource. Restraint on the part of individual states, however laudable and necessary, is inadequate to the problem, for, in the absence of international action competitive economic pressures will severely limit national abilities to require the costly measures needed to protect the environment. A broad international approach is therefore necessary."

Our approach to international environmental problems has been on two levels—through bi-lateral activities and multilateral organizations. These activities have been coordinated by the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Environmental affairs in the Department of State which is headed by the Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, Christian Herter, Jr. The Environmental Protection Agency, and virtually every cabinet-level department has been active in international environmental activities.

Your editorial expressed concern that political questions such as the status of East Germany should not be permitted to interfere with real international collaboration for environmental improvement. I assure you that this is exactly the position of the United States. At the same time, we should not permit our very real concern for environmental quality to be used by others as a lever to gain political ends which are unrelated to environmental needs and whose proper disposition should be through normal international political channels.

This administration is giving high priority to international environmental quality. This is not to say that we are satisfied with progress or complacent with results. But the U.S. government is taking a position of world

leadership in this effort—a position which deserves public recognition and support.

We live in a dirty world, but for the first time in history we are really doing something about it.

RUSSELL E. TRAIN,
Chairman,
Council on Environmental Quality.

MERCURY IN COSMETICS

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today I am releasing the results of a study showing that cosmetics containing mercury are still being manufactured in the United States.

I am also placing in the RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues, an article titled "Ugly Truths About Today's Beauty Aids" from the June 1971 issue of Today's Health.

All of us should be concerned about the presence of mercury, one of the most toxic of all substances, in the cosmetics used by consumers of our Nation. The National Commission on Product Safety has reported that cosmetics injure about 60,000 persons a year, although the number caused by mercury was not given. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has recommended that mercury used as a preservative in some cosmetics be replaced with less toxic substances.

Because of my concern with this subject, on March 23, 1971, I introduced H.R. 6551 to classify as a misbranded product—under section 602 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—any cosmetic which contains mercury or any of its compounds and whose labeling does not state that fact. Subsequently I have introduced four identical bills with 53 cosponsors. My bills are pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

To determine the extent of mercury use in cosmetics, on May 4, 1971, I sent letters to 66 principal cosmetics makers inquiring as to their use of mercury. On June 23, 1971, I sent followup letters to those from whom I had received no reply.

To date I have received 57 replies, of which eight indicated that at least one product containing mercury was still being produced by the company. Some of these indicated that they were introducing alternate substances to replace the mercury.

Another 49 companies responded that they do not use mercury in any of their cosmetic products. I am heartened to know that this segment of the industry avoids the use of this dangerous substance. Several other firms placed telephone calls to me stating a letter was being mailed stating no mercury products were used.

Finally, six companies have not responded. My conclusion is that they are unwilling to disclose to consumers the extent of mercury use in their products.

Since some companies are using mercury and others will not state to Congress or the consumers that they do not use mercury, I feel there is a great need for adoption of my legislation. This would remove from the marketplace those cosmetics which did not inform consumers of mercury contents.

The Food and Drug Administration presently lacks strong legislative authority to regulate the $6 billion a year cosmetic industry. Unlike drug manufacturers, cosmetic makers can market a product without first proving it safe. Ingredients need not be listed on the label. Market removals are mainly voluntary.

Since mercury is a highly poisonous substance, it is imperative that consumers be given the right to decide on the basis of content labeling whether they wish to expose themselves to the risk of using products containing this ingredient.

In addition to H.R. 6551, I have introduced identical bills with cosponsors as follows:

H.R. 7546, with Representatives HERMAN BADILLO, of New York, WILLIAM A. BARRETT, of Pennsylvania, JAMES A. BURKE of Massachusetts, JOHN H. DENT, of Pennsylvania, JOHN G. DOW, of New York, DON EDWARDS of California, JOSHUA EILBERG, of Pennsylvania, CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey, GILBERT GUDE, of Maryland, SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York, JAMES J. HOWARD, of New Jersey, WILLIAM L. HUNGATE, of Missouri, ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, of Kentucky, PARREN J. MITCHELL, of Maryland, WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, JOHN E. MOSS, of California, ROBERT N. C. NIX, of Pennsylvania, DAVID R. OBEY, of Wisconsin, CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, ROMAN PUCINSKI, of Illinois, THOMAS M. REES, of California, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, of New York, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, of California, and LESTER L. WOLFF, of New York;

H.R. 7547, with Representatives BELLA ABZUG, of New York, GLENN M. ANDERSON, of California, FRANK J. BRASCO and MARIO BIAGGI, of New York, JACK BRINKLEY, of Georgia, PHILLIP BURTON, of California, GEORGE W. COLLINS, of Illinois, WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, of Maine, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, of California, KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia, FRANK HORTON, of New York, ANDREW JACOBS, JR., of Indiana, ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin, PETER N. KYROS, of Maine, ABNER J. MIKVA, of Illinois, BERTRAM L. PODELL, of New York, and JEROME R. WALDIE, of California;

H.R. 7898, with Representatives BOB ECKHARDT, of Texas, WILLIAM D. FORD, of Michigan, JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania, ELLA T. GRASSO, of Connecticut, LOUISE DAY HICKS, of Massachusetts, EDWARD I. KOCH, of New York, and ROBERT A. ROE, of New Jersey, and

H.R. 9528, with Representatives NICK BEGICH, of Alaska, HENRY HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, of California, MIKE MCCORMACK, of Washington, and MORRIS K. UDALL, of Arizona.

Following are the two letters I sent to cosmetic companies:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1971.

DEAR ———: I am deeply concerned about the potentially dangerous chemical, mercury, being used in some cosmetics. While the number of injuries due to mercury has not been reported, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has recommended that mercury in cosmetics be replaced with less toxic substances.

A survey conducted in 1969 by the Toilet Goods Association at the request of the Food and Drug Administration reported that mercury preservatives were being used in 2 to 3 percent of cosmetics products. Currently, the Food and Drug Administration is conducting their own chemical analysis investigation for mercury in cosmetics. The results so far reveal that in one group of 90 unselected cosmetics samples from their consumer complaints program, mercury was present in two; in a second group of 131 samples selected from product types having a high probability of mercury usage, mercury was present in 12; in a third group of about 50 cosmetics commonly used in the homes of the FDA staff, mercury was present in none.

I would appreciate it if you would inform me whether your company uses any form of mercury in its cosmetics or similar products externally applied to the skin. Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 23, 1971.

DEAR ———: Some time ago I sent you a letter inquiring on your company's use of mercury or mercury compounds in cosmetics or any similar product which is used by men or women.

Since my letter to you was not returned by the Post Office, I must assume you received it.

I would deeply appreciate a response as I am compiling data for release in connection with pending legislation which I have sponsored along with forty-eight other Congressmen. If I do not hear from you or your company by June 30 it will be noted accordingly in the report.

Very truly yours,

PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress.

USE SOME MERCURY

Replies indicating mercury use were received as follows:

BARNES-HIND PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
May 11, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK. Thank you for your letter to Mr. Hind in which you expressed your concern about the presences of mercury in cosmetic and drug products. We are also concerned about this and have been for years. Mr. Hind has said that we are not to use mercury containing preservatives unless there is no other material available that will do the job. We currently have only three products on the market that contain such preservatives, and two of these are currently being evaluated in a new form without the mercurial. The third product will be reformulated as soon as technology has been developed which will permit it.

Thank you once again for your letter, and we are anxious to help in any way possible.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL E. PHARES, Jr., Ph. D.,
Technical Director.

BRISTOL-MYERS CO.,
New York, N.Y., June 3, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: This is in reply to your inquiry to Gavin MacBain, Chairman of our Board, with respect to the use of mercury in our cosmetic products.

This will advise that only one of our products, a deodorant, contains mercury and this at a level of .00173%.

Because of the susceptibility of this type of product to microbiological contamination, we have had difficulty in developing a stable formula not containing mercury. However, tests are now being conducted with respect

to a new formula, and we expect to be able to introduce the product without mercury in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

J. RICHARDSON EDMONDSON.

Mr. William Grief, vice president of Briston-Myers and subsidiary companies, indicated orally on June 3, 1971, that his firm manufacturers two cosmetic products containing any mercurials, and a nonmercurial formula was expected to be introduced in the next 2 or 3 months.

DART INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Los Angeles, Calif., May 17, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: This will acknowledge your letter of May 12.

Dart Industries manufactures one cosmetics product which does contain mercury—a hair-set gel—and the Company is in the process of reformulating the product to eliminate the mercury.

Cordially,

NORMAN WICKER.

DU BARRY,
Morris Plains, N.J., May 27, 1971.

Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: Thank you for your letter of May 12, 1971, addressed to Mr. R. J. Reagan, now President of Cool Ray Division of Warner-Lambert Company, which has just been received in my office.

In view of the recent questions raised in regard to mercurial preservatives, we are pleased to inform you that we have been working, since 1970, on reformulation of the few cosmetic products that contained mercurial preservatives. Reformulation, scale up and safety studies have been completed for all. We can assure you that all future production of our entire line of cosmetic products will *not* contain mercury.

Sincerely yours,

G. F. KLEIN,
Vice President, Administration.

JOHNSON & JOHNSON,
New Brunswick, N.J., June 25, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Your letter of June 23 to Mr. James E. Burke regarding our use of mercury or mercury compounds has been referred to me for reply.

It appears that your earlier letter has gone astray because we are unable to find it in our files.

Upon receipt of your June 23 letter we made an immediate check of our cosmetic and similar products and find that we do not use mercury or any mercury compound in them. However, we do market a First Aid Spray which contains .033% of Merthiolate, a well-known antiseptic containing some mercury.

We are sorry about the problem with your earlier letter.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY C. SMOYER.

THE MENNEN CO.,
Morristown, N.J., May 19, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. MINK: We, like you, are also deeply concerned about any adverse effects our products might have on the citizens of this country. When the acceptance of mercurial preservatives became doubtful, our company immediately established research and development programs for the elimination of these preservatives from any of our products which might contain them.

Presently there is one product which contains a mercurial preservative. This product, in which a mercurial preservative is present in very small amounts, represents considerably less than one per cent of our business. This happens to be a complex emulsion which has required extra research testing on such things as the stability of product and emulsion with the new preservative, the antibacterial efficiency of the new preservative, and, most important, the toxicity effects of this preservative on the ultimate user of the product. It is our expectation that our tests will be completed within two or three months, and as soon as we are assured we will switch over to the new preservative.

We appreciate your interest in this all-important topic, and assure you that as a company proud of its products Mennen is doing everything to continue demonstrating its leadership in corporate good citizenship.

Sincerely,

GEORGE S. MENNEN.

