

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene on tomorrow at 11:30 a.m. following a recess.

Under the orders previously entered, the able Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes immediately following the approval of the Journal, if there is no objection, and the recognition of the majority leader and the minority

leader under the standing order of January 29.

Following the remarks of the able Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), the very distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, following which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The period for the transaction of routine morning business will extend to the time, under the previous order, for the recognition of the majority leader in connection with the business to be transacted in executive session.

The majority leader is to be recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes just prior to the vote which will occur on the treaty. The vote will occur on the treaty circa 1 p.m. The vote will be a rollcall vote.

Following the vote on the treaty, the Senate will resume its consideration of the pending business.

RECESS TO 11:30 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with the previous order that the Senate stand in recess until 11:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed until tomorrow, February 10, 1971, at 11:30 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 9 (legislative day of January 26), 1970:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

H. Brooks Phillips, of Mississippi, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Mississippi for the term of 4 years vice John H. Phillips, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 9, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Andrew Leigh Gunn, Grace United Methodist Church, Gaithersburg, Md., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, we thank You for our beautiful and free Nation with its majestic mountains and ocean shores, its plains, rivers, and lakes. Forgive us when we befoul our land's beauty. Teach us to live in harmony with what you have created.

We rejoice in the success of our moon mission and we pray for the safe return of our astronauts this afternoon. We ask Your divine favor on the Members of this House of Representatives. May they work toward goals which will lift our Nation and bring it new unity. Yes, we ask for peace, O Lord, and the speedy return of all troops to their native lands. Let there be the greening of America by the light of Your truth and righteousness. Finally, we pray for our Nation's youth: Give them, give us all, a new vision of service and greatness. In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

NEW RULE APPROVED BY INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has long been a leading committee of the House of Representatives in taking steps to advance orderly pro-

cedures and help to bring about better committee operation and better operation of the House itself.

I am proud to be authorized this morning by the committee to announce that the Committee this morning has tentatively approved a rule which provides that any committee meeting that conflicts with regularly scheduled party caucuses or party conferences shall be canceled.

This action was taken by a unanimous vote of the committee with the support of the chairman and the ranking minority member, and I think it is a pattern that should be called to the attention of other committees of the House.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the announcement which the gentleman from Oklahoma just made.

I think the party caucuses and party conferences are important for all Members to attend, and I would hope that other committees will follow the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

A WATCHDOG OVER GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be introducing a bill today, cosponsored by 59 of my colleagues in the House, known as the "Government Contract Security Act." The bill gives expanded authority to the Comptroller General of the United States to investigate Government contracts characterized by cost overruns of 10 percent or more and/or late delivery. It requires annual scrutiny and criticism by the General Accounting

Office of the contracts of all executive agencies. Extensive reports of the findings would then be given, also on an annual basis, to Congress with careful delineations of the reasons behind the violations. GAO is empowered to obtain all such material, and I believe that it must exercise this prerogative.

Under present authority, the reports of the General Accounting Office need not be issued with any specific frequency or on any particular subject unless requested by a committee of either House of Congress. Under my proposal, the General Accounting Office would be given watchdog authority over individual contracts for services and research, construction, alteration, or repair of any kind requested by the Government, and the manufacture or furnishing of materials for which the Government had contracted, and would issue specific reports at specific intervals.

The most glaring violations of Government contracts have, of course, been in the area of defense spending; the TFX airplane, the C-5A transport, the Cheyenne helicopter are but three examples of the failures that the public has been forced to subsidize in silence, and into which the Government, until only recently, has willingly poured funds. And as we know, the overruns in defense are more costly than in any other area.

Defense encompasses about one-half of the Federal budget, and mistakes often mean billions of dollars. Inefficiency and overruns may be brought to public attention by individual "whistle-blowing," but I believe GAO's regular scrutiny of contracts is the best means of assuring such reporting.

A recent report by the General Accounting Office, entitled, "Acquisitions of Major Weapons System," documents how large these overruns have been and how poor the planning. Although I commend the General Accounting Office for its initiative in this vital area, one might say that the report was too long in coming. Billions of dollars

were spent on the C-5A and the F-111 alone to bring them up to originally contracted standards. My bill would eliminate such future waste.

My proposal would make such scrutiny a yearly project so that Congress, before authorizing and appropriating funds for projects in a new fiscal year, would have the information required to appropriate wisely—not into bottomless pits—but into viable systems and programs.

The power to appropriate funds is one of the most important ones in our entire political system. If the legislative branch is to maintain any type of control and have any say in this process, it must have an adequate supply of necessary information. It is one thing to appropriate money and quite another to do it so that the interests of all our citizens are served. The latter goal requires information that has not been readily available to Congress in the past.

The executive branch of the Federal Government has the Bureau of the Budget to aid it in its fiscal determinations. The legislative branch does have the General Accounting Office for independent scrutiny, but I believe that my bill would make that organization even more effective in these crucial determinations.

My colleague, the Honorable JACK BROOKS, of Texas, made an excellent suggestion when he stated that the GAO would also have to be provided with a modern computer-based fiscal management audit system to provide the House and Senate with a flow of data that could be used to safeguard the taxpayers' interest from all types of fiscal irresponsibility. I would like to associate myself with the ideas of Congressman BROOKS.

In addition, we are today being faced with choices that are a direct result of cost overrun and fiscal mismanagement such as Lockheed Aircraft receiving money from the Federal Government to keep operating. Decisions are now going to have to be made as to how far the Federal Government will have to get involved in these matters. I believe that such decisions would never have had to been made if closer scrutiny of contracts had been the rule rather than the exception.

Finally, defense is still only one portion of our Federal budget. Government programs in other areas have grown both numerically and in terms of the money expended. In these programs, too, efficiency is not the characteristic that is most associated with their operation. My bill would authorize the General Accounting Office to make the same annual review of these programs as well.

I believe then that this bill is an important and a timely measure. It will lead to the asking of questions that have been left out of important decisions on national priorities. It will provide Congress with the tools that it must have if it is to act and legislate in the public interest. I hope that this year Congress will act to give the General Accounting Office this important authority.

The following Members of Congress have joined with me in the sponsorship of this bill:

Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr.

BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRADEMAs, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. ESCH, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KEITH, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSHER.

Mr. MOSS, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. THONE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WOLFF.

NEED FOR INCREASED FEDERAL SHARE IN WASTE TREATMENT CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President sent to the Congress the "First Annual Report on the State of the Nation's Environment."

There are a number of good points in the document. There are also a number of omissions and failures.

The President proposes that \$6 billion in Federal funds be spent over the next 3 years as the Federal Government's 50-percent share in the program of waste treatment facilities construction. This leaves the Nation's State and local governments with a \$6 billion matching requirement. This is a nearly impossible requirement. The administration recognizes this by further recommending help to municipalities in overcoming "the difficulties they face in selling bonds on reasonable terms to finance their share of construction costs."

The tremendous cost of constructing major treatment facilities is such a burden on our already overstrained cities that as a result most construction has been done in small towns and villages—often for industrial development purposes rather than pollution control purposes. The following table, accurate through the end of June 1969, shows how little money has been spent in the big cities which are confronted with the huge pollution problems:

Population	Number of projects	Federal grants	Percent of grants (cumulative)
Less than 2,500.....	4,641	\$224,368,484	17
2,500 to 5,000.....	1,359	156,956,004	28
5,001 to 10,000.....	1,158	187,349,738	42
10,001 to 25,000.....	1,045	254,855,555	61
25,001 to 50,000.....	518	175,688,014	74
50,001 to 125,000.....	334	163,926,363	86
125,001 to 250,000.....	155	73,773,793	92
250,001 to 500,000.....	87	36,913,087	95
Over 500,000.....	148	71,025,224	100
Total.....	19,445	1,344,856,262	

Estimated total cost of the 9,445 projects is \$5,351,572,735.

The administration has made a major effort for revenue sharing. Yet there is no more important area where the Federal Government can help share local expenses and direct local expenses toward needed pollution correction then in the waste treatment facilities construction program. The demand for \$6 billion in matching funds completely washes out the promise of \$5 billion in revenue sharing.

For this reason, I am introducing today legislation which will increase the Federal share in grants to State and local governments for the construction of waste treatment facilities.

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY CELEBRATES 150TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the George Washington University of which I am a graduate, is the only private nonsectarian university in our Capital City, and this year is celebrating its 150th anniversary. On this date, 150 years ago, President James Monroe signed the congressionally approved charter for the university under which it still operates. A member of the staff of the university was good enough to furnish me with information regarding the long history of this fine institution for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY SEQUICENTENNIAL, 1821-1971

From a shoestring beginning in 1821 with 30 students and three professors, the George Washington University has grown into one of the major educational institutions in the United States.

Known as the alma mater of federal decision-makers this private, nonsectarian university has more graduates in the foreign service and in top federal executive positions than has any other college or university in the nation.

In addition to Congressman Scott, a graduate of the law school, other members of the 92nd Congress who are alumni include Senators Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia; Norris Cotton, New Hampshire; J. William Fulbright, Arkansas; Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii and Frank E. Moss, Utah. And in the House, Congressman Garry Brown, Michigan; Joel T. Broyhill, Virginia; Goodloe E. Byron, Maryland; Charles E. Chamberlain, Michigan; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; John J. Flynt, Georgia; Gilbert Gude, Maryland; Orval Hansen, Idaho; Sherman P. Lloyd, Utah; Paul G. Rogers, Florida; Keith G. Sebelius, Kansas; and Joseph Skubitz, Kansas. Also, included are two members of the President's Cabinet: Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, George W. Romney and David M. Kennedy, Secretary of the Treasury. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis, and Margaret Truman Daniel are among GW's famous graduates.

The University's 40,000 living alumni include equally distinguished people in business, industry, and the professions. In the Washington area alone, there are 20,000 alumni, including 4,200 lawyers, 900 physicians, 2,300 educators, and 1,000 engineers.

The co-winner of the 1970 Nobel Prize in medicine, Julius Axelrod, is a GW graduate and part-time faculty member.

GW's student body numbers 15,000 on-campus (from 50 states and 92 countries)

and 10,000 off-campus adults who take courses in the suburbs, in the federal agencies, and in the Armed Forces. The on-campus student population includes 97 minority group students from the District of Columbia who are admitted without charge.

Under President Lloyd H. Elliott, GW is completing an ambitious development program which, in the past five years, has doubled the value of its physical plant and given identity to its 16-block urban campus bounded by Pennsylvania Avenue, 24th, F, and 19th Streets, N.W., just three blocks west of the White House.

Currently under construction is a \$25,000,000 medical school complex and a \$16,000,000 income-producing building to be leased to PEPCO. A \$10,000,000 University Library is expected to get underway this spring. Recently completed were a \$9,000,000 University Center and a \$4,500,000 classroom building. Other recent additions include the Jacob Burns Law Library, the Luther Rice administration building, the Eugene Meyer Pavillion of the University Hospital, the Joseph Henry office building, a new office building, a new Emergency Unit for the Hospital, and the University Clinic (offering all major specialties for out-patient care).

With more than 6,500 personnel, GW is the second largest corporate entity in the Metropolitan Washington area. The University is channeling \$200,000 a day, 365 days a year into the Metropolitan Washington area through its annual budget of approximately \$75,000,000.

Academic programs are offered through eight degree-granting schools and colleges including the nation's second largest law school and the well-known schools of Medicine, Public and International Affairs, and Government and Business Administration. Interdisciplinary approaches to study and research are exemplified by programs in Science, Technology and Public Policy; Sino Soviet Studies; and Law, Psychiatry, and Criminology.

At the undergraduate level, a wide range of conventional subjects is complemented by unique programs in speech pathology, medical technology, Chinese studies, Latin American studies, statistics, and experimental humanities.

Exceptional opportunities for learning are made possible through cooperative programs conducted in various fields of study with the Library of Congress, United States Information Agency, the Smithsonian, National Gallery of Art, Members of Congress, and such inner-city groups as Shaw People for Urban Renewal (SPUR), Congress Heights Association for Services and Education (CHASE), Congress Heights Committee for Health facilities and Medical Services and the Washington Metropolitan Planning and Housing Association.

Through these and other academic offerings, GW seeks to provide future leaders with the knowledge, experience, and motivation to devote a lifetime to coping with the problems which the nation is, and will be, facing.

The Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade paid tribute to the University on January 19, 1971, at a special Sesquicentennial Luncheon. Almost 500 government, business and industrial leaders honored The George Washington University for its 150 year contribution to our nation and the Metropolitan Washington Area. Congratulatory messages were read during the festivities including:

"Throughout its eventful history the George Washington University has responded with strength and imagination to the changing academic needs of our growing society." President Richard M. Nixon—The White House.

"George Washington University's 150 years of growth and steady progress, and its significant future plans, combine to constitute an exemplary source of great inspiration to the

City of Washington and to the entire metropolitan community. Even beyond the academic contributions, we are aware of the significant economic impact that is made by the University to the general welfare of our citizens." Commissioner Walter E. Washington—District of Columbia.

"Marylanders—as well as the people of all the 50 states and many foreign nations—can take great pride in the outstanding educational and cultural opportunities offered by The George Washington University." Gov. Marvin Mandel—State of Maryland.

"For 150 years George Washington University has made a continuing contribution to higher education throughout the world. We in Virginia feel a particular bond to an institution whose alumni can be found throughout the Commonwealth." Gov. Linwood Holton—Commonwealth of Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues in the House would want to join in extending congratulations to the George Washington University on the occasion of its sesquicentennial 1821-1971.

PRESIDENT CAN ACHIEVE A STABLE ECONOMY

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, in his economic report to the Congress, President Nixon has wisely rejected the gratuitous advice from some quarters that the Government should intervene more heavily in our free enterprise market.

The President has recognized that strong action must be taken to hold back the spiraling wage and price increases but he is also well aware of the dangers in instituting wage and price controls. Using, as he says he will, all the effective and legitimate powers of Government to strengthen the free market forces that hold prices down, the President can achieve a stable economy without resorting to the crippling effect of Government controls.

We can be thankful that this administration has a healthy respect for the free marketplace and cannot be panicked into extreme Government actions. As the President said, he has a policy of action: but not a policy of merely action for action's sake.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1821, President James Monroe signed a congressionally approved charter establishing the George Washington University. This year the university is celebrating its 150th anniversary. For the past 150 years George Washington University has been a well-known and respected institution of learning, and it is my belief, and the belief of many others, that it will continue as such for the next 150 years.

I am proud to say that I am an alumnus of this great institution. In 1939 I graduated from the George Washington

National Law Center. As an alumnus, I am also proud of the distinguished record of service of so many of my fellow graduates. The George Washington University has produced more graduates in the foreign service and in top Federal positions than any other college or university in the Nation. In the 92d Congress there are five Senators and 12 Congressmen who graduated from G.W. J. Edgar Hoover, George Romney, and David Kennedy are also graduates. It is no accident that G.W. has been called the alma mater of Federal decisionmakers.

Of course many things have changed in the last 150 years. And an institution which rigidly rejected change could certainly not have survived all these years. It is to the credit of the university and its administration over the years that it has met the demands of the increasingly complex world and adapted itself to the times. Without this willingness to change the university could never have earned its reputation as an institution which provides future leaders with the knowledge and experience to deal with the problems of today and tomorrow.

I would like to join with my fellow George Washington University graduates in wishing our alma mater another 150 years of service.

CONVERSION RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACT OF 1971

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the Conversion Research and Education Act of 1970 which is being reintroduced today. Since my district includes the Kennedy Space Center, I am well aware of the serious dislocations caused by changes in national priorities and the lack of a national policy to deal with such dislocations.

Periodically, the Federal Government urgently seeks professional talent to meet what are thought important national needs, and a few years later these highly trained people are callously dumped into a depressed job market. This lack of planning or anticipating changes in national priorities is tragic. It is tragic not only because it evidences poor management and a waste of valuable national resources, but also because it shows a lack of concern by us in the Federal Government for the individuals involved.

The space program is a perfect example. In order to realize the goal of placing a man on the moon by 1970, the Congress appropriated massive funds and put maximum emphasis on the space program. Brevard County in which the Kennedy Space Center is located became the fastest growing county in the Nation. Approximately 40 percent of the total work force were in professional and managerial occupations reflecting the fact that service and support was the main requirement, rather than manufacturing of aerospace equipment.

During 1970, the economy of the area changed dramatically. Significant reduction in both NASA and Department of

Defense budgets brought about a total reduction of 16,000 jobs at the Kennedy Space Center and the Air Force Eastern Test Range. The unemployment rate in the area has risen from 1.9 percent in 1966 to almost 8 percent. A large percentage of those unemployed are well-educated with considerable technical expertise, are in the middle-age bracket, and have large family and financial obligations.

Mr. Speaker, we have a moral obligation to those displaced professionals and their families. It was the Congress who made it a national policy to lure well-qualified professionals away from other areas to be retrained in aerospace and defense science and engineering. Thus, we in the Congress are obliged to fund conversion research and the retraining of these highly skilled people to work in other emerging areas of national importance.

The bill we are introducing today authorizes funds needed to effectively meet the challenges of a nation in transition and, at the same time, sets forth a national policy which, hopefully, will anticipate and prepare for future changes in national priorities. The combination of retraining programs and research, aid to small businesses, and the establishment of nonprofit community conversion corporations will go a long way toward meeting the immediate problem. On the other hand, the establishment of an Advisory Commission on Research and Development Conversion together with a research program for the National Science Foundation will result in the anticipation and identification of changing priorities.

An area of great potential, especially for those in the aerospace field, for utilizing the skills of the professional unemployed is the environmental sciences. With public interest in improving the environment so high and the shortfall in expertise, this area is a natural. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has estimated that the water pollution control field alone will require 2,400 more water quality management engineers annually from 1972 to 1976 than present higher education institutions will produce. Projecting these figures across all of the environmental sciences can only lead to the conclusion that there is a severe need for technically trained persons, and, the logical source of supply would be the displaced aerospace and defense engineers, scientists, and technicians.

Consequently, I have worked with local educational institutions and officials to create a Center for Regional, Environmental Training and Research—Retro—in central Florida which will coordinate retraining programs in the environmental and also conduct research and development projects for Federal, State, and local agencies. This R. & D. project would provide on-the-job training while, at the same time, provide solutions to pressing environmental problems. Because it is an ideal natural laboratory and possesses the manpower and economic resources, I am hopeful that this Center will become a national stimulus for utilizing the displaced profes-

sionals in a mushrooming area of national priority.

THE INVASION OF LAOS

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in approving a major invasion of Laos, actively supported by American airpower and firepower, and apparently directed by American officers in Saigon, the President has struck yet another devastating blow at the central pillar of our American form of government, the separation of powers. Once again the constitutional authority of the Congress over questions of war and peace has been bypassed. The President has played games with congressional declarations of policy embodied in the law. The Congress itself has been tricked and demeaned.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon those Members of the House who so often in the past have been quick to rise in protest against any slight to the authority of the Congress in respect to other Government activities to speak out against Presidential authoritarianism in this case, and to act against it.

Mr. Speaker, in 1969 and again in 1970 the Congress wrote into law that no defense appropriation should be used for ground combat operations in Laos. Did anyone suppose at the time that the President, sworn to uphold the Constitution and the law, would send in American-operated helicopters to land allied ground troops, to give them air combat and artillery support, and to take the American casualties inevitable in such an operation?

Does anyone suppose that if the President had asked the Congress to approve such an American operation in advance he would have obtained such approval?

No one would have the gall so to contend.

What can the Congress then do about it?

As the first step, the Congress should quickly require an end to the Laotian operation, and a bill to that end, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, has been introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON), H.R. 3633.

Second, the Congress should enact legislation effectively to protect its constitutional authority over questions of war and peace. Since both Houses must concur in a declaration of war, the President should not be able to carry out undeclared wars unless both Houses concur, at least tacitly. This result can be assured by giving to either House the power to require the termination of undeclared hostilities. I plan to reintroduce legislation to this effect tomorrow.

THE INVASION OF LAOS

(Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, today I join the distinguished gentleman from

Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLOSKEY) and others in cosponsoring legislation to prohibit any U.S. military involvement in or connected with the nation of Laos. This legislation, which is in the form of an amendment to the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, Public Law 91-652, would prohibit the use of Federal taxpayers' funds, in any form, from supporting any kind of military operations in Laos—including U.S. ground combat troops, U.S. advisers to or for Laotian military forces, U.S. air or sea support for any military operations in Laos, or any other kind of U.S. support for military operations of any nation in Laos.

In the last few days the American people have been subjected to an object lesson in what Senator FULBRIGHT once described as an "arrogance of power."

We have witnessed the incredible spectacle of the Nixon administration blithely embarking on a second invasions expedition into countries neighboring on South Vietnam, in violation of the neutrality and the sovereignty of Laos, in violation of the Geneva Accords of 1962, and in violation of the intent, if not of the letter, of legislation—the Church-Cooper amendment—passed by the Congress last year. This was done in secrecy from the press and from the Congress of the United States. But the secrecy with which this illicit mission was undertaken is not the real or the principal issue. Nor is the protection of American troops still in Vietnam the real issue. The best way to protect American lives would be to get American troops out of Vietnam, as every American knows, and the sooner the better. The real issue is the fact that President Nixon is fully engaged on a theater-wide conflict throughout all of Southeast Asia and is following a program that was mapped out by the Pentagon long before the President took office.

Today we are fighting a general's war in Asia. This is not a war of the American people. The American people elected President Nixon to get them out of the war, and 73 percent, according to the recent Gallup poll, are for complete withdrawal. This is not a war of the Vietnamese people. The corrupt and undemocratic Thieu-Ky regime, which we bolster, does not represent the Vietnamese people. This is a war of the ruling military groups of South Vietnam and the United States, and President Nixon is riding this tragic whirlwind through the jungles of Asia. Indeed, he is responsible and will ultimately be held to account by history for his mistaken policy in Asia, providing the recklessness of that policy does not bring about another world war and render us bankrupt economically.

The Vietnamization policy has been successful if one measures it by the fact that we seek to transform the South Vietnamese Army into the invading champion of Southeast Asia, and now give them Laos to test their strength. We were told that the purpose of our involvement in South Vietnam was to enable the South Vietnamese to become strong enough to defend themselves and assure self-determination. Yet today we

see that Vietnamization as President Nixon means it is the conquest of Southeast Asia by the South Vietnamese Army and the indefinite presence of U.S. troops there to help them. They have invaded two countries in the last year, once with our overt support in Cambodia and this time with everything except U.S. troops on the ground.

Where do we go next, Mr. President? Thailand, Burma, or North Vietnam? And as we invade the freedom of others we do so at the cost of continued imprisonment of 300,000 of our own American soldiers in Vietnam.