HELENA RUBENSTEIN,
May 20, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: This will acknowledge recepit of your letter of May 12, 1971 inquiring whether Helena Rubenstein, Inc. is using mercury as a preservative in cosmetic products.

Helena Rubenstein does not use any mercury in its products as a preservative. It does use ammoniated mercury as an ingredient in two products—Bleach Cream and Lighten Cream. The labels for these products clearly disclose the amount of ammoniated mercury being used and this ingredient is necessary in these products if they are to achieve the desired effect of bleaching and lightening.

Ammoniated mercury is basically inorganic and belongs to a completely different class of compound than organic mercury which is used as a preservative.

Please be assured that Helena Rubenstein, Inc. is fully aware of its responsibility to its customers and the public in general and exercises every concern to offer to the public only those products of the highest quality which are safe for use as directed and which, in their consumption and manufacture, will have no adverse effects.

We trust this information will be sufficient for your purposes but if we can be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to communicate with me.

Very truly yours,

ROY V. TITUS,
Chairman of the Executive Committee.

Replies indicating no mercury use were received as follows:

SCHIEFFELIN & CO.,
May 7, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: We are very happy to inform you that we do not use any form of mercury in our cosmetics—ALMAY. Nor do we use any form of mercury in similar products externally applied to the skin.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of our formulary describing ALMAY HYPO-ALLERGENIC COSMETICS.

If I can be of any additional assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

EDMUND MENDELL,
Senior Vice President & General Manager.

ALOE CREME LABORATORIES, INC.,
Fort Lauderdale, Fla., May 18, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAME: In reply to your letter of May 4, we are pleased to advise you that our Alo-Cosmetics are formulated from the fresh, pure, crystal-clear 'gel' of the rare, tropical Aloe Vera plant and that they do not, in any way, contain mercury compounds. In fact, they are the purest type of cosmetics a woman can buy for her skin.

Under separate cover, we are sending you a representative package of our exclusive Alo-Cosmetics which are sold only in prominent department and prestige drug stores; and also a little Aloe Vera plant for your office. Please do not water it too much because it will rot at the roots—it just needs a bath once a week.

Sincerely yours,

RODNEY M. STOCKTON,
President.

AUVERGNE ET CIE, INC.,
East Longmeadow, Mass., May 19, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: We have your letter of May 4th and can well appreciate your deep concern about the potentially dangerous mercury being used in some cosmetics.

We are strictly a fragrance house and do not produce such things as facial creams, etc. In addition to this, our colognes are compounded by one of the larger essential oil houses. We feel confident there is no mercury content in the solutions we package, but shall certainly bring this matter to the attention of the supplier.

Very truly yours,

C. ALAN MORRISON,
President.

AVON PRODUCTS, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 26, 1971.

Re: Mercury.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: We have noted with interest your bill no. 6551 and thought you would be interested to know that we use no mercury or mercury compounds in any of our cosmetic products.

Please let me know if we can ever be of any assistance in connection with matters relating to the cosmetic industry.

Sincerely,

ROBERT R. MCMILLAN,
Director—Government and Public Affairs.

HARRIET HUBBARD, AYER,
Faubourg St. Honore, Paris, June 3, 1971.

Mrs. PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Further to your letter of May 4th, this is to advise that our Company does not use any form of mercury in its cosmetics.

Yours sincerely,

C. R. HAAS,
President.

BANDOLINE INC.,
New York, N.Y., June 28, 1971.

Congresswomen PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: This is in reply to your letter of June 23rd.

We do not use mercury or mercury compounds in any of our products.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED ROBERTS,
President.

BARNANGEN, INC.,
Chaska, Minn., May 10, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: This is in reply to your May 4 letter concerning Mercury Compound in Cosmetics.

We do not, nor have not included mercury compounds in any of the products manufactured at our plant in Chaska.

We share your concern in this matter, and if there is any more we can do, please write.

Sincerely,

GENE J. THOMPSON,
Technical Operations Manager.

BARR-STALFORT CO.,
Baltimore, Md., May 26, 1971

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,

DEAR MRS. MINK: This is in reply to your inquiry about the use of mercurials in cosmetics.

The Barr-Stalfort Company is a contract packager, packing a variety of aerosol products for many marketers but does not market any products under its own label.

To the best of our knowledge we do not manufacture any topical cosmetic for any of our customers that utilizes mercury as an ingredient in the formula.

Very truly yours,

MANUEL E. HERNANDEZ,
Assistant to the President.

BEECHAM INC.,
May 19, 1971.

Hon. PATRICIA MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MISS MINK: Your letter of May 4th inquiring about mercurial preservatives has been submitted for my attention by Maurice Bale, formerly president of Beecham Inc. As a result of a recent reorganization within the company, stemming from the acquisition of the S. E. Massengill Company, there has been a delay in receiving the information you have requested.

Rather than postpone answering your letter until all the information is on hand, I am writing now on behalf of the Beecham Products Division (formerly Beecham Inc.) to advise that mercury is not used in any form, preeservative or otherwise, in any of the cosmetics or similar products applied to the skin.

As soon as I have personally reviewed the Massengill products for the skin, I shall write to you again concerning the use, if any, of preservatives in that group of products.

In the meantime, I trust this information will satisfy your request.

Respectfully yours,

J. F. MIGLIARESE, PH. D.,
Vice President Research & Development.

JUNE 25, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM: We do not use mercury or mercury compounds in any of our products.

Cordially yours,

JOSEPH J. SUNSERI.

MURIEL BELL, INC.,
Westwood, N.J., May 17, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM: In response to your letter of May 4th, inquiring about whether our company incorporates any form of mercury in our cosmetics, please be advised that we do not use this material at all.

We manufacture and sell a basic simple line of creams and lotions for cleansing and softening the skin. They contain no harmful materials.

For your further information, we manufacture no depilatories, antiperspirants, bleaches, hair dyes, or such items.

I commend you for your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

MURIEL BELL POTTER,
President.

THE BENDER CORP.,
Bloomfield, N.J., May 10, 1971.

DEAR MRS. MINK: We do not use any mercury or mercury compounds in any of our products.

J. C. BENDER,
President.

THE POLLY BERGEN CO.,
May 24, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MISS MINK: Forgive me for not answering your letter of May 4th earlier, however, I have been out of town on business.

I am equally concerned about the chemical mercury and have made it a point to have all of my products tested. We use no mercury in any of our products; instead, we mostly use a paraben system which, I understand, is used by most cosmetic companies.

Thank you for your concern. I certainly agree with you that all cosmetic products should be constantly checked for their purity.

Sincerely yours,

POLLY BERGEN.

BORDEN COSMETICS AND TOILETRIES,
May 25, 1971.

Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: This is in reply to your letter of May 12.

All formulae covering Jean Patou, Inc., John Robert Powers and Marcelle Hypo-Allergenic Cosmetics have been studied in depth and no formulae were shown to use mercurial preservatives or any compounds containing mercury or mercury derivatives.

We hope this answers your inquiry. Thank you for your interest in our products.

Sincerely,

RICHARD LOCKMAN.

CHANEL, INC.,
May 13, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MISS MINK: In reply to your letter of May 12, I am pleased to inform you that we do not now use, nor have we ever used, mercury in our products.

Yours respectfully,

H. GREGORY THOMAS,
Chairman.

CHAP STICK,
Lynchburg, Va., May 24, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 12th.

I am happy to say that mercury has not been present in any of the cosmetics we have manufactured for the last year or two. As members of the Toilet Goods Association, we attempt to adhere very closely to both the regulations and the warnings issued by the Food and Drug Administration.

Trusting that this completely answers your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

G. E. BOND,
President.

CHESEBROUGH-POND'S INC.,
New York, N.Y., May 20, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: In reply to your letter of May 12 to Mr. Ralph E. Ward, since Mr. Ward is currently out of town I am taking the liberty of answering your inquiry on his behalf.

None of the cosmetic or toiletry products manufactured by Chesebrough-Pond's Inc. contain any compound of mercury as a preservative.

As active members of the Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association, Inc. (formerly The Toilet Goods Association, Inc.) we participated in the survey that was conducted in 1969. For at least 10 years, in developing new cosmetic and toiletry products, we have avoided the use of mercurial preservatives. At the time of the survey in 1969, we found that one of our products, developed many years ago, did still have a mercurial preservative. After the survey was completed, the CTFA suggested to its member companies that they review the need for mercury in their products.

Neither the CTFA or Chesebrough-Pond's is aware of any evidence of any injury that has ever resulted from the use of mercurial preservatives in cosmetics. However, in view of the Association's recommendation, we reviewed the question of how essential this was to maintain our product against microbial degradation. It was possible for us to devise a new formulation that made it unnecessary to use mercury, without introducing any other potential hazard into the product. Accordingly, we have changed the formula of that one product.

We hope that this information has been helpful to you. We are pleased that you share with us a serious concern over maintaining the highest possible level of consumer safety in the products of our industry.

Sincerely,

ALBERT B. RICHARDSON.

COLGATE-PALMOLIVE CO.,
New York, N.Y., May 27, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Your letter of May 12, 1971, addressed to Mr. George H. Lesch, was referred to me for reply, and I am pleased to tell you that none of our cosmetics or similar products contain any mercury.

Very truly yours,

LE ROY H. HURLBERT.

HELENE CURTIS INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., May 21, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MADAM: Your letter of May 12th addressed to Mr. Gerald Gidwitz, Chairman of the Board of Helene Curtis Industries, Inc., has been referred to me for reply.

I appreciate your concern about the use of any potentially dangerous chemicals, mercury included, in cosmetic products. We have always been very much concerned about this at Helene Curtis and we have been extremely careful that we do not use any materials which can in any way be considered to have harmful effects. We have, of course, been aware of the situation regarding the use of mercurials in cosmetic products. While we know of no direct information that these low levels of mercury containing products have caused any actual harm to the consumer, we have considered that in the interest of protecting the consumer, Helene Curtis should eliminate all mercury compounds from its formula-

tion. I am very pleased to be able to tell you that we accomplished this some time ago and that no Helene Curtis formulations contain any mercury compounds at this time.

We share your concern about the protection of the consumer and at all times are interested in cooperating in protecting her in every way possible.

I hope that the above information is of value to you. If I may be of help to you in any further way, please feel free to get in touch with me.

Very truly yours,

HYMAN HENKIN,
Vice President,
Research and Development Division.

DANA PERFUMES CORP.,
New York, N.Y., May 13, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MISS MINK: In response to your letter of May 12, this is to inform you that this company does not use mercury in any form in any of its products.

Very truly yours,

JAVIER SERRA, Jr.

FABERGE, INC.,
New York, N.Y., May 24, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: In reply to your letter dated May 12, 1971 addressed to Mr. George Barrie, please be advised that we do not use mercury in any form in any of our products. Furthermore, it is our practice to advise all suppliers of chemicals or intermediates that mercury or mercurial preservatives are not to be present in deliveries made to us.

We trust this is the information you require.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP BRASS,
Executive Vice President.

FRANCES DENNEY,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 27, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. MINK: In regard to your thoughtful inquiry concerning the use of mercury in cosmetic products, we are pleased to inform you that products of our manufacture do not contain any mercury nor mercurial derivatives.

We thank you sincerely for thinking of Frances Denney.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM F. DENNEY, JR.

MAX FACTOR & CO.,
Hollywood, Calif., May 18, 1971.

Mrs. PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Mr. Davis Factor, Chairman of the Board of Max Factor, has asked me to reply to your letter of May 12th.

Max Factor & Co. does not, at the present time, nor have they in the past, used Mercury in any form in cosmetic products.

If we can be of further assistance, please contact me.

Very truly yours,

DAVID W. ANDERSON, Jr., Ph. D.,
Vice President and Director
Research and Development.

THE GILLETTE CO.,
Boston, Mass., May 24, 1971.

PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: Thank you much for your letter of May 12, 1971 and your deep concern about the use of mercury in cosmetics. Let me assure you that as President of The Gillette Company, Toiletries Division, I share your concern for the safety of cosmetic products.

We are familiar with and participated in the Toilet Goods Association's (now the Cosmetic, Toiletries and Fragrances Association) survey concerning the use of mercury as preservatives in cosmetic products containing mercury.

The Gillette Company, Toiletries Division's products do not contain any form of mercury either for preservation of products or for any other use. We demand that our products be adequately preserved and the preservative systems are developed during the research and development phase. The ingredients that are used in our products including preservatives are always screened to insure they do not constitute potential medical hazards to the consumer under conditions of use.

I trust that the above will be of help to you.

Very truly yours,

MARCEL C. DUROT.,
President.

THE GILLETTE CO.
Chicago, Ill., May 14, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MISS MINK: This is in response to your letter of May 12, 1971 inquiring about the use of mercury preservatives in cosmetic products.

We have been aware for several years of the potential problem involved with using mercury as an ingredient. As a result I am pleased to be able to report that we have never used mercury in our products and have no intention of doing so in the future.

Sincerely,

ROBERT B. OSBURN,
President.

THE HEWITT SOAP CO.,
Dayton, Ohio, May 26, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

MADAM: In response to your inquiry of May 12, 1971, I am pleased to advise you that neither the products we currently manufacture nor any of our future plans call for the addition of any form of mercury.

If I can be of further assistance to you in this matter, please feel free to call upon me.

Very truly yours,

ALVIN L. LAMS,
Vice President—General Manager.

THE ANDREW JERGENS CO.,
Cincinnati, Ohio, May 21, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. MINK: With reference to your letter of May 12, 1971, there is no form of mercury in any of the products manufactured and/or distributed by The Andrew Jergens Company.

Very truly yours,

F. G. MEEKER,
President.

STRADFORD, LAFONTANT, GIBSON,
FISHER & COUSINS,
Chicago, Ill., May 19, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: We have in our possession your letter dated May 12, 1971 forwarded to our client Johnson Products Company, Inc. We want to convey to you the ever present concern of our client about the absolute safety of the products marketed by our client.

We want to assure you that our client does not use in the manufacture of its products any chemical containing mercury in any form.

Yours very truly,

H. ERNEST LAFONTANT.

KANEBO, U.S.A., INC.,
New York, N.Y., May 17, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM: Replying to your letter of inquiry under date of May 12, 1971 concerning the use of mercury in cosmetics, please be advised that;

1. No cosmetics of this company are presently sold in this country.

2. Even if they were, the cosmetics of this company do not contain mercury in any form.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM KARP,
Consultant.

KNOMARK, INC.,
Jamaica, N.Y., June 16, 1971.

Mrs. PASTY T. MINK,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: We are in receipt of your letter of May 4th addressed to Mr. Arnold H. Neis of Apex/Trol. Please be advised that Apex/Trol is now part of Knomark Inc. (a subsidiary of Papercraft Corporation) and Mr. Neis is no longer connected with our firm.

For your records, we do not use mercury in any of the products you mentioned in your letter nor do we use it in other products manufactured by our company.

We trust we have been of service to you.

Cordially,

JAMES B. PURCELL,
Director of Marketing.

LANVIN-CHARLES OF THE RITZ, INC.,
New York, N.Y., May 18, 1971.

Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: In reply to your letter of May 12th I am pleased to advise that no product of Lanvin-Charles of the Ritz contains mercury or any derivative of mercury.

Our company is very concerned with the entire field of public safety and health. The writer was President of the Toilet Goods Association (now changed to the Cosmetic, Toiletry & Fragrance Association) and most of our membership followed the Toilet Goods Association's recommendations to eliminate mercury some time ago. In any event our own firm has not used any for several years.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD SALOMON.

LEVER BROTHERS CO., INC.,
New York, N.Y., May 13, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: Our Chairman, Mr. Mumford, is out of the office this week and in his absence I am glad to reply to your inquiry of May 12.

None of the products manufactured or distributed by Lever Brothers Company contain any mercury or mercury derivatives either as ingredients of their formulae or as impurities contained in those ingredients.

If we can be of further assistance to you at any time, please do not hesitate to address your inquiry to me.

Cordially,

LEE H. BLOOM,
Administrative Vice President.

THE LIGHTFOOT CO.,
New York, N.Y., June 28, 1971.
Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK,
301 Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 23rd, 1971, regarding the use of mercury or mercury compounds in the products which we manufacture. We also take note of your information regarding a prior letter on this subject, and I would like to advise you that for some reason no copy of that letter is on file in our office.

As you may be aware, The Lightfoot Company, is a manufacturer of Specialty Soaps and Cosmetics. We are not using mercury or mercury compounds in any of the products which we manufacture. As a point of information, the last use of a mercury compound was in connection with a drug soap formulation, and the mercury in that formulation was changed to Pyrenone, a non-toxic insecticide in July of 1957.

We trust that the above information will be helpful for your data, and with kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM P. KERR,
President.

GERMAINE MONTEIL COSMETIQUES CORP.,
New York, N. Y., June 3, 1971.
Mrs. PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: In reply to your letter of May 12th addressed to Mr. Bjorkman, this is to inform you that Germaine Monteil does not use mercury or any form of mercury in any of its cosmetics.

We are sorry for the delay in responding to your letter and hope this will be of some help to you.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. STREET,
President.

NUTRILITE PRODUCTS, INC.,
Buena Park, Calif., June 29, 1971.
Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: This letter is to advise you that we do not use mercury or mercury compounds in any of our products.

Sincerely yours,

DICK ADDISON,
Secretary.

OXZYN CO.,
Trenton, N.J., June 4, 1971.
Mrs. PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Replying to your letter of May 12, 1971 with regard to the use of mercury in cosmetic products externally applied to the skin, I would like to take this opportunity to inform you that we manufacture no cosmetic items in our plant that contain mercury in any form whatsoever.

Trust this is the information you desire.

Very truly yours,

DAVID M. COHEN,
President.

PFIZER, INC.,
New York, N.Y., June 1, 1971.
Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
U.S. House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: Thank you for your letter of May 12. We appreciate your taking the time to write to us expressing your concern about the use of mercury in some cosmetics.

Coty does not use mercury in its cosmetics, or products applied to the skin. I would feel remiss, however, if I did not point out to you that we are unaware of consumer injury demonstrated through the use of mercury in such products.

We share your obvious concern that cosmetic products be of the highest quality and safe for use. We believe that our industry has had an excellent history in developing safe and efficacious cosmetic and toiletry products for use by American women. The care which is taken in the manufacture of our products insures that they are of the highest quality and purity. There is a tendency, regrettably, for certain facts regarding cosmetics, and indeed, other products, to be taken out of context and overdramatized. In such cases, we do not feel that the public interest is served by overreaction to alleged threats to the public health which in fact have not been factually established.

Again we appreciate your taking the time to contact us.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS M. COONEY,
Vice President.

PLOUGH, INC.,
Memphis, Tenn., June 8, 1971.
Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: Your letter of May 12, 1971 to Mr. Albert J. Elias, Vice President and General Manager, Pharmaco, Inc., has been referred to me, as Mr. Elias is out of the country on an extended assignment. My office has responsibility for the legal affairs of our related company, Pharmaco, Inc.

I am happy to inform you that none of the products made or distributed by Pharmaco, Inc. contain mercury in any form.

We trust that this answers your inquiry, and we thank you very much for your letter.

Very truly yours,

FRANK P. DIPRIMA,
Secretary and Legal Director.

POLA COSMETICS,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 28, 1971.
Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Thank you for your letter of June 23, 1971. We are sorry that we have misplaced your first letter. Our Cosmetics does not contain any mercury compound.

Yours truly,

KINICHI TORII,
General Manager.

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE, CO.,
Cincinnati, Ohio, May 28, 1971.
Hon. CONGRESSWOMAN MINK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: This is in response to your inquiry addressed to Mr. Harness about whether any Procter & Gamble cosmetic products contain mercury.

By way of background, several of our shampoo brands have historically contained minute quantities of a mercury compound. The function of the mercury compound was to provide a safeguard against bacterial growth during use in the home, and, to a lesser degree, to improve the odor characteristics of the products.

Our Company is well aware of the growing concern about the role of mercury and other heavy metals in our environment and we undertook a program many months ago to eliminate mercury compounds from the few shampoo products in which they were used. We committed ourselves to the Food and Drug Administration through the Cosmetics, Toiletries and Fragrances Association (formerly the Toilet Goods Association) to have ceased producing any consumer products with mercury by July 1, 1971.

I am pleased to tell you that we have made even faster progress than originally anticipated, and mercury is no longer in the formula of any of our cosmetic products. So in the future, none of the cosmetic products we produce will have any mercury compounds used therein.

I trust this answers your question.

Very truly yours,

T. F. WATERS,
Director, Professional & Regulatory Services Div.

SEARS, ROEBUCK AND CO.,
Chicago, Ill., June 3, 1971.
Hon. PATSY T. MINK, M.C.,
House of Representatives,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: Your letter to Mr. Metcalf of May 12 inquiring as to whether mercury is an ingredient in Sears cosmetics has been referred to me.

Sears stores having cosmetic departments carry Sears private label cosmetics under the name "Lyric" and such stores are also authorized by Sears Central Merchandising Offices to carry certain other nationally advertised, non-Sears brand cosmetics. None of our Lyric cosmetics contain or have ever contained mercurial preservations. A survey of the companies who supply Sears with non-Sears brand cosmetics also indicates that none of the cosmetics currently authorized to be carried by our cosmetics departments contain mercurial preservatives.