I hope that other Members will join in cosponsoring the Harrington-McCloskey amendment and that we will bring this measure to the floor for a favorable vote. I believe it is time that the House took decisive action to spell out for the administration the plain fact that the American people want an end to this idiocy in Southeast Asia; that they want our soldiers home again before another year passes; and that invasions in the name of peace will serve only to prolong this bitter war.

LAOTIAN INVASION

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

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a headline in Monday morning's paper says that war critics are resigned to the Laotian invasion. I am sure it is true that some of the most outspoken critics of the war are resigned to the fact that the President arbitrarily and without consulting or even informing the Congress has invaded another country just as he did a year ago.

Of course I am pleased that no American ground combat forces were used. I am sure that had we not passed the Cooper-Church amendment, they would have been used, and I am very grateful that this action and act of responsibility on the part of Congress saved a great many American lives. But American air power has made this invasion by the South Vietnamese possible. Therefore, it is as much our invasion as was the Cambodian invasion of 1970, and yet there is no hue and cry over this invasion.

Perhaps we are resigned to it. But I refuse to let this happen in total silence.

There can be no doubt about this latest action on the part of the administration. We have opened another front in the war. We have invaded another sovereign country. We have expanded an ever widening war that is supposedly winding down.

The promises of the 1970 campaign have been broken already, and once again we see that the administration considers the executive branch of Government the only branch responsible for military actions. President Nixon has been President for more than 2 full years, and now instead of just having a war in Vietnam, we have a war in Cambodia and now a war in Laos.

Last May, our objections were met with flat statements from the adminis-

tration that the invasion of Cambodia was a single and final act that would end enemy infiltration of Cambodia and secure that country for the free world.

Today, the North Vietnamese control more of Cambodia than they ever did, and it is reasonably estimated that they could seize the capital and the rest of the country at will if they so desire.

Our invasion of that country, the divisions we created, and the atrocities perpetrated in our name have probably lost Cambodia to us more than has any action, either militarily or politically, on the part of the North Vietnamese.

Are we doing this once more in a third country—Laos?

It appears so.

Once again, we are promised that this is a single and final action. That it is done to interdict the delivery of supplies and to prevent buildups before the rainy season. Yet our experience in Cambodia should teach us otherwise.

The Kingdom of Laos is sorely divided, and I doubt that our sponsorship of a foreign invasion will strengthen the forces of the Royal Lao. I think this invasion, like the Cambodian invasion, is a grave error, for it aggravates tension within those countries, it accomplishes little militarily, and it is an affront to all those that believe in international law and the sovereignty of borders.

Last May, we were told that President Nixon had ordered the invasion of Cambodia to break up Viet Cong supply lines, save American lives, and protect South Vietnam. We are now told that there has been an invasion of Laos to stop Communist supply lines, save American lives, and protect Cambodia. Whom will we invade to protect Laos?

There are those that say the President is making a big splash to cover the retreat of American forces. If this is to appease the hawks, I am appalled. If this is to show the South Vietnamese that we support them, I am dismayed.

I do not understand why it is apparent only to critics of the war that it is expanding. The administration does not see it that way. They see the invasion of Cambodia and the invasion of Laos as a narrowing of the war. Yet, the fact that we have been fighting increasingly and spending 200 times as much money in Cambodia as was originally planned does not seem to be an extension of our involvement or an extension of the war in the eyes of the administration.

It does seem that way to me.

I have no doubt that the administration will claim a success in the invasion of Laos, just as there was a "successful" invasion of Cambodia.

But if last May's experience teaches us anything, "success" means Communist forces growing in strength and popularity—with the Pathet Lao controlling more and more of the country as their counterparts now do in Cambodia.

Our intervention, designed to stop the growth of Communist forces, has had an opposite effect.

As the editorial in the Boston Sunday Globe yesterday pointed out, it appears that the administration has forgotten that Laos borders on Communist China. It has forgotten what happened

at the Yalu River during the Korean war, and that there are limits to intervention.

I would like to quote from that editorial, for it is succinct and to the point:

The Nation has been told repeatedly that we seek no wider war, and always the war widens. It is always done in the name of assuring the safety of our troops, and what we wind up supporting in their name is one weak, corrupt foreign government after another. And all this is done to oppose communism, which is a word that simply has no meaning to Asians.

By May, when the rainy season begins again, we shall still have 284,000 troops in Vietnam and be supporting in one way or another who knows how many invasions of nearby countries. We cannot begin to emerge from this morass until President Nixon sets a firm date for our total withdrawal, as Hanoi has demanded and as 73 percent of the American people, according to a recent Gallup Poll, now believe he should do.

The war widens, Americans are killed, our economy flounders. There are almost six million Americans out of work because our resources are being wasted in Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam. These great events affecting the very quality of American life occur in silence and in ignorance.

The news embargo has been successful in that Americans know less about this invasion than do the rest of the people of the world.

With insufficient information and with no direct reports either from our Government or the press, it is not easy to comment in depth. But with the scarce information we have, I feel it is incumbent upon me as the representative of the Eighth District of Massachusetts to protest this widening of the war, this circumvention of the Cooper-Church amendment.

I cannot sit by and allow the administration to commit American men and the future of our Nation to another war without speaking out. I protest this action, and I protest the President ignoring American public opinion, the expressed desires of the Congress and refusing to consult with the elected representatives of the people.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Have we now disposed of all special orders?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that the Chair intends to enforce the 1-minute rule on all occasions when we have business, but the Chair has been lenient today because there is no legislative business scheduled for today.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the Speaker.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES FOR THE CONDUCT OF THAT COMMITTEE

(Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a copy of the rules adopted by the Rules Committee for the conduct of that committee

during this session of Congress as required by statute.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the new rules of the House require standing committees to adopt their own written rules of procedure. Also, the written rules of the Committee on Rules which were adopted 4 years ago provide that the chairman may have its rules of procedure printed in an early issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Therefore, I arise at this time to place the written rules of the Committee on Rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On last Thursday, February 4, 1971, the House of Representatives reconstituted the Committee on Rules. That same afternoon it met and adopted its new committee rules for the 92d Congress which consists of its old rules with certain additions which basically were necessitated by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

Mr. Speaker, the following rules were adopted unanimously by the Committee on Rules.

THE 92D CONGRESS—RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, ADOPTED FEBRUARY 4, 1971

RULE 1—MEETINGS

(a) The Committee on Rules shall meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday of each week while the Congress is in session. Meetings shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairman, or in the absence of the Chairman, by the Ranking Majority Member of the Committee present as Acting Chairman.

(b) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public except when a majority of the Committee determine that testimony received may bear upon matters affecting the national security. Executive sessions of the Committee shall be closed.

(c) For the purpose of hearing testimony, a majority of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(d) A printed transcript of any hearing or public meeting of the Committee may be had if the Chairman decides it is necessary, or if a majority of the Members request it.

(e) A Tuesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with where, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need therefor, and additional meetings may be called by the Chairman, or by written request of a majority of the Committee duly filed with the Counsel of the Committee.

(f) The Committee may permit, by a majority vote on each separate occasion, the coverage of any open meeting, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography under such requirements and limitations as are set forth in the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(g) The five-minute rule in the interrogation of witnesses, until such time as each Member of the Committee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness, shall be followed.

RULE 2—VOTING

(a) No measure or recommendation shall be reported, deferred, or tabled by the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

(b) A roll call vote of the Members of the Committee may be had upon the request of any Member.

(c) The result of each roll call vote, including the names of Committee Members and how they voted on specific issues, shall be available for public inspection at the office of the Committee.

RULE 3—REPORTING

(a) Whenever the Committee authorizes the favorable reporting of a bill or resolution from the Committee, the Chairman or Acting Chairman shall report the same or designate some member of the Committee to report the same to the House, such report to include the totals of any record vote thereon.

RULE 4—COMMITTEE STAFFING

(a) The professional and clerical staffs of the Committee shall serve under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of the members of the staffs and delegate such authority as the Chairman deems appropriate, with the exception of the Minority staff, who shall serve under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

RULE 5—MISCELLANEOUS

(a) The Committee shall prepare, maintain, and publish for the Members of the Committee, so far as practicable, a calendar listing all matters formally before it. Information on the calendar shall include the numbers of the bills or resolutions, a brief description of the bill's contents, including the legislative committee reporting it and the name of the principal sponsoring Member.

(b) For purposes of this rule, matters formally before the Committee include: bills or resolutions over which the Committee has original jurisdiction, and bills or resolutions from other committees concerning which the chairman or designated member of such committee has requested a hearing in writing and forwarded to the Committee on Rules a copy of such bill or resolution as reported, together with the final printed committee report.

(c) Executive session minutes shall be available to Committee members but may not be released to any other person without the consent of the Committee, in compliance with Rule XI, clause 27(o).

(d) Upon adoption of the rules and procedures of the Committee at the opening of each Congress, the Chairman may have these rules and procedures printed in an early issue of the Congressional Record.

THE PRESIDENT'S ENVIRONMENT MESSAGE

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think it is especially appropriate and significant that the President's second major message on the environment has come to us this week, for it was a year ago tomorrow, February 10, 1970, that his first eloquent message on the environment was sent to the Congress. You will recall that in that message the President said:

The time has come when we can wait no longer to repair the damage already done, and to establish new criteria to guide us in the future.

He went on to say that the "urgent common goal of all Americans was the rescue of our natural habitat as a place both habitable and hospitable to man," that, "the task of cleaning up our environment calls for a total mobilization by all of us," and that, "it summons our energy, our ingenuity and our conscience in a cause as fundamental as life itself." In that message the President outlined a comprehensive, 37-point program for

the environment, including 23 major legislative proposals and 14 new administrative actions.

While the overall legislative record of the 91st Congress was far from impressive, I do think we made a noteworthy beginning in laying the groundwork for the environment decade. We passed the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 which, among other things, established the President's Council on Environmental Quality; we passed the Clean Air Act Amendments which set national air quality standards; we approved the Resource Recovery Act which deals with solid waste disposal and recycling programs; we passed tough new oil spill legislation; and we approved an executive reorganization plan creating the Environmental Protection Agency.

In his environment message yesterday President Nixon took note of these accomplishments, but also underscored those pieces of unfinished business carried over from last year's agenda.

Near the top of that list are the administration's bills dealing with water pollution control, waste treatment facilities, and environmental financing authority. These should all be top priority items in this 92d Congress. The President has proposed a \$12 billion, 3-year program to construct municipal waste treatment facilities, with half those funds coming from the Federal Government. And the President has again proposed the creation of an Environmental Financing Authority to insure that every municipality has an opportunity to sell its waste treatment plant construction bonds. And the administration is again sending up its water pollution control legislation which would strengthen water pollution standard-setting and enforcement powers, vesting many of these in the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. Unfortunately, none of the above-mentioned bills even got out of committee in the last Congress.

I do not want to deal at great length here with all of the other excellent legislative recommendations contained in the administration's environmental program, but I do want to single out a few which I feel are worthy of special mention at this time. I welcome the President's call for the adoption of a national land use policy "which will encourage the States, in cooperation with local government, to plan for and regulate major developments affecting growth and the use of critical land areas."

As the President points out:

This should be done by establishing methods for protecting lands of critical environmental concern, methods for controlling large-scale development, and improving use of lands around key facilities and new communities.

To assist States in this effort, the President is proposing a 5-year, \$100 million authorization, with priority given to States of the coastal zone which, in his words, "is especially sensitive to development pressures."

In conjunction with this, the President is calling upon the Congress to review our Federal public land policy. Federal public lands comprise nearly one-third

of our Nation's land area. As the President put it:

The public lands belong to all Americans. They are part of the heritage and the birthright of every citizen. It is important, therefore, that these lands be managed wisely, that their environmental values be carefully safeguarded, and that we deal with these lands as trustees for the future.

The Public Land Law Review Commission, in its recent report, one-third of the Nation's land, has provided an excellent springboard for public debate and review of our Federal land use policy. I look forward to working closely with the administration in reviewing that report and that policy, with a view to improving public land management, both legislatively and administratively.

I also welcome the President's "legacy of parks" proposal to bring "parks to the people," especially close to our stifling and overcrowded urban areas. In this latter regard, the President is requesting \$200 million in this fiscal year for the purpose of acquiring and developing additional park lands in urban areas.

I wish to applaud the President on his efforts to press for greater international environmental cooperation. It has already become trite to refer to this as "spaceship earth," yet the fact remains that it is a very appropriate metaphor. We are all on this tiny global capsule together, and our air, water, mineral, and food supplies are dwindling. It will take teamwork of the caliber demonstrated on the Apollo 14 mission to avert disaster and insure the survival of mankind.

Pollution is an international interloper which can only be arrested through the closest cooperation between nations. One need only consider the far-reaching effects of ocean dumping, oil spills, pesticide use, nuclear testing and the discharge of effluents into rivers and lakes, to begin to appreciate the truth in that statement. I am, therefore, pleased with the President's announcement that—

The United States stands ready to work and cooperate with all nations, individually or through international institutions, in the great task of building a better environment for man.

And I share with him the hope that other nations will see the merit of the environmental goals which we have set for ourselves and will choose to share them with us.

Many such efforts have already begun. We are working closely with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the Economic Commission for Europe on the economic aspects of environmental controls. As a result of a U.S. initiative in 1969, a NATO Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society is working on the many technological problems common to modern man, including environmental problems. And the U.N. Conference on the Human Environment to be held in Stockholm next year should prove instrumental in charting a worldwide strategy to combat environmental degradation.

The President's proposal for a "world heritage trust" is an exciting and interesting idea which should be given serious international attention. Under this plan,

certain areas would be recognized for their unique worldwide value and, without any limitations on the sovereignty of the nations involved, would be accorded special international recognition, and where appropriate, technical and other assistance for their protection and management. In the President's words:

I believe that such an initiative can add a new dimension to international cooperation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to endorse the concept of a nonprofit environmental institute as proposed by the President. This institute, funded by both Federal and private support, would conduct environmental policy studies and analyses and "provide new and alternative strategies for dealing with the whole spectrum of environmental problems."

Mr. Speaker, while all these proposals for an expanded Government attack on pollution are of great significance, let no one be deluded into thinking that Government alone can clean up and restore our precious environment. In the President's words:

Far beyond any legislative or administrative programs that may be suggested, the direct involvement of our citizens will be the critical test of whether we can indeed have the kind of environment we want for ourselves and for our children.

I welcome the President's challenge for congressional action on his proposals, and I join with him in challenging the American people, and indeed, the peoples of the world, to play their part in "reclaiming the earth for ourselves and our posterity."

THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as one who fought and voted for the enfranchisement of 18-year-olds last year, I was naturally pleased that the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of that statute as it applies to national elections. At the same time, I was disappointed that the Court did not see fit to extend this privilege to State and local elections. What we now have is a dual election system which will be extremely difficult and costly for States and localities to administer. I think the only reasonable solution to this problem lies in prompt consideration and action on a constitutional amendment granting 18- to 21-year-olds the right to vote in all elections, be they Federal, State, or local.

On the opening day of this Congress, I joined in cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 195 which would amend the Constitution to read:

The right to vote, of citizens of the United States who are eighteen years of age or older, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State thereof on account of age.

That resolution has well over 100 cosponsors in this body and some 80 cosponsors in the other body. The respective chairmen of the committees involved have promised prompt action on the

resolution, and the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) has even introduced his own resolution. This proposition has widespread bipartisan support in the Congress, and the full backing of the administration.

In that regard, Vice President AGNEW gave a real boost to the cause last week in a speech to the annual Hearst Senate Youth Conference here in Washington. After observing how well prepared 18-year-olds are today to assume the full duties and responsibilities of citizenship, the Vice President concluded:

Congress was acting wisely . . . in lowering the voting age from 21 to 18.

And that—

This is a good step, a needed change and one that is long overdue.

The Vice President went on to suggest that young people should not be classified as "youth" and treated as a special interest group, but rather, that they should be regarded as young adults. In his words:

Young people want to be released from the bondage of youth, to be taken seriously as citizens, to compete as full members of the community. And I think they should.

And he advises that his own generation "should not respond to their demands by setting them apart with special, patronizing attentions." He said:

Instead we should regard them as young adults and give them challenges and opportunities in accord with their individual abilities.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Vice President makes an excellent case for the 18-year-old vote and I believe it is now incumbent upon us to take decisive action on a constitutional amendment to enable them to fully exercise the franchise in all elections.

At this point in the RECORD I include the full text of the Vice President's speech, and I commend it to the reading of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT THE HEARST SENATE YOUTH CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 3, 1971, WASHINGTON, D.C.

My compliments to the Hearst Foundation and to you young ladies and gentlemen who have been selected from leadership positions in high schools throughout America to attend this ninth annual Senate Youth Conference. I know you are having an interesting and informative week in Washington, learning first hand how your Senator's office operates and also something about the various departments in the executive branch. It is our hope that the knowledge and stimulation you receive here may someday interest you in positions of public leadership. And I'm sure that for many of you that will be the case.

This Senate Youth Conference, which I had the privilege of addressing two weeks after taking office as Vice President and as President of the Senate in 1969, reflects some of the best qualities of America: the eagerness of young people to prepare themselves for leadership, the willingness of busy men to assist them in attaining that goal, the generosity of a private foundation in supporting this program; and, behind all of this, the clearly expressed faith in our political system.

You have reached your present age at a particularly important time, both for youth

and for America. As you know, the Supreme Court has ruled recently in favor of Congressional legislation granting 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds the right to vote in national elections. For some this has caused concern.

But let me assure you, as one who is often depicted as a fierce and ferocious scolder of youth, that I do not, in the least, share this concern. I believe this is a good step, a needed change, and one that is long overdue. As Vice President and, previously, as Governor of Maryland, I have consistently supported the enfranchisement of 18-year-olds. I have done so because I believe the great bulk of our young people to be ready to take on adult burdens at 18. Now, it may surprise you but, contrary to popular opinion, that view is not an invention of our times. It is deeply rooted in history.

Why should 21 be the magic age for a person to become an adult? Why not 20 or 19 or indeed 18? Well, I did a little research into the matter and discovered that it started back in the Middle Ages. During most of the Middle Ages, in Northern Europe, the general age of majority was 15, not 21. Only the small knightly class had a higher age, which was eventually fixed at 21. Yet the reason for this was unrelated to experience or maturity. The need to bear heavy arms, to lift a lance or sword while wearing steel armor was the determining factor. As the strength and skill required for knightly pursuits were not generally acquired before 21, that became for knights the age of majority.

This practice of the gentry came gradually to apply universally. The age, then, that is today so often regarded as a boundary between maturity and immaturity derives its origin from the physical needs of medieval knights.

I need hardly note that we are no longer in the Middle Ages, even though some of my Democratic colleagues sometimes try to accuse us Republicans of thinking that we are. Furthermore, young people today are better educated and they mature physically much sooner than they did even 50 years ago. I make that observation as an experienced father of three young adults and one teenage daughter who is 15 going on 20. So it's fair to conclude that Congress was acting wisely from the historical as well as the biological perspective in lowering the voting age from 21 to 18.

You young people here today, then, are really not so young. Most of you, I understand, are about 16 or 17, and as juniors and seniors in high school are rapidly approaching the new voter age for national elections. Some of you probably have reached it. I urge you then to regard yourselves not as youths, but as being on the threshold of adulthood.

We hear a lot about youth these days, and the freewheeling application of that term to people from 15 to 25 would astonish our most recent ancestors, to say nothing of those in the Middle Ages.

The Office of Economic Opportunity for instance, lists as eligible for its Youth Development Program "youth between the ages of 14 and 25." The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, in its report of November, 1969, spoke of "youth aged 15 to 24." Some of the most aberrational spokesmen of the wild left—now at age 30—seem to claim eternal youth. Many sociologists and educators use the term in the same way. So do the news media.

In my opinion, young people above the ages of 18 or 20 are too old to be classified as youth. They are young adults, and they deserve to be regarded as such. It has been so throughout history. There are numerous examples where public leadership at an early age was fully possible for those who were ready to assume the responsibilities.

When only 24, William Pitt was made Prime Minister of England, at that time the most powerful nation on earth. He proved to be

one of the most able leaders in modern history.

At 19, Caesar Augustus inherited the Roman Empire and immediately demonstrated his ability by raising an army and leading it himself against rivals who were challenging his position. His greatness is unquestioned.

At 17, Joan of Arc was leading a victorious army.

At 21, Alexander Hamilton was already an important and recognized figure in the American Revolution.

At 23, Alexander the Great became King of Macedon, and within seven years he had conquered a large portion of the known world.

These were not, I should stress, men or women whose accomplishments were achieved in the privacy of the home or studio or laboratory. They were public leaders and accepted as such by men two and three times their age.

So we can see that throughout history youthful years have seldom hindered either the assumption of normal adulthood or outstanding accomplishment by the gifted. I submit that the desire today on the part of our young men and women for recognition by society and for control over their own lives is a desire not for something new but for something old. The truly unusual development occurred long ago, when our society saw fit to place its children under tutelage for greater and greater periods of time in the interest of advancing their education. While it may appear to some that we are in the vanguard of a great youth revolt, we are in fact only returning to cultural patterns that have been found over thousands of years to be the most suited to developing the natural gifts of men.

In this sense, then, I am in sympathy with the "youth liberation" movement. But one aspect of this phenomenon distresses me. It is an aspect that affects both sides of the generation gap. Young Americans too often are represented as crying out as a class for recognition and as asking for special attentions. In response, many members of the older generation—my generation—have come to regard this cry as a class action and have chosen to shower on "youth" generally the special attentions that they thought youth wanted.

This has been, in my opinion, the wrong response. Our response to your appeal and the appeal of those a bit older than you should not be special attentions. This is not, it seems to me, what young people really want. Rather they want to be released from the bondage of youth, to be taken seriously as citizens, to compete as full members of the community. And I think they should. Our reply to the demands of young people should not be special programs, special committees, special offices, all to deal with youth. Many such things have been proposed, as you know.

On the contrary, our reply should be to accept young men and women—especially those 18 and over—as full members of the community. Inexperienced members perhaps, but still ready to take on a great deal more in the way of responsibilities and burdens than they generally have been given today.

I am glad to note that on this point I am in full agreement with the Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest, better known as the Scranton Report. One of the recommendations of that report was this—and I quote from the report:

"Deal with students, and young people generally, as constituents and citizens . . . We do not, however, recommend the creation of positions for 'youth representatives' within the executive branch. Young people are politically more diverse than any other group in American life; the impossibility of finding a single 'representative' young person is obvious; and it is in any case doubtful that

formal recognition should be granted to groups defined merely by age."

That last statement is especially important: we should not categorize people by age. We are one nation, one people. We are all members of a single community.