If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

R. P. ROBINSON.

EMILIO PUCCI,
New York, N.Y., May 13, 1971.
Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: This company is presently engaged only in the perfume business and not involved at all in the cosmetics field.

Should we decide to develop a cosmetic line at some future time you can rest assured that we will abide by the laws set down by the Food and Drug Administration regarding toxic substances.

Sincerely,

PIERRE GAFFINEL,
General Manger.

SHISEIDO COSMETICS,
New York, N.Y., May 14, 1971.
Madam PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM MINK: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 12th concerning mercury compounds as preservatives in cosmetic formulations.

I would like to inform you that there are very strict regulations in Japan which are just as, or perhaps stricter, than U.S. regulations. Cosmetics imported from Japan or custom packed in the U.S. do not contain any mercury in any form whatsoever. The raw materials as well as the finished products undergo rigid testing before release to the market.

Should there be any further questions, I will be very happy to cooperate with you in any way I can.

Again, thank you for your interest in our products. I remain,

Yours very truly,

TERUO SATO,
President.

PARFUMS WORTH CORP.,
New York, N.Y., June 25, 1971.

Miss PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MISS MINK: We are sorry for the delay in answering your letter of May 12th.

Enclosed is the reply from our sources in Paris.

Sincerely,

DONALD F. LANDSMAN.

PARFUMS WORTH CORP.,
New York, N.Y., June 17, 1971.

DEAR SIRS: We have duly received your letter No. 203 of the 17th ult. enclosing the one you had received from Mrs. Patsy T. Mink.

We have immediately passed Mrs. Mink's letter to our Laboratory and have just had the necessary appeasement from them.

We are therefore glad to be in a position to affirm that no component entering in the production of our articles contains a mere trace of mercury or any other injurious ingredient.

Kindly advise Mrs. T. Mink accordingly.

Your sincerely,

—— ——.

STERLING DRUG, INC.,
April 21, 1971.

Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Cannon Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: Thank you for your letter of April 9, 1971, and for your interest in Sterling Drug Inc.

We are glad to assure you that our cosmetics do not now and never have used mercury salts as bacterial preservatives. For many years we have been well aware of the possibility of bacterial contamination of cosmetics and have taken steps to prevent this by using other types of preservatives. In the development process of every cosmetic product, we screen several preservatives for their activity in the actual formula and manufacture only after we have a satisfactory system.

Raw materials are examined for bacteria content, including the water used in the process. All finished production is also examined bacteriologically and shipped only after we find it satisfactory. We employ two trained microbiologists for this purpose as part of our Quality Control staff in order to supply our customers with first quality cosmetics.

We welcome the opportunity to provide this information, and thank you again for writing.

Sincerely,

A. J. FITZGIBBONS,
President.

YARDLEY OF LONDON, INC.,
Totowa, N.J., May 21, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Thank you for your letter of May 12th addressed to Mr. Lynn, our former President concerning the use of mercury in cosmetics.

The Yardley Company has never used mercuricals in Yardley cosmetics and, in fact, does not use these ingredients in any of its products.

Thank you for the opportunity to give you this information.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. HUNT,
President.

ZSA ZSA LIMITED,
New York, N.Y., June 3, 1971.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: I'm taking the liberty of replying to your letter of May 12 to Miss Gabor regarding the use of mercury in cosmetics.

We too are most concerned with keeping cosmetics on the highest possible quality standard. We formerly did use a mercurial derivative called Thimersol in a dandricide shampoo, but we have taken steps to discontinue using this ingredient, and as of the first of January we have made no further use of Thimersol nor do we intend to use any other derivative of mercury in any of our products.

Please feel free to contact me if you should have further questions. We are happy to be of help.

Very truly yours,

DAVID STERN, *President.*

Telephone calls were received from several additional companies stating letters were being mailed.

As of June 30, 1971, no replies had been received from the following companies:

Amole, Inc., Dayton, Ohio; the Fuller Brush Co., East Hartford, Conn.; Estee Lauder, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Marly-Savon Clair, New York, N.Y.; Merrell Laboratory, St. Louis, Mo.; and Parfums Marcel Rochas, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Following is the article from Today's Health magazine exploring the issue of cosmetic health hazards:

UGLY TRUTHS ABOUT TODAY'S BEAUTY AIDS

(By Edwin Kiester, Jr.)

The cosmetics industry promises it can help you look good. Promises. Promises.

When Amy Wilcox paid out $7.50 for new foundation makeup that was supposed to give her a smooth complexion and even tone, she got more than she bargained for. Ugly red blotches appeared on her cheeks and forehead, her eyes became swollen and bloodshot; her lips grew puffy and thick.

The cosmetics industry promises that some of its compounds will even make you feel good. Promises. Promises.

One 58-year-old woman who used a certain nail hardening product experienced severe pain, nail discoloration, and skin dryness. The hardener contained formaldehyde, a highly irritating chemical.

The cosmetics industry promises that some of its products are "safe for a baby's skin." Promises. Promises.

Recently, two brands of bubblebath had to be removed from the market and reformulated because they were linked to urinary tract irritations in young girls. Of course the cosmetics industry lives on promises, that is what its customers want to hear. And if its products don't make a woman look as beautiful as she had hoped, well she can try another. But there's no "second-chancing" if the industry doesn't deliver on the promise of safety. Often, there is suffering. Often, there are medical bills.

And while the safety record of the cosmetics industry isn't bad, there are enough problems like those above to demand more careful policing of beauty aids. The public assumes that all cosmetics have been thoroughly tested. They have not. The public assumes that ingredients are known by the Food and Drug Administration and by allergists. They are not.

Cosmetics manufacturers are not compelled to print the ingredients of products on labels, file the formulas with the FDA, or conduct any sort of safety tests before offering items to the public. If an allergist seeks information that would help him in treatment, the firm is not required to furnish it. Vigorously protesting that such revelations would give away jealously guarded trade secrets, the 2,500 manufacturers have fought off every attempt at consumer protection.

Unfortunately, according to the National Commission on Product Safety, more than 60,000 women a year suffer adverse effects from cosmetics severe enough for them to seek medical attention. Cases range from mild discomfort to temporary damage to serious disfigurement and permanent injury. This figure also includes accidents involving cosmetics, such as cut hands from broken bottles.

Women have suffered underarm and skin irritations from deodorants and lotions, visual damage from shampoo, scalp burns and loss of hair from hair dye, eye infection from contaminated mascara, systemic reactions from creams and powders. Evidence is growing that lifetime use of certain cosmetics may contribute to long-range damage as well.

Yet virtually all of this could be prevented—if some simple system of consumer safeguards could be established.

One difficulty is that the cosmetics industry operates from a position of strength. Beauty is a $10-billion-a-year industry, growing at 10 percent annually in prosperity or recession. Three cosmetics companies are on the *Fortune* magazine list of the 500 largest U.S. corporations, and cosmetics stock is the darling of Wall Street. Beauty commercials make up the single largest category of television advertising, occupying about 20 percent of commercial time, and they are the chief prop of women's magazines, in whose pages seldom is heard a discouraging word about beauty aids.

When any threat is raised to the industry's privileged status, a vociferous outcry goes up. Congressmen are readily persuaded that their women constituents are unalterably opposed to any attempt to take away their beauty aids.

This is not to say that the majority of cosmetics sold today are unsafe. Most are harmless.

One notable exception, however, is nail hardeners. A few years ago, women began complaining of adverse reactions to them. These reports became so common that the FDA forced several brands off the market.

But many nail hardeners still on cosmetics shelves are formaldehyde-based. This chemical is both an irritant and a sensitizer. Products containing formaldehyde have caused reactions including pain, discoloration and bleeding under the nails, and loosening or even loss of nails.

Problems like these are among the chief concerns of Rep. Lenor K. Sullivan, Missouri Democrat, a leading consumer advocate in the cosmetics field.

Since 1954 she has been trying to get even a modest regulatory bill through Congress. "I know that most cosmetics sold today are not dangerous," she says. "What worries me are the ones not known to be safe."

Esther Peterson, Lyndon B. Johnson's consumer adviser, recently addressed the cosmetics trade group—the Cosmetic, Toiletry, and Fragance Association—at a Boca Raton, Florida, convention. Mrs. Peterson acknowledged, "Most cosmetics cause no harm to anyone, and if they make women feel better, that's wonderful."

"But," she added, "if there is any cosmetic item which contains anything which can hurt you or me, then I say the manufacturer shouldn't be allowed to sell it without at least a clear warning."

Under pressure, the cosmetics industry recently agreed to take a few small steps toward self-regulation. In a letter to Mrs. Virginia Knauer, President Nixon's consumer adviser, the trade group offered to register all manufacturers with the FDA and to file formulas of all products—provided the agency kept them secret.

Some cosmetic-ingredient information is now available to dermatologists from poison control centers and from the new reference book titled *Clinical Toxicology of Commercial Products.*

Food and Drug Commissioner Charles D. Edwards, M.D., told manufacturers at the Florida meeting, "The consumer's voice is being heard in our land as never before and in an ever-growing chorus . . . Time is running short for this association to reach some decisions."

Amelia Bassin, former vice president of Faberge, pleaded with her colleagues to set up a self-policing agency (like Underwriters' Laboratories in the electrical field).

Most women think cosmetics are relatively harmless because they are simply applied to the skin and washed off (or allowed to wear off) without entering the body.

Yet Leo Friedman, Ph.D., chief of the FDA's Division of Toxicology, declares, "The skin is not an altogether impermeable barrier." Cosmetic ingredients can penetrate intact skin. They can move into the body through cuts or abrasions. Or they may enter through the eyes, mouth, or lungs.

One potentially hazardous element which is absorbed into the body in small amounts is mercury. Ever since the disclosure that this heavy metal, in the form of methyl mercury, was present in alarming quantities in certain species of fish and other foods, attention has focused on other sources which might contribute to a poisonous buildup in the body. Mercury accumulates in the tissues and bloodstream and can cause neurological damage, kidney failure, and ultimately death.

FDA has set an upper limit of 0.5 parts per million for mercury in fish. This form of mercury is not found in cosmetics. But about 10 parts per million (ppm) of phenyl mercuric salts are used in many cosmetics, principally eye preparations. Ammoniated mercury is the basis of so-called "bleach creams," which claim to erase brown "liver spots" on the skin. Deposits may build up if the creams are used for many years.

Mercury compounds are used as preservatives in cosmetic creams. Microorganisms can multiply in unrefrigerated cream products, causing virulent infections if introduced into the body.

These quantities of mercury compounds are not considered a threat in themselves, since very little actually is absorbed into the body. But in combination with mercury from other sources, a hazard may exist. Cosmetics manufacturers are attempting to develop substitute preservatives, particularly for cosmetics used in the area of the eyes.

Another substance widely used in cosmetics is hexachlorophene. This popular bactericide—used in many skin cleansers, lotions, pediatric preparations, mouthwashes, and deodorant soap—has been known to attack the white matter of the brain if introduced into the body in large quantities.

Physicians at Shriner Burn Institute, Galveston, Texas, found that severely burned children went into convulsions, and some died, when their serious burns were disinfected by bathing them in hexachlorophene.

Until recently this finding seemed to have little application to cosmetics users, whose exposure to the chemical was quite small. But at a recent meeting of the American Chemical Society, two chemists from the federal Environmental Protection Agency reported brain damage to rats which were fed hexachlorophene. Those given five ppm suffered cerebral swelling, and those receiving 25 ppm developed brain lesions and paralysis.

The scientists said they took 14 human blood samples from persons who used hexachlorophene cosmetics and found amounts of the chemical ranging from one to 89 parts per billion.

The finding set off a flurry of new investigations both at FDA and in industry. Francis J. Marzulli, Ph. D., an FDA toxicologist, reported that a three-week study of persons who used extremely large amounts of cosmetics containing hexachlorophene developed accumulations in the bloodstream "which we considered uncomfortable."

Although Marzulli and other toxicologists agreed that massive amounts of hexachlorophene could poison the system, the danger level could not be fixed. Most scientists feel it is much more than even the heaviest user of cosmetics could be expected to amass if the substance is used properly and washed off promptly.

Animals given large doses of hexachlorophene quickly flushed it through the system, and those who developed paralysis recovered when the intake was stopped.

The moral for cosmetics users lay in the fact that large amounts of the chemical might be absorbed without the person's being aware of it.

The FDA's Doctor Friedman notes that hexachlorophene, in wide use for about 20 years, is an extremely valuable antibacterial agent, but adds:

"The chief problem is in misuse and abuse of hexachlorophene. People operate on the theory that if a little of it is good, a lot is better."

Of course, few women would use the chemical in huge quantities. But with no warning from manufacturers, Friedman says, many users of hexachlorophene leave it on the skin so that it is absorbed into the system.

Another potential cosmetic hazard arises from a chemical called 2,4TDA. This compound is used in some permanent and semipermanent hair dyes (not rinses). In laboratory tests on animals, injections of 2,4TDA produced cancerous tumors. Of course, this does not necessarily mean that it will cause tumors in humans.

The first suspicions about 2,4TDA go back about five years. A group of nurses at an Eastern hospital reported to a physician that they were passing black urine. The physician found that all the women had been using a hair dye containing 2,4TDA.

He reported this to FDA, which contacted the manufacturer. The firm opened its complaint files, which showed no other such reports from users. The agency surmised that some combination of the dye and a chemical to which the nurses were regularly exposed had caused the condition. Attempts to isolate the cause further proved fruitless; the nurses were told to stop using the dye, and the problem cleared up.

Further tests of 2,4TDA products are now being conducted, and the industry is attempting to develop substitutes, although 2,4TDA is still being used in some colors within 43 brands of dye.

When a cosmetic is proved dangerous, the manufacturer usually moves quickly to withdraw it from sale. No firm wishes to be sued for damages, to be stuck with a large inventory of unsalable merchandise, or to cause a tragedy which might bring down the wrath of Congress.

Spokesmen for the manufacturers maintain that in self-protection the industry always tests its products for safety before marketing, although some government sources consider these tests inadequate.

The consumer does have some protection under federal laws. Any cosmetic which alters the normal function of the body—or which the manufacturer claims does so—is classified as a drug, and therefor is subject to the new drug laws. The product must be shown to actually perform the action it is said to perform, and be proved safe for human use.

Cosmetics which are considered drugs within this definition include antiperspirants (but not deodorants), wrinkle removers, hormonal creams, acne preparations, and disinfectant soaps.

FDA also may take court action to ban any cosmetic proved to cause injury to users. Such actions are rare, for they require an ironclad case.

As Doctor Friedman says, "It's like speeding on the highway. You've got to catch them in the act, and if you're not there, they get away." The emphasis on injury hampers the agency in enforcing the few powers of policing that it does have.

Unlike drug manufacturers, the cosmetics industry is not required to open its complaint files of adverse reactions to FDA. It then uses the lack of public complaints as justification for its argument that no restrictions are needed.

Few women report damages traceable to cosmetics, and damage suits seldom surface. One case that did crop up several years ago, however, did prompt widespread attention. A Colorado woman maintained that she had been permanently disfigured by the single use of a permanent hair dye.

Although a patch test had indicated that she was not reactive to the dye, three days after use her hair began to fall out. A rash broke out on her neck, ears, and forehead. Within three months, she lost all her hair, eyebrows, and lashes. Within six months, her right kidney had been removed, which she also attributed to use of the dye.

Filing suit for $600,000, her attorneys maintained that many other women had suffered similar damage but were too embarrassed to come forward and sue. Eventually the woman, who was forced to wear a wig and false eyelashes for life, settled out of court for $23,500.

The FDA does keep continual surveillance on cream cosmetics, which are subject to bacterial contamination. When contamination can be shown, the products are subject to a recall order.

Over the past three years, 42 recall orders were issued for batches of cosmetics. Three recent recalls involved contaminated batches of a popular makeup base, an eye cream, and a cream mascara.

Microbiological contamination of cosmetics is a continuing and stubborn threat. As most women know, any cream product—a facial cleanser or custard pie or mayonnaise—is natural culture medium for bacteria, particularly in hot weather. Eyeliner and eye makeup are especially vulnerable. Most cosmetics contain a preservative to inhibit bacterial growth. But often bacteria are introduced by the woman herself, who fails to wash her hands before dipping into the jar.

A few years ago, a rash of bacterial infections spread through a girls' dormitory of a Midwestern university. Physicians at first were at a loss to explain the epidemic, which caused rashes and irritation as well as system upsets. The first clue was that many of the coeds' infections seemed to center in the eye areas. The investigators finally realized that the girls had been using each other's cosmetics, and that one container of eye preparation had been contaminated.

Among infections which may be spread in this way are staphylococcus, molds, and certain fungi. One particularly virulent infection is *Pseudomonas aerugionsa*, which can cause loss of sight within 48 hours if it invades the eye. The common salmonella infection, generally associated with food poisoning, also can be contracted through use of cosmetics: The bacteria may be introduced through cuts or breaks in the skin.

Yet no warning of the possibility of such contamination is included on the labels of vulnerable products, nor is the user told how to guard against contamination.

Most complaints deal with individual allergic reactions to cosmetics. Face powders, liquid makeups, foundation creams, eye preparations, deodorants, and shampoos may cause such reactions as swelling around the eyes; rash; loss of hair, eyebrows, or lashes; irritation of the face. Underarm rashes from deodorants are frequently reported.

The letters that come to Congresswoman Sullivan are often pathetic. "I have had five children, and I can say that childbirth is a snap compared to the agony I went through after using this product," one woman wrote, complaining about a "cuticle massage cream" which she said caused her fingertips to swell, blister, and drain.

A foundation cream caused another to suffer "big blisters" on her face and left scars around her mouth and eyes.

One woman told of her search to find an eye makeup that would not cause severe reaction. One product, she said, had brought on

swelling and discoloration of the face; another, itching and watering of her eyes; still a third caused her lashes to fall out. "These manufacturers just feel free to use anything they want," she wrote Mrs. Sullivan. "It there no way to control the ingredients?"

The manufacturers acknowledge the allergy problem, marketing so-called "hypoallergenic" products—low in ingredients commonly known to cause allergic reactions in many users.

The industry maintains—perhaps rightly—that half the female population is allergic to *something*, so it cannot possibly guard against all sensitivities.

But the major problem is that because the ingredients are not disclosed, no woman (nor her allergist or dermatologist) can discover the cause of her reaction except by trial and error. Indeed, according to Mrs. Peterson, because manufacturers constantly change cosmetic formulas, a woman may believe herself free of reaction to a certain product only to have an outbreak at a later date.

The FDA's Doctor Friedman points out that a person may build up a sensitivity to an ingredient after prolonged use, and this sensitivity may carry over into a whole array of other compounds, including some prescription drugs.

According to Congresswoman Sullivan, coal-tar hair dyes may build up this kind of sensitivity. A woman may not react to a patch test the first time it is given, but as she continues to use dyes, she may become sensitized to the compounds without being aware of it. Ultimately, she may lose clumps of hair or suffer scalp irritations.

The coal-tar hair—dye hazard, says Mrs. Sullivan, is a particular problem in beauty salons, where if a patch test is given at all, it is usually done only on the customer's first visit. In many cases, the customer does not even see the warning on the dye bottle.

Another potential hazard in the cosmetics area is with hair spray products. Damage to the eyes or respiratory tract may result from careless spraying of contents. And inhaling of the aerosol propellant has taken more than 50 lives in the past four years.

Aerosol products should always be used in a well-ventilated room, and spray should never be directed toward the eyes.

The most-used cosmetic of all—lipstick—appears the safest. Even though it is constantly chewed off the lips and swallowed, lipstick consists of such harmless substances as ordinary grease (about 50 percent of lipsticks are basically castor oil), perfume, and artificial coloring agents. Under a color additives act passed by Congress in 1960, FDA keeps constant vigilance on these colors; they must comply to safety standards before they are introduced, and batches are tested during production.

No one can measure whether the "magic formulas" and "miracle" ingredients actually enhance attractiveness or bring about romance.

Not even the industry's "psychological pricing," under which high charges are considered part of the sales appeal, is really questioned.

To change the pricing system, Mrs. Sullivan says, would "take a lot of fun out of women's lives. We buy cosmetics knowing full well that the glittering advertisements are a lot of bunk, but we can dream, can't we? Most of us know that the $5 jar of cream will do no more for us than the 50-cent jar . . . Those who can afford the $5 jar, and some who cannot, buy it on the outside chance that perhaps it might be a bit more effective. At least they feel better about it."

Most women concede that mink oil, turtle oil, oxblood skin stiffener, and other exotic products probably don't do much good. They know that these "secrets" have been tried before and found wanting.

Currently there is a rush toward "natural" products—lotions with balsam and lemon, creams and foundations billed as "peach blush" and "strawberry freshener." These come on the heels of synthetics which were the miracles of yesterday. With each new wave come new dreams.

The former executive director of a cosmetics trade association, Steve Mayhem, once said: "What we sell is hope." Another spokesman for the manufacturers put it more eloquently: "The business is one of moonbeams."