I recommend to my own generation, then, that we cease thinking of people from 18 to 25 as youth. We should not respond to their demands by setting them apart with special, patronizing attentions. Instead we should regard them as young adults and give them challenges and opportunities in accord with their individual abilities.

To your generation I urge this: do not think of yourselves as "youth." Think of yourselves as individuals. Think of yourselves as being on the threshold of adulthood, one or two years away from possessing the vote. Think of yourselves not as members of a given class or group but as members of the whole of American society.

And to you young people in particular, you who are here, I would say: you are leaders. But do not think of yourselves as leaders of youth fighting for the rights of youth. Think of yourselves as leaders of people. Your constituency is presently very limited in age, but you will shortly be in a position to serve a much larger community, a community where your constituency will include many people older than yourselves. It will be on the basis of your ability to appreciate more than the needs of your own age group that you will be recognized as leaders.

That is why you are here. As high school leaders you are being asked to take a close look at the work of men and women who are leaders of the entire nation, not of one special group. You have not been meeting with labor leaders, or civil rights leaders, or academic leaders. You have been meeting with Senators and Representatives, Secretaries of Cabinet Departments and heads of agencies. These are men who represent people of all ages and all backgrounds.

Note them well. They are leaders—every last one of them. And if I can leave you with one final bit of advice as you think upon the prospect of public careers, it is this: think of yourselves as members of society as a whole, not as representatives of some special interest group. Gain attention not as lobbyists for youth, but as individual men and women commanding the respect of all of your fellow citizens. Seek to advance not on the basis of your age, but on the basis of your ability. And remember that youth is fleeting. Not too long from now, you must adjust to middle age and eventually to old age.

If you do this, you will be answering the trust that the President, the Congress, and our highest court have so recently placed in young Americans hardly older than yourselves, a trust that I believe is well placed.

POW/MIA WEEK OF CONCERN

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today my distinguished colleagues from Indiana (Mr. ZION and Mr. MYERS) and I are reintroducing our House joint resolution to designate the week of March 21-27 as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action." We are being joined today by an additional nine cosponsors, bringing to 166 the total number of House Members on this legislation. I am pleased to report that I have received assurances from the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) that he would refer this resolution to the appropriate sub-

committee as soon as the full committee is organized, and that he is "in accord with this proposal." I am hopeful that early action will be taken due to the closeness of the week involved.

I might mention in passing that yesterday I joined with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BLANTON) and a large number of cosponsors in this body, in re-introducing a resolution which passed the last Congress, condemning the North Vietnamese for their inhumane treatment of American prisoners of war. I think it should be pointed out in this context that on December 9, 1970, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution which, among other things, "calls upon all parties to any armed conflict to comply with the terms and provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war." The full text of that resolution and Ambassador Yost's remarks appear at the conclusion of my remarks. Both the Blanton resolution and our resolution call attention to the fact that the North Vietnamese have not complied with the terms and provisions of the 1949 Geneva Convention, even though they signed it back in 1957.

Mr. Speaker, it is our hope that by setting aside a National Week of Concern, we will help to focus American and world attention on the plight of our men being held in Southeast Asia, as well as the anguish of hundreds of families in this country, many of whom have gone for over 5 years without even knowing whether their loved ones are alive or dead.

At this point in the RECORD I include the full text of our resolution and the names of nine new cosponsors; I would also like to insert at this point in the RECORD certain extraneous materials extracted from recent State Department bulletins relating to the POW problem. These include the December 1, 1970, press conference of Ambassador Bruce, the December 26, 1970, letter from President Nixon to the wives and families of U.S. prisoners of war, and the December 1, 1970, statement of U.N. Ambassador Yost, and the text of the U.N. resolution.

The material follows:

H.J. RES.—FEBRUARY 4, 1971

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That to demonstrate our support and concern for the more than 1500 Americans listed as prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia, and to forcefully register our protest over the inhumane treatment these men are receiving at the hands of the North Vietnamese, in violation of the Geneva Convention, the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period beginning March 21, 1971, and ending March 27, 1971, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action", and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Myers, Mr. Zion, Mr. Rostenkowski, Mr. Rousselot, Mr. Pickle, Mr. Thone, Mr. Flowers, Mr. Sikes, Mr. Camp, Mr. Chappell, and Mr. Whitehurst.

[From Department of State Bulletins, Dec. 21, 1970]

AMBASSADOR BRUCE DISCUSSES PROBLEM OF U.S. PRISONERS OF WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(NOTE.—Following is the transcript of a news conference held at Paris on December 1 by Ambassador David K. E. Bruce, head of the U.S. delegation to the Paris meetings on Viet-Nam.)

Ladies and gentlemen: In view of the amount of press and public attention presently being given to the problem of American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia, I thought it might be useful to meet with you and answer questions on this subject.

Recent events have once again focused world attention on the plight of our prisoners. The action to rescue American prisoners at Son Tay was one example, certainly the most daring and dramatic, of the many efforts the United States Government and American people have made on behalf of our missing or captured men. All of these efforts reflect grave concern over their fate. There is no issue on which the American people are more united and more determined.

This concern is the result of the other side's shameful attitude on the prisoner of war question. Just last week one of their spokesmen asserted again that North Viet-Nam treats our captured men leniently and humanely. But the record, unfortunately, shows otherwise.

What is humane about keeping hundreds of families in agonizing doubt by refusing to identify the prisoners they hold and to provide full information on the men they know to be dead?

What is lenient about keeping prisoners incommunicado for years and, even now, allowing little or no communication between many of them and their families?

What is humane about refusing to permit impartial inspection of prisoner of war facilities?

And what is lenient about failing to release sick and wounded prisoners of war and those held captive a long time?

The truth is that the other side has failed in virtually every respect to treat our prisoners of war decently or in accordance with internationally accepted standards of civilized behavior. The most recent evidence of this is the distressing news that more of our men have died in captivity. We know that some of these men were alive in North Vietnamese hands after being shot down, because they were identified as such through the other side's own propaganda media. But we have no information on how or when they died, nor do we have official confirmation of their death.

If the record is bad enough concerning our men captured or missing in North Viet-Nam, it is even worse in regard to those captured or missing in South Viet-Nam and Laos. Except for a few propaganda broadcasts, we have never had any information from any source whatever on the fate of these men. Over all these years exactly one letter has been received from a person in this category. We know that several prisoners in South Viet-Nam have been murdered, and we fear for the fate of many others.

It is clear that the other side has deliberately chosen to flout their international legal obligations under the 1949 Geneva Convention and their moral and humanitarian obligations to the prisoners and their families. They have chosen to try to use these men, and our deep concern for them, as bargaining pawns to achieve their political objectives. This is unconscionable and unacceptable. This is inhumane to the prisoners themselves; it is also inhumane to their families.

Here in Paris we have pursued the prisoner question as a matter of the highest urgency. Those of you who have been report-

ing these meetings know that we have raised this subject in over half of the plenary sessions at the Majestic Hotel, and we have frequently made it the sole subject of our statements. We have made clear from the outset that the treatment and release of all prisoners of war is a fundamental issue which cannot be ignored and need not await resolution of other problems. As you know, I have presented formally to the other side President Nixon's proposal on October 7 for the immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of war on both sides—an offer on our part to release more than 36,000 of their men, including over 8,000 North Vietnamese soldiers, in return for probably less than 5,000 American and South Vietnamese prisoners held by the other side.

The reaction of the other side has been totally negative. They show no concern for their own men and flout our concern for ours. They have refused even to discuss the prisoner of war question unless and until we agree first to their basic preconditions to negotiation. This is a crude and unacceptable attempt at blackmail. It has added greatly to the solicitude the American people feel about the fate of our men.

In this matter of prisoners, I do not reflect a uniquely American position, but a universal position as set forth in the Geneva Conventions.

Hanoi and the Viet Cong must understand, in unmistakable terms, that their past and existing attitude on the prisoner of war question is intolerable. We will continue to pursue the twin objectives of humane treatment and early release of our men by all means available to us. Our men and their families deserve nothing less.

Now, any questions?

Q. Yes, Mr. Ambassador, you have just put the prisoners question on the basis of humanity, and you have asked a series of questions. I would like to ask you a series of questions that the North Vietnamese often put to us, using your terminology: What is humane about American bombing near populated areas in North Viet-Nam? What is humane about the use of phosphorus bombs and antipersonnel weapons? And what is humane about the treatment of prisoners by our allies, the South Vietnamese, in camps such as Poulo Condor?

A. Well, let me take the last one first: The treatment of North Vietnamese prisoners in South Viet-Nam is a responsibility primarily of the South Vietnamese Government. All those prisoners are listed. They are subject to visits by the International Red Cross, they are photographed, their families are aware they are there, they have full communication with whomever they wish, they receive visits. Everything done for them, or in connection with them, is in consonance with the Geneva Convention.

As to the other prisoners in South Viet-Nam, and I suppose you are alluding to those who are not strictly prisoners of war, they are the responsibility of the South Vietnamese. Whenever there has been a complaint about the treatment of them, that complaint has not only been brought immediately to the attention of the South Vietnamese Government, but as I understand it, the conditions complained of have been corrected in such fashion that the complaints no longer exist.

Now to get back to the earlier part of your series of questions: "How do you equate the Northerners' treatment of our prisoners of war with our bombing?"

This prisoner of war question is one reason why I wanted to talk to you. It seems to me to be separable from the issues of the war itself. There has always been, going back a long, long time—don't forget there are almost 130 signatories to the Geneva Convention—a special treatment accorded the prisoners of war, especially those who are wounded, especially

those who are ill and those who have been in captivity for a long time. It's been standard practice to treat them differently than they treat other casualties arising from wartime operations.

I don't think there is any use in my getting further into that because what it leads one into is a discussion of the issues, it seems to me, of whether or not the United States or any other person ever should have become involved in the war in Viet-Nam—and I consider that separable from what I came here to talk to you about, which is that matter of the protection and treatment of American prisoners of war.

Q. Mr. Ambassador, I have just come from America with two mayors of two American cities in Virginia. They have come over here with letters from wives—six men who are prisoners of war, six of who are missing in action. They have tried, just an hour ago, to present these personal messages of appeal for information to the Delegate General of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

Now these are mayors of Newport News and Hampton, Virginia. Is there anything you can suggest as a possibility of how we might get them to just receive, without any discussion or argument—to receive these personal messages?

A. Well, your mayors have followed very lately on the heels of the mayors of Virginia Beach and Norfolk, who I had the pleasure of seeing last week.

And I imagine you found yourselves in more or less the same situation that they did.

I think the delivery of the protest from your portion of the country—of your petitions—and I assume you have the usual bales full of letters—

Q. Well, the petition here, sir, has 115,000 names, but I am referring to personal messages from the wives. There are only 12. Just 12 letters—you might say notes.

A. Well, I think the practice in the past has been, or the experience in the past has been, those letters are very unlikely to be delivered, translated, or taken seriously under consideration.

What you may get, or what you would hope to get, I think, is some response to whether or not you will be told whether the people whom you are most concerned with are alive, dead, in captivity, or what has happened to them.

Q. Yes. The letters are from the wives. They are written in French. It is not so much to transfer the letter to their loved one, as to ask the offices of the Delegate General in getting the information: "Is my husband dead or alive? Am I a widow or a wife?" But they don't seem to want to answer this.

A. Almost daily, we have attempted in this mission to try to get a complete list of those in captivity, of those who have died, and try to ascertain whether any of those missing in action but not yet identified are still alive.

Q. What criteria do you believe the North Vietnamese are using now to permit some prisoners to communicate with their families, to receive packages and in other ways to become, to be made aware of—of being prisoners and alive—while others are kept incommunicado?

A. I don't know—and I have no reason to know, based on fact.

I would surmise that, if you will read part of one of those sheets which shows the tremendous increase in the proportion, at any rate, of letters actually now delivered—delivered during the year 1970 in contrast to those previously delivered. I would think there had been a very considerable change in that respect, in the attitude of the North Vietnamese about communications between the prisoners and their families.

I would also guess that some of it came from the fact, or rather from the influence exercised by the tremendous blast of criti-

clism emanating mostly from the United States—which has assumed almost worldwide proportions—about the treatment of prisoners.

Q. And on what basis do you think that some have been released?

A. Well, a very few have been released—and it seems to have been a rather haphazard proceeding. They have not released the seriously wounded, ill, and many others who later died in captivity. There is no pattern, as far as I could discern it, for the releases made by them.

Q. As the head of the American delegation of the Paris conference, in weekly contact with the head of the delegation on the other side, how do you feel that the latest attempt to free prisoners at some time might affect the fate of the remaining prisoners in North Viet-Nam? And the other thing: I see in the rules of the Red Cross, there is one rule which says that the camps, the PW camps, should be marked visibly. Do you think that the attempt which was made in Son Tay would be used by the other side to observe such a rule—considering the fact that your commandos have been trying to storm camps in North Viet-Nam?

A. Storm a camp, I think—though I might be ignorant of other attempts.

I don't think that the marking of a camp after this would be affected one way or the other. Marking of a camp, like so many other of the observances demanded by the Geneva Conventions, is a comparatively minor point, compared to what we have been discussing.

But to get back to the principal question you asked, I wouldn't think—and after all, it's based on perhaps on a lack of thorough familiarity with the reactions of the people who run policy in North Viet-Nam—that our descent upon this supposed prisoner of war camp would have any influence whatever upon the course of the negotiations in Paris.

And when I say "negotiations," that's a misstatement in that there have never been negotiations, as far as I understand the term. There have been two preconditions stated by the other side which, if accepted by us *in toto*, would then lead, according to their declarations, to a negotiating posture.

Q. In the sheet that was distributed to us just before your press conference, it was mentioned there are 227 prisoners in Laos. I always understood the American Government to say that no U.S. forces have been operating in that country. How do you account for those prisoners? Are they all airmen?

A. You have asked a very difficult question, and I can't answer it, because I don't know whether they drifted into Laos after they were shot down, or if they were taken there after being shot down over North Viet-Nam or South Viet-Nam—and I think it would be absolutely idle for me to get into an argument as to whether or not they have any right to be in Laos.

I can only say we tried to attain the liberation of prisoners regardless of where in Indochina they were—and to date we haven't had any in Cambodia, so far as I know, so it's restricted to Laos, South Viet-Nam, and North Viet-Nam.

We have queried the North Vietnamese and tried to put on them the responsibility for our prisoners who may be—though mark you, we don't know that they were in Laos—who may be in Laos. We have never had any response and we have tried that also through other channels, but we have identified none of our prisoners as being in Laos.

Q. In view of the fact that the Viet-Nam war is unique inasmuch as there was no declaration of war, how does this affect the chances concerning prisoners of war?

A. Well, I would hate to have to do it to you but—and it would take some time—but would you ask me to read you the Geneva Conventions? They are rather lengthy. I think

it would be better if I sent them to you, because that point is specifically covered—whether there is a declaration of war or whether there isn't a declaration of war. The status and treatment of prisoners of war doesn't depend upon the declaration. It is specifically provided for.

Q. What about the fact that North Viet-Nam doesn't recognize these men as prisoners of war?

A. Well, they have got them now in a sort of state of limbo. They used to be "war criminals." Now they are labeled variously as "soldiers"—not as "mercenaries" except in private conversation, sometimes even then they are labeled as "war criminals"—but I think that they are plainly covered by the Geneva Convention and by the language of it. There is a fine juridical point involved there which I won't bore you with as to whether had they brought these men to trial as war criminals, and had they then been tried and found guilty, whether then they would have been prisoners of war.

I will refer you to an international lawyer because as an old, but now ignorant, lawyer myself I find the question quite fascinating, and I think that the attitude taken by the other side in this respect is absolutely without any foundation whatever.

Q. Mr. Bruce, I believe you just quoted the North Vietnamese as occasionally describing these men as "war criminals"—in private conversations. May I ask what "private conversations" you had reference to?

A. Well, when I said "private conversations" I really should have said at Avenue Kleber, where in the early days they were so denominated.

Q. I missed part of your earlier point where you said that you think the prisoner issue is separable from the other issues and acts of war. What's the legal background for that?

A. Well, the treatment of prisoners under any conditions is something which has been prescribed—chiefly through the Geneva Conventions, but even before they came into force there was an acceptance of what you did with prisoners of war; that is, among civilized nations.

Now, when I said it was "separable" one can readily conceive that if the North Vietnamese would turn loose those Americans who are in their custody, starting with the wounded, with the ill, with those who have been in prison for a long time, would allow the free communication as prescribed by the Geneva Conventions with their families and friends, would allow the receipt of their letters and packages and everything else which comes in, give receipts for them, allow inspections—run through the whole gamut of those things which have been accepted as ordinary practice in connection with prisoners of war—my point is that that has got nothing to do whatever with the greater, except as far as humanitarian reasons are concerned, political issues. Because this isn't really a political issue which is at stake in connection with trying to arrive at a peace in Indochina.

So they could turn loose, if they abided by the Geneva Convention, a certain number of prisoners tomorrow—as the South Vietnamese have done on a good many occasions in returning North Vietnamese.

The other part of it is whether or not they would accept the offer made by President Nixon of an exchange—which really means a release—of all prisoners of war on both sides.

Now on the northern side there are approximately less than 5,000—one doesn't know exactly how many Americans and South Vietnamese are in captivity.

On the other side, there are approximately 36,000, of whom 8,000 were soldiers in the North Vietnamese Army—but they are also prisoners of war. That includes the Viet Cong.

Now, the offer of exchange, which would

be immediate, is different from what I call abiding by the precepts of the Geneva Convention. The exchange would be a straight exchange of 36,000 for roughly 5,000—and they have found that unacceptable.

Q. But we have found in the course of these talks that they treat the prisoners issue as a political matter. Now, if we are not ready to engage in a sort of quid pro quo, if we are not able to show them that they will get something in return for releasing the prisoners or giving them treatment according to the Geneva Convention, why should they bother?

A. Well, if they are not animated by any humanitarian motives in connection with what I call the treatment of prisoners, as distinguished from the release, there is no reason to expect that they will do so.

I myself can't conceive that this use of a type of blackmail can really affect the final outcome of what might be, desirably would be, a peace settlement. This is a minor consideration, it seems to me, from the standpoint of blackmail, because we intend to get those prisoners out, through one means or another.

Q. In your earlier remarks you said that there is recent evidence that a number of American prisoners had died in North Vietnam in these camps. Is there any concrete evidence that these prisoners are not the prisoners that possibly would have died elsewhere had it not been for the fact that they were prisoners? Is there anything concrete in the evidence to show that they have died specifically because of their imprisonment?

A. I think the answer to that is "No," because we know nothing about it. There has never been any inspection or supervision of conditions in prison camps, and why a prisoner dies as contrasted with someone engaged in, let's say, a military task in South Vietnam, is unknown to us; we never will know.

Q. Mr. Ambassador, what, then, are your sources of information as to the actual disposition of prisoners? How do you know so many have died, so many are wounded, so many are missing, so many are captured?

A. Well, from time to time, the other people announce it. The Viet Cong announce that they have executed a certain number of American prisoners—a small number compared to the total number that are missing, approximately 1,500.

One gets it from reports from the liaison committee, which is an unofficial body. The tragedy of it is, in dealing with this particular case, that where one should get one's information from is from the government affected. We get nothing from the Government of North Vietnam about the number, condition, or anything else, of our prisoners, except an occasional blast to the effect that they are being well cared for, playing basketball, or whatever else it may be, and are being looked after as well as they would be were they being treated in accordance with the Geneva Convention requirements.

Q. Mr. Ambassador, I find this sentence here rather strange: "Seventeen known prisoners have been murdered or have died in Viet Cong captivity." Is there any evidence that a single prisoner has been murdered in a Viet Cong prison camp?

A. Well, if you don't mind, as this happened before my time, and the Viet Cong made an announcement about some of it, I would refer you a little later on today, a little later in this particular meeting, to our delegation spokesman, who has those figures. I've not got them.

Q. Mr. Ambassador, how do you explain the behavior on the part of the other side with respect to this prisoner of war situation, inasmuch as most of the Communist countries at world veterans meetings have pressed for a prisoner of war status even for guerrilla

fighters. They have done so quite recently, in September, where they asked for a code to be written which would be equivalent to the Geneva code for guerrilla fighters, which are undeclared wars, and, moreover, they also insist on proper conditions in South Vietnam for prisoners who are either North Vietnamese or NLF [National Liberation Front] prisoners, despite the fact that on an international level their associates do this, and despite the fact that by virtue of what they complain about South Viet-Nam, they would like to have prisoners treated by some humane standards. Why are they so obdurate in this regard? Is there any view you would care to put forward to explain such behavior?

A. I can't put forward a view on this subject. It's completely contradictory, of course. It is characteristic of some other phases of their attitudes toward the differences which separate us at the present time in regard to the fundamental issues. I don't know. I think, in respect to the prisoners of war, I myself feel they have made a terrible mistake. The reasons for it are inscrutable.

Q. Mr. Ambassador, you said recently—and officials in Washington have said much the same thing, I believe—that we intend to get those prisoners out through one means or another. You are no doubt aware that probably the next time you meet the North Vietnamese at Kleber, they will say you are threatening them. What will you say to them?

A. I will have to await the next meeting at the Kleber to give an answer to that. That will probably come after 1 hour's dissertation by Madame Binh and another hour's dissertation by Xuan Thuy, and I can then make up my mind as to how to respond, but I can't do it this afternoon.

Q. Do you anticipate a meeting on Thursday?

A. Yes. We have had no notice to the contrary. Of course, anyone can cancel a meeting at any time. We don't intend to do so.

Q. Mr. Ambassador, I don't understand the answer you gave Mr. Cohler about the North Vietnamese prisoners in the South and the conditions of the various camps. You said it was the responsibility of the South Vietnamese Government, but isn't the United States responsible for the fate of prisoners taken by the United States forces, at least many of them?

A. Yes, but the United States—you see, I am talking about prisoners of war. They are all put into camps where they have fallen under the supervision of the International Red Cross Society and where every provision of the Geneva Convention has been applied to them. And we have got them all identified, photographs have been taken of them, people go and visit them, their food standard is known, whether it is good or bad, and they enjoy all the amenities which are required by the Geneva Convention.

Q. Would you be satisfied to know that the American prisoners in North Viet-Nam are enjoying similar treatment to these North Vietnamese prisoners in South Viet-Nam?

A. Well, I would consider it most improbable, because, after all, we have nobody from the American side who is familiar with the situation there, nor have any outsiders been allowed in. We have asked time after time not for Americans to go there, although a good many of our people have requested such visits, but to have representatives of neutral like the ICRC—but to have a neutral inspection team. It's always been denied.