But along with her hopes, dreams, and moonbeams, a woman ought to be buying safety.

As the industry moves toward at least token policing of itself, more restrictive regulations may be in the offing. Mrs. Knauer plans to ask for voluntary registration of manufacturers, the filing of complete formulas with FDA, and opening of the industry's complaint files to the government.

Mrs. Sullivan's bill has once more been introduced in the House; it calls for labeling of cosmetics with all ingredients, full clearance and pretesting for safety.

Miss Bassin, the former cosmetics executive, has urged the industry to stop resisting regulation and comply. "Most consumers of cosmetics couldn't care less what's in that lipstick or face cream or deodorant spray," she says. "They want the government and manufacturers to care. Consumers are barely able to pronounce aluminum chlorohydrate . . . how can they be expected to know what it is? [They] would like merely to feel confident that any cosmetic they buy is safe, without having to make judgments for which they are inadequately qualified."

Mrs. Peterson told cosmetics makers, "The question is whether you are going to wait for some disaster to strike which forces you to come clean with your customers, or whether you will solve the competitive problem of individual company disclosure by requiring all manufacturers to disclose the same information in the same manner."

Most cosmetics are safe. But no woman knows which few might not be safe for her. To protect herself, she should minimize use of those which contain suspected substances. Eye preparations which might contain mercury preservatives should be discarded. Use of hexachlorophene products should be cut back, and when applied, they should be rinsed off according to directions. Cleansing creams and other breeding grounds for bacteria should be kept refrigerated. She should stop use of any product which causes an allergic reaction.

Cosmetics are psychologically important to most women. But no woman can feel uplifted by cosmetics if she simultaneously feels fearful about their dangers.

UNITED STATES-JAPAN ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, Americans in their concern for the environmental problems that exist all around us may often overlook that this is really a worldwide issue.

Not only the United States, but other countries are also realizing the urgent need to reverse the process of polluting our air, earth, and water. One nation with many problems similar to our own is Japan, which also has heavily industrialized areas and pollution-choked cities.

It is heartening to know that both countries are responding to the need for cleaning the environment. One manifestation of this is a cooperative effort by the United States and Japan to exchange the expertise and knowledge that each develops on how to effectively combat pollution.

A speech on this subject was given recently by Mr. Shiro Kashiwa, Assistant Attorney General, Land and Natural Resources Division, U.S. Department of Justice. Appearing before the Chicago chapter of the Japan American Society on June 25, 1971, he spoke on "United States-Japan Cooperation on Environmental Quality."

In his remarks, Mr. Kashiwa pointed out that a recent United States-Japan conference in Japan issued a communique calling for "a new higher-level arrangement to be made to guide the policy and implementation of such cooperative efforts as the establishment of criteria" on environmental quality. He feels that this international communique, the first of its kind, is "significant and . . . far-reaching."

I certainly hope that this conference will lead to a positive program of mutual remedial action. Because of the importance of Mr. Kashiwa's remarks, I ask that his speech be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

UNITED STATES-JAPAN COOPERATION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

(Speech by Shiro Kashiwa)

I thank you for your invitation to speak before this Chicago Chapter of the Japan America Society. As a member and director of the Washington, D. C. Japan American Society, I consider it an honor to be invited to say a few words tonight before this sister organization.

We have a mutual goal—good United States-Japan relations.

My subject today is "United States-Japan Cooperation on Environmental Quality." It is a subject not too well known. Very little has been written on it but it is a subject of vast importance not only to United States and Japan but perhaps to the entire world. I firmly believe that the present measures taken by men of both countries engaged in this international cooperation undertaking is outstanding. Therefore I have made it the subject matter of tonight's talk before you.

In 1970 public polls taken both in the United States and Japan showed that environmental pollution matters led all others in public interest. Never before in both countries has a subject matter attracted so much attention and public interest in such a short period of time. The public interest curve was an abrupt curve upward in both countries. All public media in both countries thoroughly discussed the subject. It became a leading subject on televised programs. Public awareness of the problems of pollution became such that candidates for public offices in both countries were compelled to include better environmental quality programs in their respective planks.

The President of the United States in his State of the Union Message in January 1970 declared:

"The great question of the seventies is, shall we surrender to our surroundings, or shall we make our peace with nature and begin to make reparations for the damage we have done to our air, our land and our water?"

Both countries being the leading industrial countries had similar environmental problems. In many instances the problems were identical. But briefly these were the familiar symptoms of environmental crisis in both countries:

(1) Air pollution, particularly from automobiles, power plants and other industrial facilities.

(2) Water pollution, particularly from municipal sewage, industrial wastes and agriculture.

(3) Specific problems such as mercury poisoning, cadmium poisoning and pesticides.

(4) The pollution of beaches, the loss of fish and shellfish areas, the destruction of wildlife.

(5) The loss of open space, urban sprawl, the destruction of shore lines, the defacement of the countryside and the despoliation of nature.

Specifically speaking what happened in Los Angeles in 1960 repeated itself in 1970 in Tokyo:

(1) Photochemical Smog—During the months of July and August 1970, instances of affliction by photochemical smog, similar in nature to the one which wrought a serious social problem some ten years ago in Los Angeles, were reported in a part of Tokyo and its outlying cities. Normally, the density of sulphur oxides and floating dust in the air over Tokyo is higher than that of Los Angeles, but Tokyo is less susceptible to photochemical smog than Los Angeles due to the fact that the former is blessed with favorable topography and meteorological condition, while the latter is prone to smog on account of its location in a basin and the comparatively smaller wind velocity.

During the assault of photochemical smog that took place in Tokyo on July 18, the level of oxidants began to rise around 9 o'clock in the morning and reached the height of 0.34 ppm during the one-hour period from 10:30 to 11:30 and persisted on a high level till about 1 o'clock in the afternoon. Forty-three students who were playing in the smog-stricken ground of Rissho High School in the outskirt of Tokyo complained of smarting eyes, flowing tears, sore throat and coughing and had to undergo medical treatment at a nearby clinic. The number of cases of smog suffering during the day which were reported to the school and nearby clinics stood at about 5,000 students and 114 local citizens.

Let me also quote you the following:

(2) Lead in Automobile Exhaust Gas—On May 21, a group of medical doctors affiliated with Bunkyo-ku Medical Consumers' Cooperative Society of Tokyo made public the findings of health examination they conducted on the inhabitants living in the vicinity Yanagi-cho on the Ushigome traffic intersection, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo. According to the report, of the 62 people whom they examined, 49 underwent blood test for lead contents. The results was that 13 of those tested carried in their blood stream more than 60 ug/dl, a quantity which is officially recognized by the Ministry of Labor in its guidelines set for those working in lead handling factories as bordering on lead poisoning. The report ascribed such an abnormal content of lead in the victims blood stream to the air pollution by lead-containing automotive exhaust gas.

As a result of the happenings in the summer of 1970, there was an exchange of messages in early September 1971 between Prime Minister Sato and President Nixon, emphasizing the need for Japan and the United States to intensify their cooperative efforts in combating environmental disruption.

This exchange of messages resulted in a decision to hold a "United States-Japan Conference on Environmental Quality" in early October 1970. The United States decided to send the following participants, all nationally known figures in the field of environmental improvement, to Japan:

Mr. Russeell E. Train, Chairman, President's Council on Environmental quality.

Dr. Gordon J. MacDonald, Member, President's Council on Environmental Quality.

Mr. Shiro Kashiwa, Assistant Attorney General, Land and National Resources Division, Department of Justice.

Mr. William Scott, Attorney General, State of Illinois.

Dr. John T. Middleton, Commissioner, National Air Pollution Control Administration.

Dr. Allan Hirsch, Assistant Commissioner for Program Planning and Development, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

Mr. Heyward Isham, Senior staff member for International affairs, President's Council on Environmental Pollution.

Dr. Vaun Newill, Director, Division of Health Effects, National Air Pollution Administration.

Dr. James Slater, International Activities Assistant, Office of the Under Secretary, Department of the Interior.

The Japanese list of equally capable participants were:

Mr. Sadanori Yamanaka, Minister of State.

Mr. Kenji Kido, Director-General, Headquarters for Environmental Pollution Countermeasures.

Mr. Morio Uematsu, Assistant-Director General, Headquarters for Environmental Pollution Countermeasures.

Dr. Keishin Matsumoto, Chairman, UJNR Panel on Air Pollution.

Mr. Ken-ichi Hanada, Chairman, UJNR Panel on Water Pollution.

Mr. Takashi Nishikawa, Councillor, Economic Planning Agency.

Mr. Yoshio Tanaka, Director-General, Promotion Bureau, Science and Technology Agency.

Mr. Yoshinao Odaka, Head, International Economy Division, Economic Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Ikuo Soneda, Director-General, Environmental Control Department, Environmental Sanitation Bureau, Ministry of Health and Welfare.

Mr. Yoshimitsu Shibazaki, Director-General, Environmental Protection Department, Environmental Protection and Safety Bureau, Ministry of International Trade and Industry.

Mr. Shozo Harada, Councillor, Minister's Secretariat, Ministry of Transport.

Certain members of the United States delegation left in early October to do the preliminary work. Problems of abatement of pollution is in the main a scientific problem so the science members of the panel of both sides met early and discussed mutual problems and solutions. Separate group sessions on air pollution, water pollution and general matters were held. Subjects such as emergency measures, organizational structures, legal basis, administrative procedures, division of responsibility (national and local), roles of industry and public, arbitration of environmental disputes and various chemical control techniques were discussed.

The entire conference ended with the drafting of the following "Joint Communique on United States-Japan Conference on Environmental Pollution" issued October 15, 1970. Pertinent portions of the communique read as follows:

"In his October 13 meeting with Chairman Train, Prime Minister Sato welcomed the Chairman's visit to Japan and stated that it was our common responsibility to present and future generations to preserve the quality of the environment. The Prime Minister particularly stressed the responsibility of the United States and Japan as major industrial countries in the world, to take constructive initiatives to improve the quality of the environment."

* * * * *

As one of the major purposes of his visit, Chairman Train had an extensive discussion with State Minister in charge of environmental pollution countermeasures Sadanori Yamanaka. They analyzed environmental pollution problems facing the two countries and explained their present and future policies for improving environmental quality.

Chairman Train explained in detail the Administration's policies and organizational structure for dealing with environmental problems, including the establishment by statute of the President's Council and the concepts governing the new Environmental Protection Agency, which will consolidate all pollution control programs of the Federal Government under one single responsible administration.

State Minister Yamanaka stated that environmental pollution control is now the top priority policy item of the Japanese Government. Accordingly, the Government has established the Headquarters for Environmental Pollution Countermeasures, which will seek to revise pollution-related laws and augment budgetary programs to combat pollution.