Q. Sir, what is the definition of a prisoner of war in South Viet-Nam?

A. I can't answer that. I would assume, although I may well be wrong, that a man taken in uniform would be a prisoner of war; a man taken who is attacking—not in uniform—an armed force of his adversary,

I would also assume would be classified as a prisoner of war, I can't answer with any assurance whatever, because the subject has never been brought up to me.

Q. Mr. Ambassador, there have been various reports emanating from the United States to the effect that due to the lack of progress in the Paris peace talks, that you were contemplating leaving here. Would you care to comment on that?

A. Would you say the last part again?

Q. Due to the lack of progress in Paris, you were discouraged and contemplating resigning, according to a report from the United States?

A. Myself?

Q. Yes.

A. I wouldn't think of resigning. No, no, it never occurred to me. I can't say I find this the most enjoyable prospect in the world, but I do think that a perseverance in trying to bring these people to negotiation and eventually a settlement of this war in Southeast Asia on reasonable grounds, which I believe to be perfectly practicable if they desire to do so, is well worth the attention of people far more important than myself.

Q. Do you think sir, that the best way to reach that negotiation stage is to continue emphasizing the prisoner of war issue?

A. Well, the reason why, it seems to me, it is important to emphasize it at this time is from my standpoint a bit dual. I've spent more attention personally on the prisoner of war problem since I have been here than on any other thing, probably as much as on all others combined.

We have our friend from Virginia, with two mayors. He is only one of a stream. We have members of Congress, we have members of the Cabinet, we have wives, relatives, and whatnot, who, gravely and justly concerned, come over here—and this is a rather good base for operations—and it requires a great deal of attention in order to try to get them to be able to present their cases. In most instances, they are unable to do so. Whether that is productive or not, I don't know. But what is appalling to me is that it would seem to me that the other side could accept, or should accept, without any pain to themselves the observance of these simple formulae which are set forth in the Geneva Conventions. As to the release of prisoners, on the proposed exchange, I would have thought they would have jumped at it. But that is neither here nor there. What you are really getting at is whether or not these meetings have any consequence. I think the prisoner of war thing should be constantly brought up because I think it is the easiest to settle.

As to the other things, I don't believe they are difficult to settle provided that the other side would engage in a true negotiation. They have never shown any tendency whatever to do so. These meetings have gone on—well, next month it will be 2 years—and certainly, as I said, in the common acceptance of the word, there has never been any indication whatever that they were serious about having a negotiation.

Look, you have two preconditions stated: (1) total, unilateral, etc., American withdrawal of all troops from Viet-Nam; (2) the overthrow of Messrs. Thieu/Ky/Khieu; the installation there of a provisional coalition government, more or less screened and set up by a minority of the population, represented through the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Viet-Nam. "You Americans accept that, and we will then be willing to talk to you about the issues which are necessary to be discussed and settled if there is to be a peace arrived at in Indochina."

So I say it is worthwhile seeing whether that stand is going to continue to be as adamant as it now is. If it is, there is going to be no negotiation.

But the reason I speak of it is that so far there has been—this is a thing that has been tossed about, certainly in the journalistic world, and has been misunderstood—there has been no negotiation in Paris. There has been a propaganda field day on the part of the North Vietnamese and the PRG. And that is all that goes on up in that place, from the standpoint of anything constructive. Maybe that is constructive, but it doesn't seem so to me.

Q. You say that there have been no negotiations and that it has all been propaganda on the part of the PRG and the North Vietnamese. However, every time that there has been a leak, or there is a rumor or a report of secret talks, it comes from Washington.

A. I told some of you, when I first came here, when it comes to secret talks, whether I am connected with them or anybody else, I am never going to mention them, and I don't know anything about them. If they are having secret talks in Washington, I wish they would tell me. [Laughter.] And our liaison with Washington is excellent.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA (AS OF NOV. 28, 1970)

	Missing	Captured	Total
By country			
North Vietnam.....	403	378	781
South Vietnam.....	463	78	541
Laos.....	227	3	230
Total.....	1,093	459	1,552

DRV VIOLATIONS OF 1949 GENEVA CONVENTION RELATIVE TO THE TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR (TO WHICH THE DRV ACCEDED IN 1957)

Article	Requirement	DRV performance
13.....	POW's must be humanely treated, protected; reprisals against POW's prohibited.	Paraded in streets, forced to make statements, some torture.
21.....	POW's no to be held in "close confinement".	Many POW's held in solitary confinement for years.
23.....	Mark PW camps so as visible from air, give information on camp locations.	No markings on camps; locations concealed.
26.....	Provide sufficient food, prevent loss of weight, take account of normal diet.	Released POW's state that standard fare consists of: pumpkin soup, rice, bread, pig fat. All POW's underweight and suffering from malnutrition.
30.....	Adequate medical care.	Much evidence of inadequate medical care (photos, released POW's); prisoners dying in camps.
34.....	Regular religious services.	Only evidence is films of some Christmas services.
70.....	Write to family within 1 week of capture.	Some have not written for 5 years.
71.....	Minimum of 2 letters and 4 cards a month.	Average of 2 to 3 letters per year (none at all for some).
72.....	Free receipt of parcels.	DRV states that POW's can receive a package every other month. Evidence indicates delivery is irregular; parcels sent to "dead" not returned.
109.....	Immediate repatriation of seriously sick and wounded. Release of POW's long held in captivity.	No regular release of sick and wounded or long-held POW's state of health or duration of imprisonment has not appeared to be a determining factor in those releases which have taken place.
120.....	Advise of deaths in captivity, full official information on circumstances, cause, burial, grave identification.	Bare assertion of death through unofficial and irregular channels, no details.
122.....	Advise promptly names of all POW's held.	Never released official or complete list.
126.....	Neutral inspection of all camps, interview of POW's without witnesses.	No inspection; propaganda interviews only.

[From Department of State Bulletin, Jan. 18, 1971]

PRESIDENT NIXON PLEDGES CONTINUED EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF U.S. PRISONERS OF WAR [White House press release dated December 26]

(NOTE.—Following is the text of a letter from President Nixon to wives and families of U.S. prisoners of war in Southeast Asia.)

Although I have corresponded with many of you individually, I would like, during this Christmas season, to address this letter openly to each and all of you—to all the wives and families of our men held prisoner in Southeast Asia—and also to the many others who care so intensely about them. I know that nothing I say could truly comfort you, and I only wish my words could bring back your loved one at once. However, I would like to tell you about our efforts to solve this problem, what we have achieved so far, and what we plan to do.

The basic obstacle, of course, is the barbaric, inhumane attitude of Hanoi in viola-

STATISTICAL RECAPITULATION BY YEAR LOST

	Missing	Captured	Total
1964.....	4	3	7
1965.....	54	74	128
1966.....	206	93	299
1967.....	249	160	409
1968.....	284	113	397
1969.....	200	11	211
1970.....	96	5	101
Total.....	1,093	459	1,552

CAPTURED ACKNOWLEDGED BY ENEMY

	By mail	By propaganda	Total
North Vietnam.....	331	18	349
South Vietnam.....	1	19	20
Laos.....	0	1	1
Total.....	332	38	370

MAIL STATISTICS

	As of January 1969	As of November 1970
Total letters received.....	620	2,700
Total number of writers.....	103	332

Note: Only 9 American prisoners held in North Vietnam have been allowed repatriation by the Hanoi government. Most of these men had been prisoners for less than 2 years. 17 known prisoners have been murdered or have died in Vietcong captivity. The physical condition of the men who have been released has been far below normal standards.

letters, over 30 previously listed as Missing in Action have been reclassified as prisoners of war. There has, however, been only one letter ever from a prisoner held in South Vietnam and none from our men in Laos.

We have also consistently demanded that Hanoi should permit our men to receive packages from their families on a regular basis. This has also brought about some improvement although the situation remains unacceptable. Prior to January 1970, Hanoi leaders had allowed our men to receive packages only three times. In January 1970, Hanoi made it known that it would allow our men in North Vietnam to receive a package every other month. They added that an extra large package—11 pounds—would be permitted at Christmas.

These limited gains are of course not enough. They do not extend to our men lost in South Vietnam or in Laos. Even for those lost in North Vietnam there is no certainty that all letters and packages reached them. And Hanoi has cruelly played on the hopes and suffering of innocent people.

In recent weeks, the Hanoi authorities have released lists said to identify the American prisoners they hold. These lists duplicated others we already have. As you know, the military services have information identifying others as having been captured in North Vietnam. These lists also tell us nothing about our men lost in South Vietnam or elsewhere in Indo-China. We will, of course, continue to hold the Communist authorities fully accountable for all the Americans they hold and for the fullest possible accounting of the dead and the missing.

Of even greater concern is the treatment of our prisoners and their early release. To know that our men are well treated, we have proposed repeatedly that there should be impartial inspection of the other side's prisoner camps just as there is for the prisoner of war camps in the Republic of Vietnam. We have frequently reiterated our concern about this in Paris. At my specific direction, Ambassador Bruce renewed our proposals for impartial inspection in the Paris meeting on December 3. Despite world-wide support for our position on this question, the Communist authorities again cruelly rejected this proposal, although impartial inspection of prisoner of war camps is among the most elementary requirements of the Geneva Convention.

As part of our wide-ranging diplomatic effort, I sent Frank Borman to twelve nations this past summer to enlist support for our cause. Wherever he went, Colonel Borman found sympathy and understanding, and renewed offers of assistance. This did not surprise me, for in my own meetings with foreign leaders I have found sympathy for our concern and support for our efforts. These main public efforts are but a small part of our continued diplomatic campaign. Our Ambassadors throughout the world have used our diplomatic resources fully to help convince the other side to treat our men humanely and to release them soon.

In these efforts we have welcomed the support of private organizations, the Red Cross and, above all, the families of our prisoners and missing personnel who by their conduct have personally testified to the depth of feeling on this subject. Many have travelled to far places to appeal directly to leaders of the other side. The news media throughout the world have helped make sure that our prisoners are not forgotten men.

Our Government and the families of our men are not alone in their efforts to improve the lot of our prisoners of war in Indo-China. The United States Congress, as you know, has been united in expressing its opinion on this subject. The United Nations on December 9 passed a strongly worded resolution calling for compliance with the Geneva Convention. The International Conference of the Red Cross has also registered its deep concern about any failure to comply with Geneva

tion of the Geneva Convention and all standards of human decency. In the face of this, during the past two years there has been a wide range of efforts on behalf of our men lost in Indo-China. Early in 1969 I directed that there be an intensive review of the prisoner of war problem. I decided that it was time to take new measures, that the enemy's cruel and manifestly illegal policy toward our men should be exposed fully to public attention in this country and around the world.

One of the subjects we have emphasized continually, at the Paris Talks and elsewhere, has been to gain mail privileges for our men. This effort has produced only limited success. As you know, by the start of 1969 families had received less than 600 letters from only 100 men held in North Vietnam during the entire period of the war. As of today, 332 families have received over 3,000 letters, and we are confident there will be more. Although these letters are short, obviously written under scrutiny and censorship, they are welcomed. And from these

Convention requirements. Hanoi has adamantly refused to budge from its position of holding our men as hostages, denying us even elementary information.

As we approach 1971 we face above all the question of the release of our men. On October 7, in my Indo-China peace initiative, I proposed the immediate release of all POWs on both sides. On December 10 we proposed, as a first step, the release of all North Vietnam prisoners of war held in South Vietnam in return for the release of all American and free world prisoners in Indo-China and any South Vietnamese prisoners held outside South Vietnam. This is as generous a prisoner-release proposal as history has known. We have, in effect, offered to exchange 8,000 North Vietnamese prisoners for 800 free world prisoners. I have sought to approach this subject on a humane basis and to keep it separate from the political and military issues of the war. Despite the other side's abrupt rejection of our proposals they remain in effect. You have my assurance that we are ready instantly to proceed toward arrangements for the release of all prisoners of war on both sides.

In the meantime, to demonstrate our readiness to comply with the appropriate international standards the South Vietnamese Government each year has released groups of sick and wounded North Vietnamese prisoners. Another such release will take place shortly.

Hanoi, however, has so far rebuffed every effort to obtain release of our men or to verify the conditions of their treatment. This attitude violates not only the Geneva Convention, which Hanoi had pledged to observe, but all common standards of human decency. It is barbaric. It has been universally and justifiably condemned.

In closing, may I say how deeply I feel the sorrow you have known from this conflict. Along with the others in the Government closest to this problem, I will not forget the strength, the loyalty and the dignity with which you have borne your burden. I can do no less than pledge to you that we will not rest until every prisoner has returned to his family and the missing have been accounted for.

With every good wish,
Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

[From Department of State Bulletin,
Jan. 4, 1971]

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR YOST ISSUED ON
DECEMBER 1

[U.S./U.N. press release 180 dated
December 1]

The United States is profoundly gratified that the Social Committee of the General Assembly in its consideration of the question of Respect for Human Rights in Armed Conflicts has overwhelmingly approved this broadly sponsored resolution on prisoners of war.

It makes clear the very real concern of the world community for the humanitarian treatment of all who find themselves in captivity, anywhere, during times of conflict. It reaffirms the fundamental principle that prisoners are entitled to certain basic protection, care, communication with their families, and repatriation.

Beginning in the mid-19th century with the noble work of Henri Dunant, the Swiss humanitarian who founded the Red Cross movement, civilized states have recognized that all those who find themselves in captivity of internment, often through no fault of their own, are inherently entitled to decent treatment as human beings. In our century, in the heat of conflict, this principle has too often been overridden for political or propaganda ends. This has been and is a clear denial of those basic human rights set forth two decades ago by the United Nations in the Universal Declaration of Human

Rights and codified with respect to times of conflict by the series of Geneva Conventions. Virtually every nation-state and member of this world organization has subscribed to these principles, but in many areas the principles are not, unfortunately, followed in practice.

Today's vote shows that this treatment of prisoners weighs on the conscience of the world. It is gratifying that the Social Committee has approved this resolution. We hope that it will receive even broader affirmation in the plenary.

The United States is of course most deeply concerned over the treatment in North Vietnam and elsewhere in Southeast Asia of the more than 1,500 of its citizens and servicemen who are missing in action. We have positive evidence of the inhumanities to which they have been subjected. Their families have long suffered—in some cases for over 5 years—by the silence imposed upon their loved ones. We are equally concerned for the fate of all other prisoners, wherever they may be, who suffer similar deprivation and indignities.

My Government, and its allies, have sought scrupulously to observe the provisions of the Geneva Convention, have made all our detention facilities accessible to the International Committee of the Red Cross, and have moved swiftly to correct any inadequacies of treatment of prisoners brought to the attention of authorities by representatives of that impartial humanitarian Swiss agency.

It is our hope that today's expression of conscience by this committee, along with the reiteration by the Secretary General on November 25 of his appeal for humanitarian treatment of prisoners and detained newsmen in North Viet-Nam and elsewhere, will lead to the acceptance of the humanitarian offices of the Red Cross wherever it has been denied access. We hope it will prompt release of accurate lists of captives, repatriation of sick and wounded, and restoration of communication among families.

Indeed, if member states will continue to lend their good offices, we believe this resolution provides a way for rectification of this grave violation of human rights. By internment in neutral third countries, by exchange of prisoners from both sides, by providing full access to all prisoners by humanitarian agencies, by restoring communications with families, real and practical steps can be taken toward ending this blot on the world's record of respect for human rights. If today's action by the United Nations helps to accomplish this, it will be a shining proof of the devotion of member states to humanitarian pledges of this Charter.

[From Department of State Bulletin,
Jan. 4, 1971]

TEXT OF RESOLUTION¹

The General Assembly.

Recalling that the Preamble of the Charter of the United Nations affirms faith in the dignity and worth of the human person,

Recalling that the United Nations has as one of its purposes the achievement of international co-operation in solving international problems of a humanitarian character and the promotion of respect for human rights,

Reiterating the obligation of Member States for the urgent termination of all armed aggression as envisaged in Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter and in other relevant documents of the United Nations,

Noting the obligation of Member States under the Charter to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights,

Recalling its resolutions 2444 (XXIII) of 19 December 1968 and 2597 (XXIV) of 16 December 1969 requesting the Secretary-Gen-

¹U.N. doc. A/RES/2676: adopted by the Assembly on Dec. 9 by a vote of 67 (U.S.) to 30, with 20 abstentions.

eral, in consultation with the International Committee of the Red Cross, to continue to study, *inter alia*:

(a) Steps that could be taken to secure the better application of existing humanitarian international conventions and rules in all armed conflicts.

(b) The need for additional humanitarian international conventions or for other appropriate legal instruments to ensure the better protection of civilians, conventions and rules in all armed conflicts.

Believing therefore that the treatment accorded to victims of war and armed aggression is a concern of the United Nations,

Noting resolution XI, adopted by the twenty-first International Conference of the Red Cross at Istanbul, calling upon all parties to the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War of 12 August 1949 to ensure that all persons entitled to prisoner-of-war status are treated humanely and given the fullest measure of protection prescribed by the Conventions, and that all parties involved in an armed conflict, no matter how characterized, provide free access to prisoners of war and to all places of their detention by a protecting Power or by the International Committee of the Red Cross,

Considering that the direct repatriation of seriously wounded and seriously sick prisoners of war and the repatriation or internment in a neutral country of prisoners of war who have undergone a long period of captivity constitute important aspects of human rights as advanced and preserved under the Geneva Convention and the Charter of the United Nations,

1. Calls upon all parties to any armed conflict to comply with the terms and provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War of 12 August 1949 so as to ensure humane treatment of all persons entitled to the protection of the Convention and, *inter alia*, to permit regular inspection, in accordance with the Convention, of all places of detention of prisoners of war by a protecting Power or humanitarian organization, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross;

2. Endorses the continuing efforts of the International Committee of the Red Cross to secure the effective application of the Convention;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to exert all efforts to obtain humane treatment for prisoners of war especially for the victims of armed aggression and colonial suppression;

4. Urges compliance with article 109 of the Convention, which requires repatriation of seriously wounded and seriously sick prisoners of war and which provides for agreements with a view to direct repatriation or internment in a neutral country of able-bodied prisoners of war who have undergone a long period of captivity;

5. Urges that combatants in all armed conflicts not covered by article 4 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War be accorded the same humane treatment defined by the principles of international law applied to prisoners of war;

6. Urges strict compliance with the provisions of the existing international instruments concerning human rights in armed conflicts, and urges those who have not yet done so to ratify or accede to the relevant instruments in order to facilitate in all aspects the protection of the victims of armed conflicts.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION TO STUDY THE USAGE, CUSTOMS, AND LAWS RELATING TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that much confusion exists throughout the Nation in regard to the proper method for displaying the flag of the United States.

This confusion exists due to the lack of a single code designating proper and uniform methods for display of the flag. For example, each branch of the armed services has its own code, and each code differs from the others. In an attempt to provide a uniform code I am introducing today a bill to establish the U.S. Flag Commission. This bill has recently been introduced in the Senate by two distinguished Senators, JOHN TOWER, of Texas, and CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island.

Briefly stated, the Commission—made up of representatives of the Congress and the executive branch, and certain lay members having particular expertise—would be empowered to review the entire matter of a U.S. flag code and to present to the Congress its report which would recommend specific legislation.

I request that the Judiciary Committee give special attention to this legislation. With the date for the Bicentennial Celebration fast approaching, I believe the work of the committee should begin as soon as possible. The time has come to establish a uniform flag code for the United States.

ATTACKS BEING LEVELED AT BIG BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it seems that hardly a day goes by without some kind of attack being leveled at big business. It is as though size, in and of itself, is equated somehow with evil.

From the Government we have the spectacle of Richard McLaren, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, futilely spearheading suit after suit against some of the giants of American free enterprise. Among his more recent misadventures, he directed the Justice Department to institute proceedings against the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. and tried to stop it from acquiring the stock of Grinnell Corp. The Government brought its case before Chief Judge Timbers of the U.S. district court in Connecticut, and after a full and complete trial on the merits of the lawsuit, Judge Timbers dismissed the case unequivocally. This decision was based on his findings that the Government had not proved its allegations that ITT's acquisition of Grinnell could have the effect of substantially lessening competition.

Turning to the private sector we have the spectacle of Ralph Nader calling press conference after press conference and issuing charges and condemnations against big business in a fashion that sometimes appears to serve the interests of publicity more than the interests of truth. Although we are all familiar with the form Mr. Nader's crusades usually

take, I wonder how many of my colleagues are aware that on December 23, 1970, Mr. Nader wrote the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and the Honorable PHILIP HART, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation, urging them "to consider commencing early next year a full-fledged inquiry into the Antitrust Division," of the Justice Department. The impetus for this letter appears to be Mr. Nader's dismay and frustration that the U.S. Government has not attempted to dissolve General Motors and Ford Motor Corp.

I for one do not think large corporations should be hoisted on the petard of political evangelicalism. Neither should they be crucified for the sake of some secular theology of consumerism. I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that all restrictions on business be laid aside. What I am suggesting is that the interests of the American people and the interests of the free enterprise system would be better served by a comprehensive modernization of Federal antitrust laws than by the attacks of zealous bureaucrats and private citizens.

In my judgment much remedial treatment of Federal antitrust laws is needed. In the more than three-quarters of a century since the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act the commercial system of this Nation has undergone great changes. New forms of business activities require new regulatory laws. For not only must the public be protected against the greed of unscrupulous businessmen, honest businessmen need a clear legal framework within which to engage trade and commerce.

In an effort to facilitate systematic congressional consideration of this problem, I am today introducing legislation to establish a Commission on the Revision of Federal Antitrust laws. As I envision it, this Commission, composed of 24 eminent individuals from public and private life would have as its goal nothing less than the comprehensive investigation and review of all aspects of Federal antitrust laws as they affect domestic and foreign commerce. Not later than 1 year after its first meeting, the Commission would be required to submit a final report of its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, to facilitate a fuller understanding of the details of my proposal, I am inserting a complete statement of it at the conclusion of my remarks.

In closing I would fervently urge my colleagues not to wait until this Commission has been impeached before beginning to take a good hard look at the state of present Federal antitrust laws. Congress has a clear responsibility to modernize these antiquated statutes; now is the time to proceed. For my part I plan on pursuing legislative solutions to antitrust problems and I would welcome comments and recommendations from business leaders, concerned citizens, and my fellow Members of the 92d Congress.

My proposal follows:

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION ON THE REVISION OF FEDERAL ANTITRUST LAWS

Whereas the antitrust statutes of the United States are in certain major areas of their application in need of revision; and

Whereas there exist under the antitrust statutes of the United States conflicts in policy as to the proper standards of conduct required to be observed by American business; and

Whereas a thorough examination is essential in order to determine the impact of such statutes upon the productivity and long-range economic growth of the United States and upon United States foreign trade, investment and economic policy; Therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") constituted in the manner hereinafter provided.

PURPOSE OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. The purpose of the Commission shall be to study the effect upon competition (including competition between American business and foreign business), price levels, employment, profits, production, consumption, foreign trade, economic growth and the capability of the economy to best sustain the Nation at home and abroad of

(1) Existing antitrust statutes (including enforcement proceedings thereunder), as interpreted by judicial, executive and administrative decisions.

(2) Existing price systems and pricing policies of trade and industry in the United States and

(3) The extent and causes of concentration of economic power and financial control.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of twenty-four members as follows:

(1) Eight appointed by the President of the United States, four from the executive branch of the Government and four from private life.

(2) Eight appointed by the President of the Senate, four from the Senate and four from private life.

(3) Eight appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, four from the House of Representatives and four from private life.

(b) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Of each class of four members mentioned in subsection (a), not more than two members shall be from each of the two major political parties.

(c) VACANCIES.—Vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Thirteen members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission, 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 the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—Notwithstanding section 5533 of title 5, United States Code, any member of the Commission who is in the executive branch of the Government shall receive the

compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary not exceeding \$30,000; and he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) **MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.**—The members from private life shall each receive not exceeding \$100 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) (1) HEARINGS.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions and duties, hold such hearings and sit and act as such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, or such member.

(2) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection, any district court of the United States or the United States court of any possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is being carried on or within the jurisdiction of which the person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under inquiry; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(b) **OFFICIAL DATA.**—Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act.

(c) Subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Commission, the Chairman shall have the power to—

(1) appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director, and such additional staff personnel as he deems necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, but at rates not in excess of the maximum rate for GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title, and

(2) procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed \$100 a day for individuals.

(d) The Commission is authorized to enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of its duties.

SEC. 9. The Commission shall transmit to

the President and to the Congress not later than one year after the first meeting of the Commission a final report containing a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission may also submit interim reports prior to submission of its final report.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. Sixty days after the submission to Congress of the final report provided for in section 9, the Commission shall cease to exist.

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. Seventy-five years ago, Alfred Nobel, inventor of dynamite, established five of the world's most prestigious honors awarded each year to those who "have conferred the greatest benefit on mankind in the fields of physics, chemistry, physiology or medicine, literature and peace." In the first 20 years only three Americans were recipients of these awards; however, from 1958 to 1968, 28 Nobel Prizes have gone to Americans.

ECONOMIC SITUATION FACING AMERICAN FARMERS HAS GONE FROM BAD TO HORRIBLE

The **SPEAKER**. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, just over 2 years ago, when President Nixon was campaigning for the Presidency, he called 74 percent of parity "intolerable" for farmers and said they were "entitled to better."

Mr. Nixon won the 1968 election, of course, and 2 years have passed. Now we are beginning a new year. Snow covers many of the fields which produce this Nation's food. It is a good time, I think, to review just what has happened to our farm economy during the last 2 years.

Basically, the economic situation facing our farm population today is one which can only be described as having gone from bad to horrible.

PARITY AND FARM INCOME

Parity is a concept designed to compare the prices farmers receive for their products and the prices they pay for goods and services. It is a yardstick for determining how well or how poorly farmers are doing economically.

The 74-percent parity which the President termed "intolerable" a few years ago meant that farmers were earning only 74 percent of their worth, truly, as the President said, an intolerable situation.

Yet, sadly, in the past 2 years, the intolerable situation inherited by the President has been made immeasurably worse.

While parity averaged 77 percent for the 8 years before 1968, it dropped to

74 percent in 1969, and slid to 67 percent by 1970's end, a level unmatched in bleakness since 1933 in the dark days of the great depression.

In August of last year, farm prices slid 3 percent, the largest 1-month decline in 22 years. In contrast to that slowing in prices, interest, and taxes on farmland went up 8 percent and farm wages went up 7 percent in the first 6 months of 1970. In the year just ended, the prices Wisconsin farmers paid for goods increased 4 percent, while the prices they received increased 3.5 percent.

In an effort to camouflage this sorry situation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been engaging in statistical gimmickry with parity.

Thus, in its December issue of "Agriculture Prices," the Department gamely tried to assure us that "no such—parity—ratio realistically reflects the current status of the income or the welfare of farmers." At that time they also announced that henceforth 1967 would be substituted for 1910-14 as the base year to measure costs and prices for farmers.

So, while under its traditional definition, farm parity stands at 67 percent, under the new USDA definition we are supposed to be lulled into believing that parity, and the economic welfare of farmers, is really 91 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the reality of an agriculture depression cannot be covered up by slick bookkeeping techniques. It takes a great deal of effort for those who make their living in agriculture to believe that there is no relationship between the increasing costs which farmers are being required to absorb and the sliding prices they are receiving for their products. Even using the "paper parity" now in vogue at the Department of Agriculture, the index of prices paid by farmers was up 5 percent from January 1970 to January 1971.

Frankly, I know of only one way to interpret the bleak fact that parity has skidded from 75 to 67 percent in 1 year's time. Simply put, farmers are in a tighter squeeze than they were a year ago. And I challenge anyone to prove otherwise.

WHAT IS THE ADMINISTRATION FOR?

The administration seems willing to concede, in speeches at least, that all is not well on our farms and in our rural communities.

In mid-December, for example, the President said:

The Nation owes American agriculture a very great debt, a very great debt which perhaps has not been adequately reflected in agriculture income.

But in agriculture, as with all other areas, action means more than speeches.

While the price support level for milk was 89 percent of parity in 1966, 87 percent in 1967, and 89 percent in 1968, it dropped to 83 percent of parity for the 1969-70 marketing year, and was established at 85 percent of parity by the Secretary of Agriculture for this marketing year—4 percent lower than 4 years ago. Yet, the \$4.66 per hundredweight price which was 85 percent of parity last April is only 81 percent of parity today.

When the Senate passed, as part of

general farm legislation which came before the Congress late in 1970, a provision pegging the minimum feed grain price support level at 75 percent of parity, the administration made it clear that it was "strongly opposed" and would "continue to be opposed to the Senate provision." The USDA said 68 percent of parity was all it could accept.

In 1970, we were told by USDA officials that their efforts in 1971 would be directed only toward "maintaining" farm income, not increasing it. Now, according to a USDA press release announcing this year's wheat, feed grain, and cotton programs, we are told the effort will be to fight against "depressed prices," although there is a serious question whether we have not reached that point already.

Nowhere is there mention of adequate prices, or 100 percent of parity, which would truly bring to our farm population the opportunity to maintain a stable income at a level which would allow a decent standard of living across rural America.

Mr. Speaker, there have been other actions over the past 2 years which reveal less than adequate administration concern for our farm population and the rural economy it supports.

For example, funds for the ACP program were eliminated by the President from his budget. Even after funds for the program were reinstated by the Congress, strong pressure was required from Congress, from individual farmers and farm organizations before the administration finally allowed any ACP funds to be spent.

Funds for the special milk program were also eliminated by the President. Congress reinstated them and made the program permanent. Yet strong pressure was needed to persuade the administration to allow a school milk program to function when schools opened last fall.

The administration also ended advance payments to farmers under the feed grain program. When advance payments were included by the Senate in the 1970 general farm legislation, the administration made known its opposition to this provision and helped defeat it.

The Secretary of Agriculture, early in 1969, held listening sessions throughout the country, to help in developing policies and programs aimed at building a prosperous and successful family farm agriculture in a prosperous and inviting rural America, but the administration evidently listened little—because it never did present to Congress a farm program of its own.

It promised improvement in rural development, but made known its opposition to congressional approval of a rural development section of the farm bill which would have given high priority to the revitalization and development of rural areas. Fortunately this provision was adopted in spite of administration opposition.

And, among the grossest of oversights was the failure of the administration to propose legislation to increase the bargaining power of farmers or to curb the threat of a corporate takeover of agri-

culture, two subjects that weigh heavily on the mind of the family farmer in America.

DAIRY IMPORTS

In May, the U.S. Tariff Commission conducted an investigation on the importation of certain products to determine whether those cheese imports were interfering with our domestic price support program for milk and butterfat.

The investigation of the Tariff Commission showed that they were.

The Commission recommended a "zero" quota for ice cream, certain chocolate products, and animal feeds containing large amounts of milk solids. It also recommended an annual quota of 100,000 pounds for cheese with 5 percent or less of butterfat.

But the administration had plans of its own. In December it announced a most unwelcome Christmas present to the dairy farmer.

The quota set by the administration for low-fat chocolate crumb was not zero, but 4.6 million pounds, four times the average imports during 1967-69.

The quota set by the administration for animal feed mixtures was not zero, but 16.3 million pounds, four times the average imports during 1967-69.

The quota set by the administration for ice cream was not zero, but 431,330 gallons, one-half times the average annual imports for 1967-69.

The quota set by the administration for low-fat cheese was not 100,000 pounds, but 8.9 million pounds, almost nine times the average imports for 1967-69.

With the action of the administration so clearly at odds with the Tariff Commission recommendations, dairy farmers may seriously ask themselves whether they can afford any further action by this administration in the area of dairy import limitations. And yet action in the right direction is badly needed on a number of problems.

One such problem is cheese selling for over 47 cents per pound. It was predicted in 1968 that imports of such cheeses would flood the country because, while a quota was set for cheese selling under 47 cents per pound, none was established for cheese selling over that amount. True to form, clever and ever-watchful importers used this loophole to import millions of pounds of quota-free cheese into the country.

Why the administration refused to take action to curb these imports I do not know. According to the Tariff Commission report, cheese selling for over 47 cents accounted for 239 million pounds of quota-free dairy imports which entered the country in the first 7 months of 1970. This is 59 million pounds, or 33 percent, more than the total imports—180 million pounds—accounted for by the four products for which the President requested a Tariff Commission investigation. Volume alone would suggest that action is due with regard to cheese selling for over 47 cents per pound.

Another problem is lactose. The importation of this product rose from a 700,000 pound average in 1965-68 to 4.2

million pounds in 1969, or an increase of about 500 percent. Lactose imports for the first 11 months of 1970 are 111 percent over those for the same period last year.

During 1969 the share of the domestic market supplied by lactose imports rose 800 percent from the 1965-68 average.

This is important to remember because lactose is a product made from whey, a byproduct of the cheesemaking process. According to the Tariff Commission report on imports:

If it were not for the import of lactose, more domestic whey would most likely be used commercially rather than being disposed of through streams or sewage systems, a practice aggravating pollution problems and burdening U.S. governmental expenditures, including those by the Department of Agriculture, for pollution control.

Simply put, whey is a potential pollutant. If domestic whey is not used but is replaced by imports, we are contributing to an already serious waste disposal problem for cheesemakers. For economic and environmental reasons, then, it is important that action be taken to curb lactose imports.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the legitimate complaints farmers are voicing these days. They are concerned, and I am frankly concerned, that this administration is not tuned in to the problems of rural communities.

We are aware, of course, that the administration is trying to deal with a troubled economy, more troubled than at any time since 1958. In fact, farmers are particularly aware of the economy because nowhere, except perhaps in America's ghettos, is our economic slump felt more intensely than in rural America.

Historically, economic downturns have hit our rural communities first and hardest. Today, these communities throughout America are struggling against economic adversity to a degree which has not been seen since agriculture was able to free itself from the grips of the great depression.

Frankly speaking, I believe the administration lost ground in the Midwest in the November elections because of its disregard of farm problems, especially the sagging farm economy. I do not say that in the spirit of partisanship. I say that rather in hopes that the administration will recognize that fact and will take the steps required to provide rural Americans with what all Americans want—a chance to earn a decent, dignified living by the sweat of their own brow and the strength of their own muscle and, most of all, a chance for a decent future. A government that cannot provide even that is simply not doing its job.

The administration has indicated that in an attempt to strengthen the economy, it plans an expansionary budget for next year. I would certainly hope that in any budget where the administration finds enough room for the SST, the Penn Central Railroad, and tax breaks to stimulate America's business economy, there will also be a little room left for a more compassionate consideration of the problems of farmers and rural America.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE, LATIN AMERICA AND PANAMA CANAL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on September 30, 1965, the House of Representatives, after extensive debate and by the overwhelming vote of 312 to 52, adopted a sense of the House resolution—House Resolution 560, 89th Congress—to the effect that, first, any domination in the Western Hemisphere by the subversive force known as international communism or threat of it violates the principles of the Monroe Doctrine and, second, called upon the parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, in the exercise of their individual or collective self-defense, to forestall or combat intervention, domination, control, or colonization in whatever form by such subversive force.

Since that time there have been many changes, which include the seizure of U.S.-owned properties in Latin America, repudiation of United States-Cuban policy by a growing bloc of South American and Caribbean countries, including Chile, which recognized Castro's Cuba on November 12, 1970, and continued pressures aimed at wresting control of the Panama Canal from the United States.

In this connection, the report of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission under Public Law 88-609 was submitted to the President on December 1, 1970. Its principal recommendations call for the construction of a second canal of sea-level design in the Republic of Panama about 10 miles west of the existing canal, the surrender of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama, and making that country a participant in the management and defense of both canals.

Members of the Congress who have opposed such surrender, including the House Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, are not alone in their views. Col. John P. Sheffey, executive director of the canal study, in a published interview in the Wall Street Journal of December 1, 1970, made some slightly significant statements as follows:

First. That the major purpose of constructing the proposed new canal is securing "excellent treaty relationships" with Panama.

Second. That in the event of the inability to secure such relationships there is no justification for doing it.

Third. That on economic grounds alone the justification for such new canal is quite weak.

After reading the Commission's report, which required about 5 years to prepare and cost our taxpayers more than \$21 million, I have concluded that Colonel Sheffey's brief comments are the most valuable part of the recent canal inquiry.

The crucial canal question now before the Nation is that of continued sovereign control of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal by the United States. Under the Constitution—article IV, section 3, clause 2—only the Congress, which in-

cludes the House, can authorize the disposal of either the Canal Zone or canal. To bring this matter into focus and to make clear the determination of the House in safeguarding our just rights, power, and authority at Panama, my distinguished colleague from Missouri (Mr. HALL) and I have written all Members urging that they introduce or cosponsor resolutions identical with House Resolution 154 and House Resolution 156 of the 92d Congress introduced on January 26, 1971, by us. Mr. Speaker, I would urge that our colleagues do this promptly and that early action be taken for their adoption.

Fortunately, there are leaders in the United States who grasp the problems now arising to the south of us, among them Harold Lord Varney, the able chairman of the Committee on Pan American Policy of New York. In the latest issue of Pan American Headlines, the publication of that committee, he supplies new and important information that I quote as part of my remarks:

WILL PRESIDENT NIXON SAVE THE MONROE DOCTRINE?

President Nixon stands today on the brink of the gravest crisis of his career. It is a crisis which will not come in Vietnam or in the Middle East, despite all the present alarms. It will strike right here in our own hemisphere. It will be in South America.

For those unblinded by optimism, the signs are unmistakable. In the last 18 months, three nations, formerly staunchly pro-U.S.—Chile, Peru and Bolivia—have pulled out of the Washington orbit. Their defection has exposed 3,000 miles of Pacific South American coast to Russian penetration. After 147 years of U.S. hegemony, the Monroe Doctrine line has been breached. Russia will endeavor to enter.

There is a familiar law in politics, as in science, that nature abhors a vacuum. Since 1969, American hemisphere policy has been the nearest thing to a vacuum, that this nation has ever seen. Other South American nations, inflamed by their domestic anti-gringo politicians, will be tempted to follow the first three into recalcitrance. South America is slipping away from us.

Behind, and waiting, stands Soviet Russia. One of the oldest of Moscow's tricks is to throw its opponents off-balance by pumping up a nerve-torturing crisis, somewhere else, while it moves in, unperceived, upon its real target. This is happening today in South America. As in 1948, when it conjured up the phony Berlin airlift showdown to obscure the fact that it was helping Mao Tse-tung to snatch huge China, Russia is using the Middle East as a decoy to distract us from the South American play. While we are preoccupied elsewhere, it will move in for the kill in our own hemisphere.

Moscow realizes, as many American foreign policy experts do not, that we can survive a set-back in Asia, or even in the Mediterranean region, and still live to fight another day. But we cannot survive a successful Communist entrance into our own hemisphere.

What is ironic about the situation is that President Nixon was elected in 1968 on a Republican platform that pledged the new administration to uphold the Monroe Doctrine. In two years in the Presidency, Mr. Nixon has not once mentioned the Doctrine in any of the voluminous papers that have emerged from his Kissinger office. As far as present administration and State Department policy is concerned, the Monroe Doctrine is a dead issue. In an explosive South American situation, we are steering rudderless into the heart of the approaching difficulties.

HOW WE GOT INTO THE PRESENT MESS IN SOUTH AMERICA

The first indication that men in the Nixon administration were planning to follow a soft, no-win policy in South America, in hostile situations, was telegraphed in the unfortunate encounter with Peru in 1969. Peru was clearly in the wrong. She had seized the U.S.-owned International Petroleum properties (an action within her rights) and had offered compensation at a figure much below the valuation previously made by her own appraisers.

Then she attempted a brazen hold-up. She tried to weasel out of this compensation by trotting out an "illegal enrichment" charge of \$690 million, for "unpaid taxes" computed retroactively as far back as 45 years. Of course, the \$690 million would have wiped out Peru's obligation to pay any compensation at all. It was a palpable swindle.

It was a decisive moment. All of Washington's South American ill-wishers were watching Nixon, with searching eyes, to learn if the new administration had teeth in its pronouncements. Had the new President shown firmness against Velasco, he would have given courage to the U.S. friends in all the other Latin American nations to stand firm against the Leftist underground in their own countries. Instead, his representatives capitulated.

He foredoomed his case by sending to Lima, as his special envoy, one of the weakest figures in the diplomatic establishment—John N. Irwin. Irwin had not even had the guts to stand up to tiny Panama, where President Johnson had sent him as one of the two U.S. negotiators in 1965, to negotiate a new treaty. He had produced a treaty which gave away the Canal Zone (American soil "in perpetuity") to Panama, and which also presented Panama with virtually a half ownership of the Panama Canal (a \$3 billion U.S. property).

In Peru, he wilted again. When the six month period was reached at which it was obligatory for the U.S. to invoke the Hickenlooper Amendment, he suspended the Amendment, after consultation with Secretary of State Rogers in Washington. In doing this, Irwin and Rogers nullified and killed the Hickenlooper Amendment, which was Washington's only weapon for dealing peacefully with confiscators like Velasco. When, later, Velasco also attempted seizure of the Grace sugar properties in Peru, the State Department similarly chose not to enforce the provisions of the Sugar Act, which would have required the cancelling of Peru's sugar quota.

It is a sign of the self-deception which surrounded this whole sorry Irwin performance in Peru that the U.S. Latin American correspondents of the leading American dailies and wire services reported that the Washington capitulation in Peru had pleased and "reassured" the other South American countries about the new administration's Latin American policy. No report could have been more false. The pliability of Washington in Peru "reassured" only the anti-Americans: it sent a shiver of distrust into the minds of all the traditional friends of the U.S., who have supported us in the past in our fight against Castroism and Leftist upheaval.

The administration's second important blunder in South America was its failure to use every means in its power to bring about the defeat of the Communist Salvador Allende in the Chilean election. Washington stood by, with catatonic inaction, and permitted Allende to win.

There was a real chance to beat Allende. The Leftist forces were divided dangerously between Allende and Tomic, the Christian Democratic candidate. Tomic is so far to the Left that even after Allende's election, he came out with a statement of approval of Allende's take-over of the copper mines. Ales-

sandri, the conservative candidate, a strong candidate, could have been elected.

If it be objected that the U.S. could not intervene in a South American election, the answer is that we did intervene in this same country, Chile, in 1964, when the U.S. Ambassador, acting behind the scenes, mobilized terrific support for Eduardo Frei, the Christian Democrat, and made possible his election. Bernard Collier told the story in the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1967. He reveals that Frei personally solicited the White House for support. He got it. "A reasonable estimate is that Christian Democrats got about \$1 million a month, for many months, from American sources", wrote Collier.

What Johnson did for a questionable Left Liberal character like Eduardo Frei, to head off an Allende Communist victory in 1966, Nixon failed to do for Alessandri, a genuine conservative, in 1972. Washington marked time, and allowed the Communists to take over Chile.

NO NEW POLICY IN PANAMA

Anyone who hoped that the exit of the Johnson administration would see the end of the proposed Panama Canal and Zone giveaway pressure in Washington is in for a sad awakening. The Panama pot is still boiling.

Members of the same cast that Lyndon Johnson assembled are still calling the turns. Robert B. Anderson, despite the blistering Bernard D. Nossiter exposé in the WASHINGTON POST, alleging questionable business practices, is still Chief U.S. Negotiator under Nixon. The PANAMA CRITICA reported on Nov. 7th the "Ambassadors Jose de la Osa and Robert B. Anderson continue working, with new advisory teams, selected by each government."

John N. Irwin, Anderson's former No. 2 man, after his fearful boo-boo in Peru, has actually been promoted by Nixon and is now top administrative official at Foggy Bottom, as Undersecretary.

Panama's President, Demetrio Lakas, representing Strongman Torrijos, visited Washington in November and emerged from his talk with President Nixon to announce that "We have won", and to disclose that negotiations on a new treaty are about to commence.

Meanwhile, the almost forgotten U.S. Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, after five years of labor and expenditure of \$24 million of tax-payers' money, has come up with its final report asking for a \$3 billion new sea-level canal, on a site near the present one.

Torrijos has indicated that a demand in the proposed negotiations will be the transfer of police authority in the Canal Zone from the United States to Panama. This, of course, is transfer of sovereignty without using the sovereignty name.

In this confusion, a sane voice was raised when the Subcommittee on Panama of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, headed by the outspoken Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan, issued a report urging the preservation of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal and Canal Zone.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA CELEBRATE 61 YEARS OF SERVICE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the second week of February the Boy Scouts of America will celebrate 61 continuous years of service to the American public. For many years Scouting in America has distinguished itself as one of the finest and most wholesome activities in which youth can participate. This organization which origi-

nated with only a relatively few interested boys has grown in scope to affect the lives of millions of Americans. During this decade Scouting will be attempting to establish itself in previously neglected areas in order that all of America's youth will have the opportunity to participate in this worthwhile activity.

Scouting has invested itself into the preparation of future American citizens. By operating a very competent educational program the national Boy Scout organization enables boys to handle a wide range of problems that will be facing America in the future. It is important that this program be examined in order that all can recognize its contribution to society.

Scouting for the most part is associated with the "outdoors." From a Scout's earliest introduction into the program he is taught those practices and skills which allow him to cooperate with nature. The result is clear in the fact that a Scout continues through life to respect natural and human resources. At this particular time such education is beneficial to an America greatly concerned with the preservation of its environment.