Furthermore, State Minister Yamanaka expressed deep concern about pollution of the oceans due to dumping of wastes, particularly pollution of the Pacific Ocean. He stated that Japan and the United States should cooperate in cleansing the oceans and that Japan is now preparing for a legislative action to prevent marine pollution. Chairman Train agreed with Minister Yamanaka's remarks, noting that President Nixon had recently endorsed a national policy on ocean dumping of waste to ban unregulated ocean dumping of all materials and strictly limit ocean disposal of any materials harmful to the marine environment.

Chairman Train and Minister Yamanaka agreed on the necessity of an intensified program of cooperation between Japan and the United States, emphasizing positive remedial actions, in order to deal more effectively in air and water pollution and other environmental problems of immediate concern not only to Japan and the United States but to other countries all over the world. They agreed to recommend to the Prime Minister and the President that *a new higher-level arrangement be made to guide the policy and implementation of such cooperative efforts as the establishment of criteria*, the exchange of personnel and reports, and the joint planning and conduct of research projects. It was agreed in principle that the organizational basis for such cooperation should be periodic meetings of ministerial-level officials. These officials will be assisted by administrative officials responsible for policy execution and officials responsible for research and development. [Emphasis supplied.]

The communique is in my belief significant and a far-reaching one in that it is:

(1) The first of its kind in the world on the subject of environmental betterment between two nations.

(2) It is between two of the now leading manufacturing nations of the world.

(3) That the communique is the result of meetings of some of the world's most competent men in this field.

(4) That the communique received the blessing and backing of the top political leaders of both nations.

(5) That the representatives decided on "an intensified program of cooperation between Japan and the United States, emphasizing positive remedial actions, in order to deal more effectively in air and water pollution and other environmental problems of immediate concern not only to Japan and the United States but to other countries all over the world." This I believe will be a historic pledge between the two countries.

(6) The communique predicted future higher level arrangements.

(7) It promised exchange of personnel and reports.

(8) It promised periodic meetings of ministerial-level officials.

I beg to report that Minister Sadanori Yamanaka arrived in Washington, D.C. on May 28, 1971 with a Japanese delegation to continue their cooperation under the communique. They remained for a week in Washington, D.C. They are carrying out this worthy agreement. We in the Federal Government of the United States are cooperating with them as much as possible.

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Japan are to be congratulated for originating this concept of mutual coordination between the two nations on

this very important matter which affects not only Japan and the United States but other nations. Mr. Russell E. Train, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality of the United States and Honorable Sadanori Yamanaka, Minister of State of Japan deserve and should receive 100 percent support from the people of both countries for their wonderful planning and foresight in this effort. The men who made up both teams, United States and Japan, should also be congratulated and applauded.

We as members of the team benefited from the conference. In my case for example, one of my functions in the Department of Justice is to enforce the pollution laws of the United States. On or about the time of my visit to Japan, we were in the midst of our mercury pollution cases. This is what I did.

After the conference in Tokyo, I flew out to Fukuoka and from Fukuoka to Kumamoto City on a slow train. From Kumamoto City, I traveled to the small town of Minamata, in Kumamoto prefecture. Many of you here in the audience are from Japan or have traveled extensively in Japan but you have never been to Minamata. It is a small town of about 50,000 inhabitants on the southern shores of Kyushu with a beautiful protected bay. The people were friendly. I went there because starting in 1954, Minamata village was the historic scene of one of the leading examples of human disaster which may be caused by industrial pollution. Mercury poisoning affected about 111 residents of Minamata of whom 38 died. I visited the public city-operated hospital and health center to see some of the permanently injured patients who are still there. Words cannot describe their suffering. I was impressed with the research the medical men at the University of Kumamoto pursued to solve this problem. They kept records and proper reports. These records and reports are very important to us in the field of environmental litigation. They may be used as basis of opinion evidence in the courts of the United States to prove human dangers of mercury pollution. The public officials at the hospital in Minamata fully cooperated with me, I am grateful. Fortunately in the United States, we have cut down mercury pollution before anyone has been seriously injured. We owe it to these doctors in Kumamoto who traced mercury poisoning from the mercury pollution in the waters of Minamata, to the fish caught in the area to finally the persons who ate the fish and in many cases, the infants of mothers who ate such mercury infested fish.

There are many other areas in this whole field of environmental improvement where the United States and Japan may mutually benefit from each others experience. Our United States laws on air pollution will have direct effects on imports from Japan in the area of auto imports. Rules and regulations drawn under the act and methods of enforcement of the act may create problems.

We as members of the Japan America Society should be particularly interested in this joint cooperation agreement. Pollution is a problem not only of the United States and Japan but it is a world-wide problem. As the United States or Japan find solutions to problems in pollution, under this understanding, it will not only be mutually available but the whole world will benefit from it.

In concluding, let me say this, pollution is a dirty subject. But by an agreement to cooperate, the environmental leaders of both countries have developed not only an arrangement of mutual benefit to each other, but an agreement which promotes good will and understanding between the two countries.

PETER BARTON HUTT

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, recent news releases announced the appointment of Mr. Peter Barton Hutt as Assistant General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for Food, Drug, and Environmental Health.

I take this occasion to applaud this appointment. Mr. Hutt is a distinguished lawyer who combines the highest professional capacity and ability with a proven commitment to public interest concerns. Mr. Hutt has won widespread distinction for his successful efforts to effect realistic solution to our nationwide problem of drug abuse and alcoholism.

As I am personally acquainted with Mr. Hutt, I am familiar with his many contributions to the establishment of programs directly aimed at combating these serious, growing problems. As founder and head of the committee on alcohol and drug reform of the American Bar Association's section on individual rights and responsibilities from 1967 to 1971, Mr. Hutt has fought for an essential change in attitude on proper treatment of alcoholics—from a punishment for a crime to a cure for an illness. I have been impressed by the exceptional quality of his pioneering leadership as chairman of the committee on drug abuse of the ABA's criminal law section and as co-chairman of the drug abuse survey project funded by the Ford Foundation. Mr. Hutt is also consultant to the Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse.

Mr. Hutt's professional expertise in area of his new responsibility is beyond doubt. In 1960, he was granted a fellowship at the food and drug law institute at New York University, and in recent years, he has been a partner in the firm of Covington and Burling and has specialized in food and drug law and regulation. Perhaps it was for this reason that press reports indicated opposition to his appointment from at least one major consumer organization. I can only say that I believe the opposition to Mr. Hutt's appointment was both unfortunate and misinformed. Not only is his personal integrity beyond doubt, but his distinguished record of accomplishment in vital areas of the public interest commands the fullest confidence in the discharge of his new responsibilities. It should be noted that Mr. Hutt makes a considerable financial sacrifice in accepting his new position.

I believe that Secretary Richardson, General Counsel Wilmot R. Hastings, and Mr. William Goodrich, Mr. Hutt's predecessor, should be commended for their part in bringing to the Government service a man of Mr. Hutt's exceptional capacities and commitment.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN, for Thursday, July 1, 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. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday next and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOLLISTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHEUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MIZELL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BOLAND, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. O'HARA, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. O'NEILL in three instances.

Mr. PERKINS.

Mr. BLATNIK, immediately prior to the passage of S. 2133 today.

Mr. HARSHA, immediately prior to the passage of S. 2133 today.

Mrs. ABZUG, during the consideration of H.R. 8629 to follow the remarks of Mrs. GREEN of Oregon.

Mr. STAGGERS, to insert full text of a letter which he read a part during consideration of H.R. 8629.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. HASTINGS in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. JONAS.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. MCCLORY in four instances.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. BELCHER.

Mr. ARCHER.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in five instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. QUIE in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. RIEGLE.
Mr. NELSEN in two instances.
Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.
Mr. SCHERLE.
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENHOLM) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. MANN in two instances.
Mr. CLAY in six instances.
Mr. CARNEY in two instances.
Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts in four instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.
Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama.
Mr. HANNA in three instances.
Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.
Mr. JOHNSON of California in three instances.
Mr. O'NEILL in three instances.
Mr. DE LA GARZA in eight instances.
Mrs. MINK in two instances.
Mr. ABBITT in two instances.
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.
Mr. FAUNTROY in five instances.
Mr. MAZZOLI in two instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
Mr. MAHON.
Mr. ADAMS.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. PATTEN in two instances.
Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.
Mr. PICKLE in eight instances.
Mr. EILBERG.
Mr. RARICK in two instances.
Mr. BRASCO.
Mr. DINGELL in four instances.
Mr. FRASER in three instances.
Mr. ASHLEY in two instances.
Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. ROONEY of New York.
Mr. DORN in three instances.
Mr. FLOWERS in three instances.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
Mr. DIGGS.
Mr. FOLEY.
Mr. ABOUREZK.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9271. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

Date June 30, 1971.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 31. An act to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes; and

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 30, 1971:

H.R. 7016. An act making appropriations for the Office of Education and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7767. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1973, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap;

H.R. 8311. An act to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to extend the act for 2 years, to modify the interest rate on excessive profits and on refunds, to provide that the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction of renegotiation cases, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8313. An act to amend the Social Security Act in order to continue for 2 years the temporary assistance program for U.S. citizens returned from abroad;

H.R. 8825. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 742. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes.

On July 1, 1971:

H.R. 9271. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 351, 92d Congress, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday, July 6, 1971.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 351, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 6, 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:

925. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report on funds obligated in the chemical warfare and biological research programs during the first half of fiscal year 1971, pursuant to section 409, Public Law 91–121, as amended by Public Law 91–441; to the Committee on Armed Services.

926. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of the estimated value of support furnished from military functions appropriations for forces in Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand, for the third quarter of fiscal year 1971, pursuant to 838(b) of Public Law 91–668; to the Committee on Appropriations.

927. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a report entitled "Exports of Significant Defense Articles on the U.S. Munitions List" for the period January through June 1970, pursuant to Public Law 90–229; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

928. A letter from the Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, transmitting notification of a delay in filing the completed audit report for the year ended December 31, 1970; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

929. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of building project survey for Las Cruces, N. Mex., pursuant to a committee resolution; to the Committee on Public Works.

930. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of building project survey containing a general plan and program for the establishment of a convention center-sports arena within the boundaries of the District of Columbia, pursuant to a committe resolution; to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

931. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need of the Post Office Department to evaluate and improve the postal source data system before further expansion; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 492. Resolution directing the Secretary of State to furnish to the House certain information respecting U.S. operations in Laos (Rept. No. 92–327). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 493. Resolution directing the Secretary of State to furnish to the House certain information respecting the Phoenix program (Rept. No. 92–328). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 494. Resolution directing the Secretary of State to furnish to the House the report entitled "United States-Viet Nam Relationships, 1945–1967" (Rept. No. 92–329). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 495. Resolution directing the Secretary of State to furnish to the House certain information respecting bombing operations in northern Laos (Rept. No. 92–330). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HANLEY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 134. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to repeal the reporting requirement contained in subsection (b) of section 1308 (Rept. 92–331). 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. ABOUREZK:

H.R. 9564. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for citizens' suits and class actions in the U.S. district courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 9565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in relation to deduction for business expenses for care of certain de-

pendents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERGLAND:

H.R. 9566. A bill to further provide for the farmer-owned cooperative system of making credit available to farmers and ranchers and their cooperatives, for rural residences, and to associations and other entities upon which farming operations are dependent, to provide for an adequate and flexible flow of money into rural areas, and to modernize and consolidate existing farm credit law to meet current and future rural credit needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9567. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia):

H.R. 9568. A bill to provide compensation to prisoners of war of the Vietnam era because of the inhumane circumstances of their incarceration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LENT, Mr. MORSE, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PELLY, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. FULTON of Tennessee):

H.R. 9569. A bill to provide compensation to prisoners of war of the Vietnam era because of the inhumane circumstances of their incarceration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9570. A bill to strengthen the financial capabilities of State and local governments by providing emergency general support aid to certain local governments; by allowing a credit against individual income taxes; by providing revenue equalization grants to States; and by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into agreements providing for Federal collection of State income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. GROVER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. THONE, Mr. VEYSEY, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 9571. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to provide more effective means for protecting the public interest in national emergency disputes involving the railroad and airline transportation industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9572. 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.

H.R. 9573. 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. 9574. 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. 9575. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $3,000 of an individual civil service retirement annuity (or other Federal retirement annuity) shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MANN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 9576. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, relating to grants for the construction of treatment works, in order to increase the Federal share of construction costs and to authorize the obligation of certain amounts for such grants, and to amend section 10 of the act relating to water quality standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 9577. A bill for the relief of certain separated former employees of railroad terminal companies who formerly performed certain discontinued mail-handling functions in and about railroad terminals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. HATHAWAY, and Mr. HUNGATE):

H.R. 9578. 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. LINK (for himself and Mr. ABOUREZK):

H.R. 9579. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Standing Sioux Tribe in North Dakota and South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCMILLAN (for himself and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia):

H.R. 9580. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland concerning the fees for the operation of certain motor vehicles; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. PELLY, Mr. DOWNING, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PIKE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TEAGUE of California, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 9581. A bill to promote the safety and protect the environmental quality of ports, waterfront areas, and the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MYERS:

H.R. 9582. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the supplementary medical insurance program for surgical services furnished in certain facilities which are established to perform surgery without inpatient hospitalization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 9583. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for citizens' actions in the U.S. district courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. ERLENBORN, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 9584. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to raise the minimum wage to $2 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia:

H.R. 9585. A bill to designate certain lands in the Shenandoah National Park, Va., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 9586. A bill authorizing the improvement of certain roads in the vicinity of Perry Reservoir, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9587. A bill to establish a program to replace, through the cooperative efforts of Federal, State, and local governments, elementary and secondary schools which are in a dangerous location or unsafe condition or are otherwise deficient; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 9588. A bill to provide comprehensive treatment for servicemen and veterans who suffer from abuse of, or dependency on, narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9589. A bill to require Federal contractors to observe practices which will preserve and enhance the environment and fisheries and wildlife resources; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9590. 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. HARSHA (for himself and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 9591. A bill to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1970 to provide additional funds for highway safety programs by authorizing appropriations for such programs in an amount equal to 40 percent of the revenue collected from Federal taxes relating to alcohol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 9592. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 9593. A bill to provide a comprehensive Federal program for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 9594. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Grant-Kohrs Ranch National Historic Site in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER (for himself and Mr. KING):

H.J. Res. 764. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the immunity of Senators and Representatives in cases of public disclosure of classified information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.J. Res. 765. Joint resolution limiting military assistance and military sales to Pakistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.J. Res. 766. Joint resolution; Stable Purchasing Power Resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BOLAND (for himself and Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. STOKES):

H. Con. Res. 356. Concurrent resolution to create a select joint committee to conduct an

investigation and study into the reasons for, and the course of, the U.S. involvement in the war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOLAND (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MINISH, Mr. NIX, Mr. PODELL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YATES):

H. Con. Res. 357. Concurrent resolution to create a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study into the reasons for, and the course of, the U.S. involvement in the war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 358. Concurrent resolution requesting the President and the Secretary of State to urge the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to release Ruth Aleksandrovich, a Soviet Jew, and other similarly situated persons from imprisonment reportedly resulting from their desire to emigrate from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to Israel, and to urge the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to allow all persons desiring to leave that country to do so; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

231. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to naming a nuclear submarine in memory of Congressman William H. Bates; to the Committee on Armed Services.

232. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to removing debris in the Columbia River; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee introduced a bill (H.R. 9595) for the relief of Ruth W. Durrett, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMARKS OF F. EDWARD HÉBERT AT THE KEEL LAYING OF THE "L. MENDEL RIVERS" (SSN-686)

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1971

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the keel of the nuclear attack submarine *L. Mendel Rivers* was laid at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. in Newport News, Va.

The distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, F. EDWARD HÉBERT, was the principal speaker at this significant ceremony and his remarks were timely, important, and eloquent. He praised our former beloved colleague for whom this submarine has been named as:

A man who loved his country and devoted the major energies of his public career to seeing that his country was prepared to counter any threat to its survival.

No truer words could be spoken.

Chairman Hébert also had interesting words about those persons who may be "fatigued in spirit" as far as our overall national defense is concerned. I think my colleagues will find his words most interesting:

REMARKS OF F. EDWARD HÉBERT

In dedicating this nuclear attack submarine to be named in honor of L. Mendel Rivers, we are paying his memory an honor that is richly deserved and singularly appropriate.

He was a man who loved his country and devoted the major energies of his public career to seeing that his country was prepared to counter any threat to its survival.

His contributions have left an indelible mark upon the Armed Forces of the United States. Therefore, it is only just that his name be honored by an instrument of our national security.

To honor him by naming this nuclear attack submarine for him is singularly appropropriate for a number of reasons.

MENDEL RIVERS RECOGNIZED THAT THE UNITED STATES IS ESSENTIALLY A MARITIME POWER

L. Mendel Rivers was always particularly aware that the United States is a maritime power and that command of the seas is, and always has been, central to its survival.

Mendel Rivers rarely wrote magazine articles. The lonely perseverance of the writer did not fit one of his restless nature. But in a rare magazine article several years ago he expressed his feelings about our dependence on the seas. His words bear repeating now.

"It is sometimes forgotten that the U.S. throughout most of its history has been essentially a maritime power. . . .

"The success of our foreign policy and to a considerable extent our economy has depended on control of the seas.

"These rather elemental facts have always been understood by the Congress as they were understood by the founding fathers and because of these facts the Congress has always taken a very special interest in our maritime posture and our naval power. In every war we have fought, save one, it is conceivable that we would have lost—in some case certain that we would have lost—without control of the seas. The exception would be the war with Mexico of 1846–48. Even in our own tragic War between the States, a blockade was crucial to the Union's success. In the Revolutionary War, we did not fully control the seas but our naval successes were essential to victory.

"In our early years, the Congress recognized that a naval power sufficient to protect our maritime commerce was essential to our economic well being. In our own day, it is equally true that our world position could not be maintained without our naval strength and that in warfare, limited or unlimited, a fundamental requirement is unshakable control of the seas."

MANY OF OUR NUCLEAR WARSHIPS BEING BUILT TODAY WERE AUTHORIZED BECAUSE MENDEL RIVERS TOOK THE INITIATIVE TO FORCE THEIR CONSTRUCTION

It is well known that Mendel Rivers fought hard for revitalization of the Navy during his years as Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and made great efforts to convince the Congress and the American people that we should increase the rate of shipbuilding to replace the aging ships in our fleet.

But he was also totally committed to exploiting the advantages of nuclear propulsion for the Navy—not only for submarines, but for surface ships as well.

I think he would be particularly pleased to know that his name is being given to a nuclear ship.

Probably nowhere in the whole national defense area has the impact of Congress been so direct and so profound as in the area of the nuclear Navy.

Without the actions of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Committees on Armed Services, and the Appropriations Committees, the nuclear submarine would not have been developed as early as it was. And, of course, without the development of the nuclear submarine, we could not have had the Polaris submarine, the most invulnerable arm of our strategic deterrent.

In all of the Congressional action to bring about the development of the nuclear submarine, to bring about the development of Polaris, to hasten the development of faster and quieter submarines, and to hasten the application of nuclear power to the surface Navy, Mendel Rivers played a vigorous role.

Ten years ago the House Armed Services Committee took the initiative to change the frigate Truxtun from conventional to nuclear power. Our report at that time—which was issued before the first nuclear-powered surface ship had put to sea—said:

"The purpose of the change is to effect the Committee's desire to increase the number of surface naval vessels which will possess the invaluable ability to cruise with almost unlimited endurance."

In 1965, when he became Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mendel Rivers started the long fight to get a reasonable nuclear-frigate program going.

Mendel Rivers, more than any other person, was responsible for the action in Congress a few years ago which substituted two nuclear frigates for two nonnuclear ships requested by the Department of Defense. These ships are the *California* and the *South Carolina*, which are now under construction here at Newport News along with the nuclear aircraft carriers *Nimitz* and *Eisenhower*.

At that time we also got the Defense Department to agree with a program of five additional nuclear frigates.

However, last month somebody in the Pentagon got the idea that we should not build those frigates.

It was announced that the Department would not build the two frigates, DLGN's 41 and 42, for which advanced procurement funds had already been appropriated. Our Committee refused to accept this disregard of the will of Congress. In the recently passed Military Procurement Authorization bill we limited the use of a portion of Naval ship construction funds to the construction of these DLGN's.

The language we used in our legislation requiring that the nuclear-frigate program proceed is the same language we used in the law to get the *California* and the *South Carolina* built. We learned well the lesson Mendel Rivers taught us.

I tell you today, I pledge to you in Mendel Rivers' name, that this fight for an adequate number of nuclear frigates goes on.

I tell you today that those of us in Congress to whom he threw the torch are determined that Mendel Rivers' dream of a nuclear Navy shall someday become a reality.

MENDEL RIVERS WAS THE OUTSTANDING CONGRESSIONAL EXPERT ON THE SOVIET SUBMARINE THREAT AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ASW MISSION FOR THE U.S. NAVY

The submarine for which we lay the keel today will be one of the last of the Sturgeon