Further it cannot be denied that Scouting has instilled in its members' minds those ideals of a high moral character. This spirit only results in respect of self, fellow man, and national institutions and continues the greatness of this Nation. These important factors will enable Scouts as future citizens to face those dilemmas which are presently crippling this Nation. Problems such as drugs, race relations, and crime can be better handled by these young men who have developed strong ethical and moral convictions.

Although Scouting is a program instituted for youth, capable adult leadership has been enlisted in order to keep the program active. In the 15th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, The Minsi Trails Council, BSA, has enjoyed the continuing service of many adult leaders. These men and women have individually served for periods of 10, 20, 30, and 40 years. Without their ever-present and faithful service the existing program could not be of such magnitude. Particularly the distinguished services of Zenon Hansen should be commended. As president of Mack Trucks, Inc., Mr. Hansen has been able to find time to serve the local and national Scouting program. Such faithful and continuous service has been particularly helpful to the Scouts and residents of the 15th District.

Scouting can never be forgotten for its influence upon the American public. The Scouting program has introduced many distinguished citizens and leaders into American communities. Many Americans have had the opportunity to be served by this organization and are truly appreciative. Whenever called upon, the Boy Scouts of America have served individuals, community, and Nation to their fullest extent. Indeed everyone is indebted to the millions who have participated in this program and hopefully such service will continue through the future.

During a congressional breakfast for

the Boy Scouts of America on February 9, 1971, a new program for conservation was introduced as a part of Scouting's "Report to The Nation." "Save Our American Resources"—SOAR—has been established to reflect Scouting's continuing concern for the environment. Scouts across the Nation will take part in a national littler cleanup day on June 5, 1971. It is hoped that such a project will have a lasting effect upon the environment and cause all Americans to take action to cure the problem of solid waste disposal. This program is welcomed by all concerned Americans who desire to see definite solutions taken to cure our environmental problems. It is called to the attention of Members of the Congress the following facts are printed by the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America:

PROJECT SOAR: OUR 1971 CONSERVATION GOOD TURN BACKGROUND

The Boy Scouts of America, the Nation's largest youth organization, has been in the forefront of the conservation movement since its beginning here in 1910 so the current upsurge in interest in environmental pollution has been welcomed enthusiastically by its over 6 million boy and adult members.

As a part of its BOYPOWER '76 long-range plan, which has as one of its objectives "to deeply involve in Scouting a representative one-third of all boys," the B.S.A. is naturally including a number of programs that will reflect our concern for our environment. Project SOAR (Save Our American Resources), our 1971 Conservation Good Turn, is one of them.

PROJECT

In a letter to Irving Feist, nationally known conservationist and President of the Boy Scouts of America, President Richard M. Nixon provided the impetus of Project SOAR. He said:

As Honorary President of the Boy Scouts of America I have become aware of your BOYPOWER '76 long-range plan. I urge that you include in that plan a major conservation service project. In carrying out a program for conservation, our young people can surely set an example for us all to follow.

Mr. Feist and Alden G. Barber, Chief Scout Executive, accepted the challenge, and Project SOAR was the result. The highlights follow.

OBJECTIVE

To motivate action programs that will help improve our environment and to focus public attention on problem areas and create a concern for environmental betterment.

To help boys develop an understanding of the vital importance of natural resources to themselves and their country, and our way of life. Interdependence of man with his environment will be emphasized. The environmental responsibilities of citizenship will be included.

EMPHASIS

Although a variety of community improvement or conservation projects will be undertaken, they will be based on the needs of each urban, suburban, or rural community. Projects will be principally those that lend themselves to boy participation, such as anti-air and water pollution, litter prevention, and waste disposal and recycling.

PRIORITIES

Community improvement programs will be suggested by committees of adults who are experienced in environmental problems and solutions. Several nationally directed programs will be launched.

TIMING

February 1971. Anniversary Celebration. The annual observance of Scouting's anniversary will be the kickoff month for projects in Cub Scout packs and Boy Scout troops. Anniversary Day is February 8.

March 1971. Community environmental education activities and projects, particularly in the areas of air and water pollution, will be launched.

April 24, 1971. National Explorer Service Weekend. Explorers, Scouting's action program for young men of high school age to 21 years, will have their own special conservation service program during 1971. It will emphasize the adult character of Exploring's involvement. A "slide talk" for civic clubs and other local groups will be used to create public awareness of Exploring's role.

June 5, 1971. Scouting Keep America Beautiful Day. A massive cleanup project mobilizing BOYPOWER and adult power of all organizations to make an impact on the litter problem all over America . . . and to drive home the lesson that "A cleaner America starts with you."

Summer 1971. Over a million boys will be in summer Scout camps. Conservation tours and field trips, conservation training, and activities will be featured.

Summertime activities for Cub packs and Scout troops will include:

- Block and yard cleanup and beautification.
- Planting gardens and window boxes.
- Erosion control and stream improvement.
- Planting for wildlife cover and food.
- Planting for strip mine spoil banks.
- Service projects in parks and recreation areas.

Aluminum can collection for recycling. (This project is already underway in some areas in cooperation with the Reynolds Metals Company of Richmond, Va.)

PLANNING

Project SOAR was planned by a special committee headed by William Towell, executive vice-president of American Forestry Association. Members of his committee are Thomas Kimball, executive director, National Wildlife Federation; Dr. Elvis Stahr, president, National Audubon Society; Richard Stroud, executive vice-president, Sport Fishing Institute; and Gordon Zimmerman, executive secretary, National Association of Conservation Districts.

CONSERVATION, ORGANIZATION SUPPORT

Private conservation organizations and industry have contributed materially in the planning process for Project SOAR. In addition to financial contributions, these organizations have provided expert advice, and all have pledged continued support until the project has been completed.

GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

Local, state, and Federal conservation-oriented agencies have participated actively in the planning stages and will work with us in the achievement of Project SOAR's objectives in 1971.

CONTACT

For additional information on Project SOAR, contact Rebel L. Robertson, director, Public Relations, Boy Scouts of America, North Brunswick, N.J. 08902, or Ted Pettit, assistant director, Camping and Conservation Service. Phone for both is 201-249-6000.

SAVE OUR AMERICAN RESOURCES

BACKGROUND

The Boy Scouts of America, the Nation's largest youth organization, has been heavily involved in litter-prevention activities for many years, and has been on the Keep America Beautiful Advisory Council since 1955.

Now, as part of Project SOAR (Save Our American Resources), a national conservation service project during 1971, the Boy

Scouts of America will highlight the need for litter cleanup, litter prevention, and recycling in a nationwide activity.

THE PROJECT

Scouting Keep America Beautiful Day, June 5, 1971, a massive educational effort, involving a large segment of the American public, aimed at both an immediately cleaner environment and litter prevention in the future.

THE REASON

The cost and quantity are staggering—Litter cleanup of public areas costs an estimated \$500 million annually.

If you add the cost of litter removal from private property, the annual national litter bill approaches \$1 billion.

Each year, according to a study of the Highway Research Board, National Academy of Sciences, motorists drop 16,000 pieces of trash on each mile of primary highways.

Litter is a health and safety menace—An estimated 130 persons annually lose their lives in litter-fed fires; every 12 minutes a home is destroyed or damaged by a fire starting in trash.

In one state, foreign matter on the roadway contributed to 21 fatal and 1,068 non-fatal accidents in 1 year.

Littered waters endanger swimmers, fishermen, boaters, and plant life. During 1 year, 200 vessels were involved in accidents caused by striking floating objects.

Litter provides a breeding ground for disease-carrying insects and rodents.

PURPOSE

Scouting Keep America Beautiful Day is a massive 1-day clean-up project. Huge stacks of litter will be accumulated in highly visible places, to be picked up later, as an effective way of making people aware of the problem. For 1 day, national attention will be focused on litter. Millions of people, young and old, working to remove litter from our streets and highways, our parks and recreation areas, our alleys and empty lots, will be seen by millions of others. All this will help make the point that people litter and that people can control litter.

A second objective of Scouting Keep America Beautiful Day is to make a dent in the litter problem itself by cleaning up as much as possible in this massive 1-day effort. But, we feel sure that this clean-up effort will not stop on June 5. The youths and adults involved, once they see what a clean alley, vacant lot, or sidewalk looks like, will want to keep it that way. It has been shown that people who have been exposed always to a littered environment do not know anything else and, consequently, contribute more and more litter. But, when they see the results of a clean-up campaign, they will begin to appreciate an improved environment and will want to contribute to further improvement.

Probably the strongest argument for a national litter clean-up day is its educational value for young people. We learn to do fastest by doing, and the habits that can be acquired in just 1 day of action learning might carry through for a lifetime.

And, finally, perhaps our most important objective in Scouting, Keep America Beautiful Day is to get across the story of recycling as an answer to the solid-waste problem. We hope to recycle as much of the collected trash as possible—aluminum, glass, steel, paper, and other materials. Recycling solves two problems at one time. First, it gets rid of the trash that may become litter. Second, it reduces the drain on natural resources needed to make the product. With increasing demands on raw materials from a burgeoning population and with solid wastes taxing our disposal capabilities, we need to turn more and more to recycling techniques. We might be able to build a few more playgrounds over sanitary landfills or construct ski slopes out

of artificial mountains of litter, but reuse of materials is far better conservation.

WHO

A special committee, headed by David Reynolds, executive vice-president and general manager of Reynolds Metals Company, is providing the financial support, expertise, and guidance at both national and local levels. More than 100 representatives of business, industry, citizen groups, and government make up this committee.

CONTACT

For additional information on Scouting Keep America Beautiful Day, contact Russell L. Bufkins, Public Relations, Boy Scouts of America, North Brunswick, N.J. 08902; or Lyle Youngstrom, Project SOAR Public Relations, at the same address. Phone—(201) 249-6000.

REVENUE SHARING

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message, President Nixon outlined a set of proposals that promise to fundamentally transform the American political order. After four decades in which power and resources have flowed to the ever proliferating array of Federal bureaucracies in Washington, the President has called for a massive effort to stem the tide.

Mr. Speaker, I found President Nixon's message one of the most important and timely challenges to be handed down by a Chief Executive during the entire period of my service in public office. I say this, let me emphasize, out of no nostalgic longing for an age that has gone by nor out of a belief that problems will be automatically resolved merely by delegating them to the local level. Rather I welcome the President's call for a revolution in the structure of the American Federal system because I am convinced that the high purposes and noble goals adopted by this Nation over the past decades cannot be achieved by means of present relationships.

Let us face the truth squarely. There is a growing serious breakdown in Government performance and delivery that must be remedied and remedied soon if our basic national social goals and commitments are to be fulfilled. The genius of the President's message is that it confronted this fact honestly and directly.

A principal component of the President's plan to improve Government delivery and performance is to encourage a decentralization of power through revenue sharing. The aim is to return desperately needed dollars and discretion in decisionmaking to local and State governments so that they will be better able to devise solutions to problems that reflect unique local circumstances and needs, and provide wide avenues for meaningful citizen participation in the governmental process. By providing a substantial stimulus of new general revenues, we can hope to reverse the process by which local and State governments are being transformed into mere, rigid administrative appendages of the Federal Government and restore to them their rightful policymaking role.

I doubt that very many would take exception to these objectives. Indeed, there seems to be general agreement from all points on the political spectrum that our governmental system has become dangerously overcentralized and bureaucratized. But there is considerable difference of opinion, I hardly need remind you, about the manner or mechanisms of achieving a reduction in our present overcentralization. Frankly, I had thought that revenue sharing would be one of the less controversial mechanisms and that it would engender wide consensus and support. This now appears to be not entirely the case. Of late, a growing number of criticisms have been made of the President's proposal. Many of them are baseless, but some of them are serious and substantial and therefore merit careful consideration.

Today, I want to briefly respond to some of these charges and attempt to present some evidence that I believe strengthens the case for revenue sharing. Of course, I would not pretend to have all the answers or to deny that there are some very real difficulties. I do think that it will be of little profit for those of us who advocate revenue sharing to merely rest content with the seeming attractiveness of the concept. If revenue sharing is to become a reality, it will require convincing rebuttal to some of the hard questions raised by its critics.

One important criticism made recently is that the distributive impacts on the States have not adequately been considered. The key point of this criticism is that the \$5 billion in "new money" contained in the proposal for general sharing will have to come from somewhere. If an across-the-board reduction in Federal expenditures is chosen to raise the money then some States are going to benefit substantially more than others, because of the uneven impact of Federal spending. Similarly, if only grant-in-aid portions of Federal spending were reduced by \$5 billion, a different set of States would show up in the winners and losers columns. And finally, if additional Federal taxes were levied still another lineup would result.

First, let me say that the main difficulty with this whole line of argument is that the administration has never considered any of these three alternatives as a means of raising the new money required for revenue sharing. A key element of the revenue sharing plan is that it plugs local and State treasuries into the high growth Federal tax base. As you know, for every 1 percent growth in gross national product, Federal revenues increase 1.5 percent. This high revenue growth rate means additional increments of Federal revenue each year while tax rates remain stable. During the last decade Democratic administrations chose to absorb this additional revenue through an endless proliferation of costly new categorical grant programs. By contrast the Nixon administration is determined that a higher priority claimant for these growth revenues, or what some have called the fiscal dividend, should be our fiscally beleaguered State and local governments. Therefore, this new money need not be obtained by overall spending reduction, selective reductions, or even

higher tax rates, as has been suggested by some critics. What will be cut, though, is the heady annual growth rate in new revenue absorbing categorical programs, and the savings from this will be reserved for revenue sharing. This fundamental point makes the totting up of winners and losers under the alternative assumptions mentioned above largely an academic exercise.

But even if this game of distributive impacts were to be played, it is not at all clear that revenue sharing would suffer as a result. Rather than compare winners and losers resulting from an artificial expenditure reduction or tax increase, the real question is this: Given the automatic annual growth of Federal revenue or fiscal dividend, how can it be most equitably spent? Should a given \$5 billion in revenue growth be channeled into the present grant-in-aid structure or might it better be returned to the States through the administration revenue sharing plan? From the point of view of equitability—that is, a return to a State in proportion to its tax effort—it appears that the evidence supports revenue sharing.

As is well known State distributions under the current grant-in-aid programs vary considerably in relationship to tax effort. The most recent figures on State shares of the \$5 billion general revenue sharing program, however, indicate that this gap would be reduced in a predominant majority of the cases. That is, States currently getting disproportionate amounts in relation to tax contributions would get somewhat less, and those receiving less in grants than they contribute in taxes would get proportionately more. Specifically, in the latest distribution plan four States would remain unchanged; but among the 46 States where there would be a change in distribution, 32, or 75 percent, of the changes would be in the direction of equalization.

Moreover, the large urban States faced with expanding service demands and mounting deficits would be especially benefited under the general revenue sharing proposal. Seven of the nine largest States—all of which face deficits in excess of \$100 million in the coming year would receive a larger share of the Federal dollar under revenue sharing than they do under the current grant-in-aid structure. For instance, Michigan contributes 4.80 percent of the Federal tax dollar but receives only 3.41 percent in return under the various grant programs. Under revenue sharing its portion would be 4.58 percent. Similarly, New Jersey contributes 4.24 percent but receives only 2.55 percent in grant-in-aids. Its portion of revenue sharing would be 3.08 percent.

In pointing out the equalization that would occur under revenue sharing I am not attempting to imply that this is the sole criterion for judging it. For obviously even if the distributive impact were worse rather than better than the grant-in-aid structure, the benefits of renewed local decisionmaking power and program flexibility would have to be weighed in the balance. But if the distributive impact is to be considered—and I think it

should be—then revenue sharing comes out ahead on that count as well.

Before moving on to another point, I want to anticipate one objection to the arguments I have just made. Some will say, "How can you speak of a fiscal dividend or automatic increases in revenue at a time when we are running an \$18 billion deficit and have recently received a budget document that projects a deficit. Are you not implying that the 'new money' made available in revenue sharing will be financed out of a perpetual deficit?"

While it is possible to draw such a conclusion from looking only at the immediate fiscal situation, a longer range view, I submit, will cast a much different light on the issue. We are now running a deficit only because the restrictive economic policies required to slow down the pace of inflation left the economy in a state of considerable slack. If the economy were operating at full employment, revenues would considerably outpace current spending and there would indeed be a fiscal dividend to tap to secure new money for revenue sharing. Moreover, because the administration has adopted a fiscal policy based on the full employment budget concept I am hopeful the economy will approach, as the President's economic report indicated, the full employment level by mid-1972. This would permit us to move into a sustained period of balanced growth thereafter; a development which would mean nearly \$40 billion in additional Federal revenues by 1975. Of course, much of this will be absorbed by increased costs of present programs and obligations of the Government. But there will remain a healthy surplus and the issue returns to one of adding more categorical programs or devoting the dividend to revenue sharing. I hope we have the wisdom to follow the President's lead in choosing the latter.

Another criticism of revenue sharing rests on the growth in the tax base that I mentioned above. Critics argue that if income taxes are so sensitive to gross national product growth why do not States adopt or increase their own income taxes to meet additional revenue needs? The seriousness of this argument is underscored by the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, used this argument himself in his critique of the administration's proposal last week. Indeed, he seemed to imply that the States are beginning to become aware of this and that "you will find that much of the growth in State revenues in recent years is attributable to income tax increases."

In all due respect I must submit that I do not see the evidence for this assertion. Quite the contrary. The evidence seems to indicate that the Federal Government has preempted this lucrative source of revenue and that the States have been highly reluctant to challenge its dominance. In 1969 local governments collected only 1 percent of the income tax revenue in the country and State governments only 8 percent. This means that the Federal Government still collects over 90 percent of personal income taxes, as it has for many years.

The fact is, in the period between 1950 and 1967 fully 42 percent of the growth in State and local revenues was accounted for by property taxes. Another 34 percent of the growth was contributed by increases in sales and consumption tax revenues. In contrast to this, 76 percent of the revenue increase which has come from tax bases that grow more slowly than the economy as a whole, we find a mere 14 percent of the increase resulting from personal and corporate income taxes combined. When we recall that property tax revenues grow at only 0.7 percent for every 1 percent in gross national product and that consumption taxes also generally grow slightly less rapidly than gross national product, then the strain on local governments becomes apparent. For while the Federal Government can rely on an automatically expanding revenue base, States and localities must continually engage in the not so automatic process of securing rate increases from an already highly taxed citizenry just to stay up with gross national product.

To illustrate this point, we need only remind ourselves that in the last decade Americans enjoyed two substantial cuts in their personal income tax rates, and businesses received a number of similar benefits, yet Federal revenue increased over 100 percent. While the overall increase in State revenues was similar during this period, fully 53 percent of this additional revenue, according to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, resulted from tax rate increases. Specifically, this entailed over 400 separate actions, either in the form of new taxes, or increases of existing ones at the State level. In Minnesota 15 separate tax increases were required within the decade; in my own State of Illinois the number was 13 increases, as it was for New York, Maine, and Wisconsin as well. These kind of figures, I believe, make it difficult to argue that political lassitude outranks political fortitude in State government.

To return to the point, we find that the Federal Government dominates the income tax field, that a very small percentage of new State revenues over the last two decades has resulted from income tax changes, and that, forced to rely on low-growth tax bases, State governments must continually go to the public for tax rate increases. It seems to me that these hard-pressed Governors or legislators would, to put it mildly, be quite unresponsive to any exhortation to tap further the personal income tax spigot in order to raise new revenues.

Indeed I sometimes wonder that that old shoe about not trusting local governments to spend money they have not raised is not being put on the wrong foot. After all, it is the Congress which madly appropriated new funds and established new programs and commitments for an entire decade without once having to go to the voters—with the exception of the temporary surtax—requesting higher rates. During the same period State governments were averaging almost one new increase a year. I cannot believe that these struggles for new taxes have taught nothing about

fiscal responsibility. Moreover, revenue sharing is not intended to supplant State revenues but only to provide marginal supplementation. In most instances, revenue sharing funds will amount to only a few percentage points of regular State and local funds. This means in all likelihood that States and local officials will have to continue to go regularly to the public for additional revenues. There is no reason to believe that while doing so they will not be called to account for the manner in which revenue sharing funds are being disposed of. In fact, perhaps the heat will be even greater since the public will be inclined to ask, "Why do you need more taxes when you have \$5 billion in new Federal money coming in already?"

This whole charge that no-strings attached revenue sharing would encourage waste and profligacy at the local level needs to be considered from another point of view as well. We are somehow being asked to believe that revenue sharing implies an open-ended commitment for the Federal Government to shovel in revenues to the local level as fast as they can be spent. Nothing could be further from the truth. Once enacted the revenue-sharing program would provide a specific formula for distribution of funds to State and local governments. This is set at 1.3 percent of the personal taxable income base, a figure that can be determined with a fair degree of accuracy for up to a decade in advance. Thus, it will be quite easy for any local or State official to compute with a good degree of accuracy the precise amount of money in dollar terms that he can expect for a number of years in advance. With a knowledge of the competing demands that will be made upon this money it seems to me that it will be entirely likely that local officials will plan to use it wisely and responsibly.

Still another criticism made of the Nixon revenue-sharing plan is that it would not distribute the pass-through funds in an effective or socially desirable way. The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) has argued that if the pass-through funds were divided between local governments on the basis of expenditures, a built-in incentive to fiscal irresponsibility would be established, as the more you spent the more you would get. There is, no doubt, an inescapable logical appeal to this argument, but two things need to be considered. First, the Nixon administration has never proposed a pass-through distribution formula based on expenditures. Second, and more important, an expenditure-based formula would make it "rational" for local governments to dramatically increase their spending only if there were a substantial percentage return in additional revenue-sharing money. That is, if every time you spent a dollar you got another or even 50 cents, you might be tempted to spend to the limit. But notice that this condition hardly applies in this case. Revenue-sharing funds are only going to be about 3 or 4 percent of most local budgets, often considerably less; remember too that we are only talking about \$5 billion out of a State and local expenditure level that has already passed the \$130 billion mark.

Therefore, if you can believe that hard-pressed local taxpayers would tax themselves an additional \$100 just to get two or three extra revenue-sharing dollars this argument may have some validity. It is my own suspicion, however, that the weary American taxpayer, unlike Jack, is not likely to be ready to trade a cow for a sack of beans.

Another argument made against the pass-through distribution formula proposed by the administration is not so easily disposed of. If local revenue effort is to be the sole basis for the pass-through allocation, so the argument goes, will this not reward the wealthy jurisdictions and penalize central cities where the resources are less but the need considerably greater? I must confess that for a time I found this question troubling indeed. But let me make two observations.

First, revenue sharing is not intended to be primarily a redistributive measure. No doubt we need this type of effort but there should be no illusion that this is the primary purpose of the revenue sharing program. Rather revenue sharing has a multiplicity of aims, all of which need to be taken into consideration when evaluating it. One of these is to provide some immediate emergency revenue relief for the fiscal bind that plagues almost all local and State governments. Another aim is to revitalize and expand local policymaking and program capabilities by providing unattached support funds. A third is to plug State and local treasuries into a high growth tax base and thereby lessen the revenue shortage endemic in the current restricted local tax bases. And a fourth aim is a moderate degree of redistribution so that those areas in especially critical need are afforded larger than average benefits. But I would caution that this cannot be a massive bias in favor of high need areas or the other important goals of revenue sharing would be undermined.

Though it may not appear so on the surface, I believe the pass-through distribution formula based on revenue effort provides for this kind of moderate bias toward high need areas that does not at the same time mitigate against the achievement of other desirable goals, such as spinning-off wider policymaking discretion to all local governments. To demonstrate this, I would call your attention specifically to some very revealing data contained in a recent study by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. This study compares the per capita local tax burden in the central cities of the 37 leading standard metropolitan statistical areas—SMSA's—with the per capita tax burden in the noncentral city or suburban peripheries of these metropolitan areas. Since these 37 SMSA's account for 20 percent of the population of the Nation and over 50 percent of the local tax base, it is clear that we are dealing with the basic contours of the situation, not merely a few aberrant cases.

This study shows that the per capita local tax burden in the central cities of these major SMSA's average \$200 per capita while the average for areas out-

side the central cities is only \$150 per capita. As a percentage of per capita income these tax levels are 7.6 percent for the central city and 5.6 percent for the noncentral city. Overall, the noncentral city areas raise only about 75 percent per capita as much as the central cities do in local tax revenues. Since the pass-through formula is based solely on tax revenue effort this means that the central cities would average one-third more revenue sharing money per capita than the more affluent jurisdictions outside the central city. Chicago, for instance, raises \$203 per capita in local revenue whereas other jurisdictions in the Chicago SMSA raise only \$123; the pass-

through distribution formula, of course, provides for proportional benefits. I am including at this point a chart compiled from the ACIR study that provides a more vivid illustration of this point by showing a comparison of per capita revenue efforts in selected, major SMSA's. I believe that these figures should lay to rest once and for all the myth that revenue sharing will be merely a bonanza for the rich suburbs or that it scatters its benefits indiscriminately. Quite the contrary. The distribution formula exhibits clear priorities and a modest bias toward areas of need, but does so without undercutting the other important objectives I mentioned earlier:

the flow of revenue from the highly efficient, growth sensitive Federal income tax system with no real compensatory assurances that current dependence on inefficient sales, consumption and property tax bases would be lessened. In my estimation this is a most undesirable and unwarranted trade-off. Our efforts should be precisely in the opposite direction. Of course, some wistfully propose that a modest cutback in Federal income taxes would open the way for increases in state income tax rates. I doubt this very much. For one thing the powerful force of competitive advantage would be thrown into play. Each State would seek to hold off enlargement of its income tax levies in order to provide a more hospitable environment for new industrial development. I need not remind that one great State in my part of the country has made a great and highly publicized virtue of its low tax rates and lack of an income tax in recent years and with no small amount of success too, at least from the point of view of industrial and economic growth. In my view, the only effective inducement would be a massive cutback in Federal income taxes, and let us face it, this simply is not in the works. To begin with, the budgetary leeway just is not there, and besides, such a major cut could wreak havoc with our economic stabilization policies.

A final important objection to the tax cut route is that it would undermine the thrust toward decentralization and the revitalization of local government. While this assertion may seem paradoxical on the surface it really is not when viewed in perspective. Those remaining defenders of the Washington-centered bureaucratic welfare state make the argument that all the really creative, innovative, and effective social programming in the last decade emerged from Washington, and that the State and local governments are simply incapable of a similar performance. Whether or not this assertion is true is not my immediate concern here. The real issue is, if this is, indeed, true, why is it so? Is it because Federal officials are wiser, more creative, more responsive to the needs of the people? I for one would not presume to make such a claim. Rather, in my view the answer is that if Washington has been more creative and responsive it is precisely because we have had the budgetary flexibility and the cushioning from direct taxpayer pressure to be imaginative. How bold and innovative would have been the New Frontier and Great Society programs if each one of them had had to be financed by a new tax increase? Would Congress have poured billions of dollars into some of the frankly boondoggling and ill-conceived shenanigans carried on by local OEO programs if the voters had been required to approve a tax increase each year to support these efforts? How much less zealous would we have been in our concern for the downtrodden, the poor, the black, and the outcast if we would have had to tap each year the pocket of the middle American taxpayer for higher levies? The point of this is not to say that the social programs of the last decade were irresponsible, though I believe some of them were, or that the national commitments and social goals adopted were unwise or unjustifiable, al-

CHART I.—LOCAL TAX EFFORT AND PER CAPITA INCOME IN SELECTED SMSA'S

SMSA	Central city			Outside central city			(6) as percent of (3)
	Tax per capita (1)	Income per capita (2)	Tax per capita as percent of income per capita (3)	Tax per capita (4)	Income per capita (5)	Tax per capita as percent of income per capita (6)	
Washington, D.C.	\$291	\$3,003	9.7	\$129	\$3,033	4.2	43
Miami	169	2,067	8.2	143	2,372	5.5	67
Chicago	203	2,775	7.4	123	3,072	4.0	54
Boston	223	2,421	9.2	167	2,756	6.1	67
St. Louis	167	2,292	7.3	110	2,634	4.2	57
Newark	273	2,049	13.3	205	3,171	6.5	49
New York	279	2,732	10.2	221	3,314	6.7	65
Cincinnati	190	2,462	7.7	108	2,345	4.6	60
Dayton	180	2,261	8.0	116	2,382	4.9	61
Pittsburgh	164	2,365	6.9	110	2,282	4.8	69
Providence	160	2,298	7.0	103	2,174	4.7	67
Milwaukee	193	2,349	8.2	122	2,803	4.4	54

Source: Fiscal Balance in the Federal System, ACIR.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on to respond to other particular charges that have been made against the revenue sharing plan, but I think a more important issue is: What are the alternatives? And this question cannot be avoided. I think there can be no doubt that local and State governments are on the edge of fiscal breakdown and that some kind of aid or relief must therefore be forthcoming. Just recently the Governor of a major industrial State announced that without new taxes the State would be bankrupt in 30 days. Similarly, Governor Rockefeller has recently announced a budget for the coming year that contains a mammoth \$1.1 billion tax increase to support an \$8.4 billion program which he nonetheless labels only a "crisis, stopgap measure." In California Governor Reagan has called for a \$700 million health and welfare spending cut as the only alternative to a huge deficit. And these are only typical cases.

What is worse, these growing budgetary crises come at a time when taxpayers are becoming increasingly resolute in their opposition to further local tax burdens. The case of Cleveland in which a city income tax was defeated for the second time in 3 months, despite the support of most city officials, the leading newspapers, and the community leadership structure, provides a case in point. This defeat will require a deep slash in city spending and a considerable cutback in the payroll including the scuttling of a promising program in law enforcement training and expansion. It is somewhat ironic, therefore, to note that the \$10 million cutback in the city budget

that will now be required is the exact amount that would have accrued to Cleveland had the President's revenue sharing proposal been enacted last year.

Nor is Cleveland an isolated case. A recent publication of the Federation of Tax Administration reveals that almost every State proposal for increased or new income, sales, or property taxes was defeated in last year's elections. By contrast the issues that were approved in voter referendums were proposals for broadening tax exemptions, deductions, and the like, in effect, tax decreases.

Because of these kinds of returns I believe the first major alternative to revenue sharing is totally unrealistic; namely, suggestions that Federal taxes be cut so that States and localities can raise their own local taxes. Let me briefly point to three shortcomings of this approach.

First, I believe it is politically unrealistic to think that for each dollar reduction in Federal taxes that you could get a dollar, 50 cents, or even 20 cents in new State and local taxes. The voters have become too numbed by repeated requests by local officials for more taxes to be bought off with a modest Federal tax reduction. Let us not forget that we are already beginning to feel the benefits of the quite substantial cuts in the 1969 Tax Reform Act, but there appears as yet to be no great new enthusiasm on the part of local voters for additional local levies to absorb these loose funds.

Second, and more important, the tax cut would only compound the structural problem underlying much of the current fiscal crisis of local and State government. For it in effect would cut back

though some of them may have been. The point is that Washington has been able to be more innovative, farsighted, and sensitive to new needs because it has the unique luxury of being able to finance new programs on an automatically enlarging flow of revenue; it has been able to withstand the constant heat of voter resistance to new taxes.

Now I believe a central aim of revenue sharing is to provide some of that same cushioning, flexibility and respite for local and State officials. And given similar advantages I am convinced that they would be no less willing to find new ways to tackle problems than Washington has been. For let us make one thing clear. The real danger is not that local officials will spend money irresponsibly or extravagantly. Let us once and for all excise that silly bugaboo from serious discussion of this issue. If anything, the danger is the opposite; that with their feet held to the fire local officials will become increasingly cautious, timid, and unimaginative in their efforts to solve problems and meet new social needs. If that should happen individuals will be forced to turn to Washington for solutions, and the great potential for turning government back to the people that now is within our grasp will be lost for perhaps another generation.

Justice Brandeis, who was a great and lifelong foe of stifling bigness in any form, was particularly opposed to centralization and government by Washington-based bureaucracy. Contrary to many of his liberal contemporaries he had a broad vision of the States and localities as "great laboratories of democracy." I believe that the Brandeis vision of creativity and innovation bubbling up throughout the land in the States and localities is precisely what we are trying to restore with the new federalism. We can never hope to attain it unless we provide local and State governments with new revenue inputs that allow greater margin for experimentation, flexibility and boldness. Thus, in a sense, revenue sharing is not only or even mainly a device for sharing of cold cash. More significantly, it is the sharing of the capacity for creative, enlightened government—a primary requisite if a revived federalism is to become a reality in America during the 1970's.

A more serious alternative to revenue sharing that has been gaining increasing attention of late is a proposal to federalize the entire cost of local and State public welfare functions. The rationale behind this proposal is simply that if the Federal Government takes over the expensive welfare burden, State and local funds equivalent to those under revenue sharing will be released for other local purposes.

One thing can be said for this proposal. In contrast to the illusive hope for fiscal aid promised by the tax cut route, federalization of welfare would provide immediate, substantial emergency relief. If the sole goal was to shovel new revenue into the local and State level as rapidly and as massively as possible, then a Federal assumption of the welfare burden might indeed be the desirable route. Certainly it would be a popular one.

But let us for a moment consider some of the costs that might be involved; let us ask whether some of the other goals of revenue sharing might be undermined by locking tightly on the single objective of relief for the expenditure burden in one functional area. First, would the goal of revitalizing and providing new flexibility and wider policymaking discretion for all local governments be served? Obviously, this would depend on fairly even and uniform distribution of the benefits as occurs under revenue sharing. For if the funds are massed in a few areas or inordinately concentrated on selective targets the remaining parts of the country would receive so little as to make a negligible impact on local budget needs.

There is reason to suppose that this is precisely what would occur if the burden of local and State public welfare was picked up by the Federal Government. It is, of course, too early to know the precise details of these proposals for federalization of welfare. Whether they would include, for instance, all, much, or only part of non-Federal welfare spending, and whether they would include Federal assumption of only local and State matching costs, or all costs including that of general assistance and other nonfederally supported welfare costs, is not by any means clear. But I take the proposal to mean a serious effort to overhaul the entire present tangle of local, State, and Federal welfare programs, beginning with AFDC or FAP and moving out, and then a Federal takeover of funding for the restructured system that results.

Now all this may be a necessary and desirable goal, but can it really be considered an alternative to revenue sharing? Or does it concern a quite different and more narrow set of problems and goals; to use the vernacular, may not the two proposals be in quite different ball parks? I suspect that this is indeed the case.

Recall that to serve the multiple set of goals envisioned by revenue sharing the distribution of benefits has to be fairly even. I have looked at the data on local and State welfare spending and conclude the benefits of federalization would be, in fact, highly uneven. First, on the interstate level, a few States would reap the preponderant portion of the benefits. In fact, three States—Massachusetts, New York, and California—would alone receive 51 percent of the dollar gains. To contrast this with what I consider to be the more equitable distribution of the administration's proposal, New York would receive 10.6 percent of the revenue sharing funds but almost 20 percent of the dollar savings from federalization of welfare. The figures for California would be 11 percent and 21 percent respectively. Massachusetts, which has a large general assistance program, would be the biggest winner of all, getting fully 10 percent of the savings from welfare federalization, in contrast to a little over 3 percent under revenue sharing.

Of course, if a few win big, a lot of people have to lose. It is sort of like the lottery. In fact, 37 States would receive a smaller portion of the benefits under welfare federalization than they are

slated to get through revenue sharing. The big losers would be Texas, Florida, and Georgia with percentages as follows:

Texas—1.7 percent of the savings under welfare federalization and 4.8 percent of the benefits under revenue sharing;

Florida—0.97 percent and 3.25 percent respectively; and

Georgia—1 percent and 2.15 percent.

Furthermore, the following smaller States would get a 100 percent and in some cases 200 or 300 percent smaller percentage of benefits under welfare federalization than under revenue sharing:

Alabama, Arizona, Kentucky, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Wyoming and South Dakota.

Moreover, for the record I should point out that Arkansas would be included in this group as it is slated to receive 0.86 percent of the revenue sharing dollar but would only reap 0.40 percent of the savings of welfare federalization.

Chart II follows:

CHART II.—DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS TO THE STATES: WELFARE FEDERALIZATION VS. REVENUE SHARING

State	[In percent]		
	Benefits under welfare federalization	Benefits under revenue sharing	Contribution to Federal tax dollar
Alabama.....	0.80	1.64	1.12
Alaska.....	.13	.17	.14
Arizona.....	.30	1.03	.66
Arkansas.....	.40	.86	.57
California.....	21.00	11.80	11.31
Colorado.....	1.12	1.20	.93
Connecticut.....	1.80	1.18	2.09
Delaware.....	.26	.27	.38
Florida.....	.97	3.35	2.74
Georgia.....	1.00	2.15	1.70
Hawaii.....	.39	.47	.38
Idaho.....	.21	.40	.26
Illinois.....	3.02	4.40	6.82
Indiana.....	1.10	2.32	2.47
Iowa.....	1.41	1.49	1.25
Kansas.....	.69	1.08	1.02
Kentucky.....	.76	1.56	1.12
Louisiana.....	1.10	2.03	1.37
Maine.....	.36	.46	.39
Maryland.....	1.30	1.85	2.20
Massachusetts.....	10.00	2.72	3.15
Michigan.....	4.90	4.58	4.80
Minnesota.....	1.89	2.15	1.86
Mississippi.....	.49	1.23	.59
Missouri.....	1.47	1.93	2.18
Montana.....	.28	.38	.28
Nebraska.....	.31	.78	.67
Nevada.....	.19	.28	.27
New Hampshire.....	.28	.31	.35
New Jersey.....	2.18	3.08	4.24
New Mexico.....	.31	.64	.36
New York.....	19.77	10.68	11.75
North Carolina.....	.63	2.27	1.77
North Dakota.....	.19	.41	.22
Ohio.....	4.30	4.25	5.51
Oklahoma.....	1.44	1.27	.97
Oregon.....	.79	1.14	.94
Pennsylvania.....	5.20	4.92	6.08
Rhode Island.....	.78	.42	.50
South Carolina.....	.30	1.13	.82
South Dakota.....	.13	.38	.23
Tennessee.....	.78	1.74	1.43
Texas.....	1.71	4.86	4.70
Utah.....	.28	5.7	.38
Vermont.....	.24	.24	.18
Virginia.....	1.11	2.09	1.98
Washington.....	1.94	1.84	1.69
West Virginia.....	.46	.83	.64
Wisconsin.....	2.72	2.49	2.04
Wyoming.....	.09	.23	.15

Source: (A) State Governmental Finances, 1969. (B) Governmental Finances, 1968-69. (C) Tax Foundation, 1970.

An equally important question concerns the distributive impact of the proposal within each State. As you know, the revenue sharing plan has strong built-in guarantees that a substantial portion of

the funds will be passed directly through to local units of government. I consider this one of the most critical features of the entire plan, for frankly I see it as the real hope for decentralization and returning power and access to participation at the local level. It is here that we will have to devise new structures, consolidate current fragmented jurisdictions, and develop more effective, innovative social programs and policies. So an important criterion of any scheme for revenue sharing is what kind of guarantees or prospects it provides to insure that the cities, towns, counties, and other emerging forms of local government will get a fair share.

I am afraid that the prospects for an adequate "pass-through" are not terribly promising under the federalization proposal. The following chart demonstrates that in almost all of the States the great bulk of non-Federal public welfare spending originates at the State level. Therefore the great weight of the dollar savings would also accrue to State treas-

uries. While it would be expected that some of this savings would be returned to local governments through various on-going State grant-in-aid programs it is also true that: First, the percentage would be considerably less than that provided in the revenue-sharing pass-through formula; and, second, that money which did come through would likely be locked in with all the strings and categorical restrictions that we are trying to get away from on the Federal level.

Specifically in Connecticut local governments pick up only about 8 percent of the combined local-State welfare tab. This means that 92 percent of the savings resulting from welfare federalization would directly benefit the State treasury. If we assume that the usual or prevailing portion of this new revenue will be transferred to local government in the forms of various aid programs—in Connecticut the figure tends to be around 26 percent—the ultimate share for local governments will be 32 per-

cent—8 percent plus 26 percent of the State residual—93 percent. By contrast the local share of the revenue-sharing dollar will be 64 percent—52 percent mandatory pass-through plus 26 percent of the State residual—48 percent. In my own State of Illinois where welfare is almost totally a State function the similar figures for ultimate or eventual local government benefits would be 26 percent under welfare federalization and 67 percent under revenue sharing. Since local governments, which rest on the weakest tax base, are experiencing the most rapidly mounting demands and provide in my view the best hope for both the solution of our pressing problems, and renewed citizen participation and confidence in our governmental system, they deserve a large share of any new funds that we decide to make available. And for this reason I believe revenue sharing provides a more effective vehicle for the task than does welfare federalization:

Chart III follows:

CHART III.—IMPACT OF REVENUE SHARING VERSUS WELFARE FEDERALIZATION ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

State	1969, Non-Federal welfare spending (millions)			Local share as percent of State/Local welfare spending (4)	Ultimate benefit to local governments (percent)		State	1969, Non-Federal welfare spending (millions)			Local share as percent of State/Local welfare spending (4)	Ultimate benefit to local governments (percent)	
	Local source (1)	State source (2)	Total (3)		Welfare Federalization (5)	Revenue sharing (6)		Local source (1)	State source (2)	Total (3)		Welfare Federalization (5)	Revenue sharing (6)
Alabama.....	\$2.90	\$39.00	\$41.90	7	34	56	Nebraska.....	0	\$16.90	\$16.90	0	26	69
Alaska.....	0	6.80	6.80	0	14	44	Nevada.....	\$3.80	6.00	9.80	38	57	63
Arizona.....	2.60	12.80	15.40	17	46	61	New Hampshire.....	6.10	8.30	14.40	42	57	63
Arkansas.....	.65	22.00	22.65	3	28	54	New Jersey.....	0	117.00	117.00	0	29	70
California.....	150.00	997.00	1,147.00	10	48	73	New Mexico.....	.20	16.30	16.50	1	29	48
Colorado.....	13.00	49.00	62.00	19	25	66	New York.....	329.00	733.00	1,062.00	31	74	82
Connecticut.....	7.80	88.60	96.40	8	32	64	North Carolina.....	12.00	22.00	34.00	35	49	57
Delaware.....	0	14.00	14.00	0	32	51	North Dakota.....	1.80	8.00	9.80	18	21	53
Florida.....	19.00	33.00	52.00	37	61	65	Ohio.....	80.00	151.40	231.40	35	54	68
Georgia.....	4.70	50.50	55.20	9	38	62	Oklahoma.....	1.90	53.80	55.70	4	24	41
Hawaii.....	.10	21.40	21.50	1	6	30	Oregon.....	2.00	40.00	42.00	5	30	63
Idaho.....	3.00	7.80	10.80	27	33	55	Pennsylvania.....	50.50	220.50	271.00	18	42	62
Illinois.....	0	161.00	161.00	0	26	67	Rhode Island.....	.20	40.00	40.20	1	17	51
Indiana.....	30.80	28.70	59.50	52	67	64	South Carolina.....	2.50	12.50	15.00	17	42	51
Iowa.....	18.00	57.50	75.50	24	46	63	South Dakota.....	1.10	5.70	6.80	16	28	61
Kansas.....	0	37.10	37.10	0	31	68	Tennessee.....	8.40	31.90	40.30	20	47	61
Kentucky.....	3.10	38.00	41.10	7	26	46	Texas.....	10.90	80.80	91.70	11	35	58
Louisiana.....	1.20	68.20	69.40	2	31	52	Utah.....	.70	13.80	14.50	5	31	58
Maine.....	2.40	16.30	18.70	14	29	54	Vermont.....	1.80	10.90	12.70	14	25	45
Maryland.....	9.90	97.00	106.90	9	49	65	Virginia.....	36.50	26.40	62.90	58	71	57
Massachusetts.....	205.80	335.00	540.00	38	56	65	Washington.....	0	103.60	103.60	0	27	54
Michigan.....	47.00	220.00	267.00	18	38	63	West Virginia.....	.70	24.00	24.70	3	23	45
Minnesota.....	57.00	43.00	100.00	57	77	69	Wisconsin.....	64.00	72.40	136.40	47	71	68
Mississippi.....	2.30	23.90	26.20	8	38	59	Wyoming.....	3.10	2.32	5.42	57	66	56
Missouri.....	5.70	72.80	78.50	7	30	65	Total.....	1,143.00	4,222.02	5,365.07	26		
Montana.....	4.70	9.90	14.60	32	43	60							

¹ Less than.

Source: (1) Government Finances in 1968-69; (2) State Government Finances in 1969; (6) see

footnote (1) of chart VI, p. 23b, for explanation of method by which "Ultimate Benefit" figures were derived.

In making these points and presenting this evidence my purpose has not been to undermine honest interest in reform of the welfare system, for everyone knows that we certainly need that, nor to divide State from local government interests, nor to set big States against small ones. In fact I desperately hope those who are interested in welfare reform will first promptly move to get the present family assistance plan proposal on the statute books, and then move on from there. My concern however, has been to question whether welfare federalization can properly or rightfully be considered a legitimate alternative to revenue sharing; to ask whether or not it provides an adequate measure of local fiscal need; whether it is oriented to the multiple set of goals implicit in the revenue sharing concept or finally, if it is not oriented

toward a more narrow range of objectives and problems. I think this data on the distribution of the State-local welfare burden shows that it is not a very good indicator of local fiscal needs nor because of its highly concentrated distribution can welfare federalization hope to stimulate and invigorate governments evenly throughout the Nation.

The other great shortcoming of the welfare federalization proposal is that it attacks the problem on the wrong side of the ledger. That is, it seizes upon a currently rapidly increasing item on the expenditure side and assumes if this could be erased much of the problem would be solved. I submit this is not the case. The fiscal crisis results not from this or that expenditure overload. It results from inherent inadequacy on the revenue side of the State and local

budget ledger and unless a proposal promises to do something about this, it is not a real solution to the problem.

The following tables, I think, vividly demonstrate the problem. The first shows the relative growth sensitivity for the major State sources of revenue and then the corresponding percent of State revenue generated by that source in 1970. The totals point straight to the heart of the problem. Fully 76 percent of revenue stemmed from sources that grow less rapidly than the economy, considerably less so in the case of alcohol and cigarette revenues which grow only 0.3 or 0.4 percent with every 1 percent growth of the economy. By contrast only about a fifth of the economy stems from profit and income taxes which as the chart shows grow considerably faster than the economy. Unless this distribution can be changed

considerably the local and State fiscal crisis will stay with us. For relief of a single expenditure item today will only pave the way for similar emergency bail-out actions tomorrow. Perhaps the next call will be for federalization of education spending, or who knows what other items. This approach can never provide a satisfactory solution and that is why welfare federalization is not a real alternative whatever its merits in its own right.

The second chart demonstrates the impact of these nongrowth tax sources on urban revenue. The implication is clearly that most revenue growth in central cities must be financed out of rate increases or new taxes.

Charts IV and V follow:

CHART IV.—GROWTH SENSITIVITY OF STATE TAX SOURCES

Type of tax	Growth sensitivity ¹	Number of States using tax	Percent of revenue
Auto license and registration	0.30	50	5.7
Tobacco	.35	50	4.8
Alcoholic	.50	50	3.0
Motor fuel	.50	50	13.1
Public utilities	.95	40	1.9
General sales	.97	45	29.5
Property	.70	43	2.3
Subtotal			60.3
Income:			
Corporate	1.20	43	7.8
Individual	1.60	42	19.2
Subtotal			27.0
High growth responsive			27.0
Low growth responsive			60.3
Other			12.7
Total			100.0

¹ Percent growth with each 1 percent growth in GNP.

Source: (A) Federal-State Coordination of Personal Income Taxes, ACIR (October 1967); (B) U.S. Bureau of the Census, State Tax Collections in 1970.

CHART V.—SOURCE OF LOCAL TAX REVENUE INCREASES FOR SELECTED CENTRAL CITIES, 1965-75

Central city	Projected local tax revenue increase 1965-75 (millions)	Amount attributable to natural property tax base growth (millions)	Percent to be raised through rate increases or expansion of non-property taxes
San Diego	\$126.8	\$88.2	30
San Francisco	254.5	85.2	66
Denver	73.7	13.7	81
Miami	35.9	14.2	61
Tampa	105.4	49.9	53
Chicago	427.1	93.0	78
Indianapolis	73.7	17.5	76
Baltimore	66.8	3	98
Detroit	105.1	11.6	111
Minneapolis-St. Paul	82.1	17.7	79
Kansas City	48.8	15.5	67
St. Louis	76.8	2.8	96
Newark	65.9	10.8	83
Buffalo	37.9	1	100
New York	1,958.1	1,101.6	58
Rochester	28.1	3.8	86
Cincinnati	49.0	11.1	77
Cleveland	36.1	8.9	75
Portland	38.3	5.0	87
Philadelphia	126.1	48.0	62
Milwaukee	102.0	57.6	43

Source: "Fiscal Balance in the Federal System," ACIR.

A third major alternative to revenue sharing is the provision of tax credits for proportion of State income taxes. Proponents of this plan believe it would considerably lessen voter resistance to more meaningful and productive State income tax systems. The important thing that can be said in favor of this approach is that it deals directly with the problem of a weak tax base and focuses its efforts on reform of the revenue side of the ledger. Moreover, the direct stimulus of tax incentives can plausibly be linked with real hope of State income tax increases. Both of these points make the tax credit approach a serious alternative to revenue sharing.

However, the credit approach also has some quite serious shortcomings that I want to spell out briefly. The first is that it would provide an even larger portion of the benefits to State government than welfare federalization. By definition a tax credit scheme to stimulate State income tax efforts means that the new revenue would be going into the State treasury. If prevailing spending and transfer patterns were to persist, then on the average about 70 percent of the benefits would accrue to State governments and 30 percent eventually to local governments.

Of course, significant increments of new revenue could reasonably be expected to induce States to step up their transfer efforts to local governments, but even a modest upward revision could never begin to close the local government benefit gap that exists between this approach and revenue sharing. For instance, the adjusted local benefit percentage under revenue sharing for Kentucky would be 46 percent and for the tax credit approach 20 percent; for Kansas the comparable figures would be 68 percent and 31 percent. The same pattern tends to exist in the big industrial States as well. The figure for adjusted local benefits under revenue sharing for Pennsylvania is 62 percent and for the tax credit 29 percent; in Massachusetts the figures are 65 percent and 29 percent.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this point a table which gives the breakdown and a comparison between these two approaches for all the States. Again I make no claim that these figures are final or definitive. They are based on current trends and relationships which might in fact change under new conditions, but I suspect not enough to invalidate these findings.

Chart VI follows:

CHART VI.—THE IMPACT OF REVENUE SHARING VERSUS TAX CREDITS ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

State	Percent of State revenue transferred to local level	Local revenue as percent of combined State-local revenue	Percent of revenue sharing ¹ dollars to local level	Percent of tax credit ² dollars to local level	State	Percent of State revenue transferred to local level	Local revenue as percent of combined State-local revenue	Percent of revenue sharing ¹ dollars to local level	Percent of tax credit ² dollars to local level
Alabama	29	38	56	29	Montana	17	52	60	17
Alaska	14	36	44	17	Nebaska	26	58	69	26
Arizona	35	40	61	35	Nevada	28	49	63	28
Arkansas	26	38	54	26	New Hampshire	11	57	62	11
California	42	54	73	42	New Jersey	29	58	70	29
Colorado	33	50	66	33	New Mexico	28	28	48	28
Connecticut	26	52	64	26	New York	63	51	82	63
Delaware	32	28	51	32	North Carolina	37	31	57	37
Florida	38	44	65	38	North Dakota	17	43	53	17
Georgia	32	43	62	32	Ohio	29	55	68	29
Hawaii	6	26	30	6	Oklahoma	21	25	41	21
Idaho	24	41	55	24	Oregon	26	50	63	26
Illinois	26	55	67	26	Pennsylvania	29	47	62	29
Indiana	32	48	64	32	Rhode Island	17	41	51	17
Iowa	29	48	63	29	South Carolina	30	30	51	30
Kansas	31	53	68	31	South Dakota	14	55	61	14
Kentucky	20	33	46	20	Tennessee	33	42	61	33
Louisiana	29	32	52	29	Texas	26	43	58	26
Maine	17	44	54	17	Utah	27	43	58	27
Maryland	44	45	65	44	Vermont	13	37	45	13
Massachusetts	29	51	65	29	Virginia	31	38	57	31
Michigan	36	44	63	36	Washington	27	37	54	27
Minnesota	46	43	69	46	West Virginia	21	31	45	21
Mississippi	33	38	59	33	Wisconsin	46	41	68	46
Missouri	25	53	65	25	Wyoming	21	44	46	21

¹ Sum of required pass-through plus percentage of State residual normally distributed to local governments as indicated in col. I.

² Assuming normal distribution of State revenues as indicated in col. I.
Source: Governmental finances in 1968-69.

The second shortcoming of the tax credit scheme is that it would have a highly differential impact on the States. For reasons that are obvious, you could not offer an unlimited credit for State income taxes. One limited to just 10 per-

cent of Federal liability for instance could potentially cost the Treasury \$9 billion, so I doubt whether we would be justified in even speculating about anything above that. Because the amount of creditable State tax would of necessity be limited it would be rather imprudent to offer a 100 percent credit for this would be quickly exhausted and the taxpayer would be left to pay each additional tax dollar entirely from his own pocket, and at that point, as the history of the last years indicates, the resistance to higher State income taxes would begin. Therefore I think it is reasonable to suppose that any credit measure would be something on the order of a 40-percent credit on State income tax liability as the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations once proposed, up to a maximum of 10 percent of Federal tax liabilities.

What would this look like in terms of the new tax efforts that might be spurred in the States? I am including some data to show that the results could be highly inequitable. In States that already have high income taxes it would probably not induce much additional revenue. By contrast, probably considerable new revenue efforts would be elicited in States like

Ohio and Pennsylvania where there is currently no income tax.

Specifically, States like Oregon, Hawaii, Wisconsin, and Minnesota which already have high income tax levies could hope to reap hardly any benefits, as it is unlikely that credit could induce citizens to agree to much higher levels. For once having exhausted the maximum amount creditable, and most of these States are near or past this threshold already, chances are that people would rather pocket the money than pay it back in higher noncreditable tax levies—that would have to be paid out of the pocket dollar for dollar. By contrast, the psychological and economic incentives are working in the opposite direction in States like Ohio and Pennsylvania where there is currently no income tax. In these instances there would be a powerful tendency to raise taxes high enough so that much if not all of the credit benefits could be employed.

Specifically, I would like to insert a chart which indicates some rough comparison of the distribution of benefits among the States under the two approaches. The assumption underlying this table is that 40-percent credit would be a powerful inducement to raise taxes

to near the maximum creditable level in each State as proponents of the credit plan claim. I have my doubts whether this would in fact happen. Most likely only marginal new tax efforts would be stimulated or States without income taxes would adopt them because they are creditable, and then cut other taxes leaving little net revenue gain. That is, a tax credit proposal might be highly efficient at channeling Federal revenues into private pockets, but not really terribly successful at producing new revenues in States treasuries.

In any case the following table accepts the assumption of high tax-generating efficacy and shows that the results could be highly inequitable. New York, which has a high personal income tax already, would gain only 2.32 percent of the benefits in this admittedly model situation, in contrast to the 10.68 percent it is slated for under revenue sharing. By contrast Pennsylvania would potentially reap 10.4 percent of the benefits under the tax credit, compared to 4.92 percent of the benefits under revenue sharing. A breakdown for relative gains and losses that each State might experience follows:

CHART VII.—THE IMPACT OF REVENUE SHARING VERSUS TAX CREDITS ON STATE GOVERNMENTS

[Dollars in millions]

State	Estimated 1970 Federal income tax	State income tax collections, 1970	State income tax potential with credit	Potential State revenue gain	Benefits	
					State share under credit proposal (percent)	State share under revenue sharing (percent)
New England:						
Maine	\$325,560	\$18,885	\$81,400	\$62,545	0.42	0.46
New Hampshire	280,240	3,462	70,054	66,592	.49	.31
Massachusetts	2,948,000	517,952	737,000	219,048	1.60	2.72
Rhode Island	443,090	18,644	110,775	92,131	.67	.42
Connecticut	1,997,840	4,916	510,500	505,584	3.69	1.18
Mid-Atlantic:						
New York	11,300,000	2,506,435	2,825,000	318,565	2.32	10.68
New Jersey	4,158,400	17,643	1,039,500	1,021,857	7.46	3.08
Pennsylvania	5,722,320	0	1,430,500	1,430,500	10.43	4.92
East North Central:						
Ohio	5,225,120	0	1,306,250	1,306,250	9.49	4.25
Illinois	6,535,920	575,601	1,633,750	1,058,149	7.72	4.40
Indiana	2,287,712	216,384	571,750	355,366	2.59	2.32
Michigan	4,718,888	415,345	1,179,500	764,155	5.59	4.58
Wisconsin	1,798,960	489,944	449,000	0	0	2.49
West North Central:						
Minnesota	1,392,160	345,700	348,000	2,300	.02	2.15
Iowa	1,039,600	112,700	260,000	147,300	1.07	1.49
Missouri	1,988,800	129,700	497,000	367,300	2.67	1.95
North Dakota	171,760	15,400	42,900	27,500	.20	.41
South Dakota	162,720	0	40,600	40,600	.29	.38
Nebraska	542,400	44,400	135,500	91,100	.66	.78
Kansas	804,560	78,400	201,200	123,800	.90	1.08
South Atlantic:						
Delaware	424,800	68,500	106,200	37,700	.27	.27
Maryland	2,088,240	413,400	522,000	108,600	.72	1.85
Virginia	1,726,640	282,800	431,400	148,600	1.08	2.09
West Virginia	551,440	40,000	137,800	97,800	.70	.83
North Carolina	1,437,360	270,900	359,200	88,300	.64	2.27
South Carolina	623,760	95,400	156,900	61,500	.45	1.13
Georgia	1,419,280	184,900	354,700	169,800	1.24	2.15
Florida	2,250,960	0	562,700	562,700	4.11	3.35
East South Central:						
Kentucky	894,960	121,400	223,700	102,300	.75	1.56
Tennessee	1,184,240	12,100	296,000	283,900	2.07	1.74
Alabama	913,040	85,100	228,200	143,000	1.04	1.64
Mississippi	415,840	44,200	104,000	59,800	.43	1.23
West South Central:						
Arkansas	424,800	42,600	106,200	63,600	.46	.86
Louisiana	1,057,680	48,000	265,000	217,000	1.59	2.03
Oklahoma	804,560	50,500	201,200	150,700	1.10	1.27
Texas	3,870,160	0	970,000	970,000	7.08	4.86
Mountain:						
Montana	235,040	38,900	58,800	19,900	.14	.38
Idaho	207,920	36,700	51,900	15,200	.11	.40
Wyoming	126,560	0	31,700	31,700	.23	.23
Colorado	804,560	129,100	201,200	72,100	.53	1.20
New Mexico	316,400	35,700	79,100	43,400	.31	.64
Arizona	623,760	65,000	155,900	90,900	.65	1.03
Utah	325,560	61,300	81,400	20,100	.14	.57
Nevada	262,160	0	65,500	65,500	.48	.28

See footnotes at end of table.

State	Estimated 1970 Federal income tax	State income tax collections, 1970	State income ¹ tax potential with credit	Potential State ¹ revenue gain	Benefits	
					State share under credit proposal (percent)	State share under revenue sharing (percent)
Pacific:						
Washington.....	\$1,437,360	0	\$359,000	\$359,000	2.62	1.84
Oregon.....	849,760	\$213,100	212,500	0	0	1.14
California.....	10,407,000	1,150,600	2,601,700	1,451,100	10.59	11.80
Alaska.....	135,600	32,500	33,800	1,300	.01	.17
Hawaii.....	325,400	105,000	81,400	0	0	.47
Total.....				13,655,152		

¹ This assumes (1) the inducement of 40 percent credit for State personal income taxes up to 10 percent of Federal tax liability will encourage States to raise taxes high enough to obtain the full value of the credit; and (2) States will rationalize their tax structure so that each individual taxpayer can take full advantage of the credit. In this situation, it would require that the effective State tax rate for each individual or tax class be exactly $\frac{1}{4}$ of the Federal rate, e.g. if an effective State tax rate that is $\frac{1}{4}$ of the Federal tax rate for any taxpayer yields: Federal liability=\$400; State liability=\$100. Then; 40 percent of \$100=10 percent of \$400=optimum State tax rate.

The general rule is: Optimum effective tax rate = $\frac{\text{percent Federal liability allowable}}{\text{percent State tax creditable}}$.

While neither of these optimum conditions are likely to prevail in practice, if the credit incentive is to work as its proponents claim, then the tendencies would be in the direction of the optimum case.

Sources: (A) Bureau of the Census, State Tax Collections, 1970; (B) Economic Report of the President, 1971; (C) Federal Revenues and Expenditures in the Several States (averages for fiscal years 1965-67) by Harriet Halper and I. M. Labovitz, Legislative Reference Service, 1968.

These comparisons, of course, are based on optimal situation models that might not be fully implemented in actual practice. But if the tax credit proposal is to work as a powerful incentive as claimed, then the tendencies indicated by the chart would likely be present with their highly uneven pattern of benefits. Thus both the intrastate and interstate pattern of benefits under the tax credit proposal do not meet a basic criterion for a revenue sharing scheme that I have tried to stress in this presentation; namely, that the benefits must be generally even and uniform if the goal of regeneration of all local and State governments is to be served.

In discussing these alternatives to revenue sharing my purpose has not been to criticize particular proposals, for many of them may have considerable merit in their own contexts. Rather my aim has been to underscore and demonstrate that the concept of revenue sharing is based on a multiple set of goals and that they must be carefully balanced when choosing a mechanism for implementation. I believe that none of the alternative proposals can even approximate this: welfare federalization provides immediate, emergency fiscal relief but does not deal with the source of the fiscal crisis in the State and local tax structures; a tax cut offers the dubious potential of higher tax efforts at the local level, but at the expense of further constraining and hardening the arteries of local government rather than freeing them and providing larger capacity for innovation; and finally the tax credit and welfare federalization schemes would be highly concentrated and inequitable in the distribution of benefits—a fact incompatible with the need for broad based dollar inputs to all local governments.

Of course, these deficiencies by no means imply that revenue sharing is without flaws. Certainly there are many bugs yet to be worked out. But at a time when each new week seems to produce another "alternative" to revenue sharing I hope that this discussion may serve to highlight the fact that revenue sharing is not conceived merely as an emergency stop-gap measure to bail out fiscally pressured local and State governments, although this is indeed one of its purposes and likely consequences. It is designed to serve a multiplicity of purposes

and it should be this criterion by which we evaluate any past, present or future alternatives that may be proposed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. POWELL, for Tuesday, February 9, 1971, on account of representing President Richard Nixon at ceremonies commemorating the birth of former President William Henry Harrison at North Bend, Ohio.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special order heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KYL) to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous matter:)

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous matter:)

Mr. OBEY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. GALMO, for 60 minutes, on Wednesday, February 10.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, for 60 minutes, on Wednesday, February 10.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON in three instances and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KYL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WINN.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. MCCULLOCH.

Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGL.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in four instances.

Mr. FORSYTHE in two instances.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. SEBELIUS.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. STAFFORD.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. DEVINE.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. LLOYD.

Mr. McKEVITT in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VANIK in five instances.

Mr. CARNEY in three instances.

Mr. PEPPER in two instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. ABOUREZK in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in 10 instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. PATTEN in two instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. FASCELL in five instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.

Mr. CLARK in two instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in three instances.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee in four instances.

Mr. BEGICH.

Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. SIKES in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 10, 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:

239. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to restore balance in the federal system of government in the United States, to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems, to achieve a better allocation of total public resources, and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States (H. Doc. No. 92-47); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

240. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on a violation by the General Services Administration of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

241. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on Federal contributions program equipment and facilities for the quarter ended December 31, 1970, pursuant to section 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

242. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

243. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to designate the legal public holidays to be observed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

244. A letter from the Chairman, D.C. Armory Board, transmitting the 23d annual report and financial statements of the Board's operation of the D.C. National Guard Armory and the 13th annual report and financial statements of the operation of the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium, covering fiscal year 1970, pursuant to Public Laws 80-605 and 85-300; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

245. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on the amount of Export-Import Bank loans, insurance, and guarantees issued in June through December 1970, in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia, pursuant to the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

246. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Office of State Technical Services for fiscal year 1970, pursuant to section 14(b) of Public Law 89-182; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

247. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Agricultural Hall of Fame and National Center, transmitting the annual audit and report of the Board of Governors of the organization, for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1970, pursuant to section 14(b) of Public Law 86-680; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

248. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the use and operating costs of the Atomic Energy Commission's high energy accelerators; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 3945. A bill to establish a commission to study the usage, customs, and laws relating to the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 3946. A bill to authorize the acquisition and maintenance of the Goddard rocket launching site in accordance with the act of Aug. 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 3947. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require a packaged perishable food to bear a label specifying the date after which it is not to be sold for consumption as food; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 3948. A bill to modify ammunition recordkeeping requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 3949. A bill to protect the personal security and academic freedom of students, faculty, staff, and other employees of institutions of higher education by requiring the adoption of procedures by the States to govern the treatment of disruptive campus violence by students, staff, and other employees, as precondition to Federal assistance, and to assist such institutions in their efforts to prevent and control campus disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3950. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3951. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3952. A bill to restrict travel in violation of area restrictions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 3953. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp as a tribute to the effective services of homing pigeons for the Armed Forces of the United States in World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLMER (for himself and Mr. SMITH of California):

H.R. 3954. A bill to amend section 502 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 with respect to the use of local currencies by certain committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 3955. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, relating to enrollment charges for Federal employees' health benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 3956. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.R. 3957. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the

conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 3958. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 149 to permit the distribution of certain surplus Federal property to certain organizations which provide for the education and recreation of young boys and girls; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 3959. A bill to modify ammunition recordkeeping requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 3960. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3961. A bill to alleviate certain hardships to employees in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3962. A bill to grant civil service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3963. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts, to make grants to States for the payment of such compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 3964. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility for pensions under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3965. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide equality of treatment for married female veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3966. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to provide, under the program of aid to families with dependent children, for the furnishing of three meals a day to all children under age 16 who are eligible for such aid or whose families are below the poverty level, at appropriate day-care centers and at public and private schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3967. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to designate the home of a State legislator for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3968. A bill to regulate interstate commerce by requiring certain insurance as a condition precedent to using the public streets, roads, and highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3969. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 in order to promote competition among motor vehicle manufacturers in the design and production of safe motor vehicles having greater resistance to damage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3970. A bill to promote the greater availability of motor vehicle insurance in interstate commerce under more efficient and beneficial marketing conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3971. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 3972. A bill to declare that certain federally owned lands shall be held by the United States in trust for the Soshone-Ban-

nock Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 3973. A bill to designate as wilderness the Cranberry, Otter Creek, and Dolly Sods areas in the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 3974. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 3975. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCULLOCH (for himself and Mr. POFF):

H.R. 3976. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKEVITT:

H.R. 3977. A bill to extend the fire research and safety program until June 30, 1973; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 3978. A bill to provide for the construction of wells and other facilities necessary to provide a supplemental water supply to the lands of the Mirage Flats Irrigation District, Mirage Flats project, Nebr., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 3979. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 3980. A bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, or transportation of handguns, in any manner affecting interstate or foreign commerce, except for or by members of the Armed Forces, law enforcement officials, and as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury, licensed importers, manufacturers, dealers, and pistol clubs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 3981. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 3982. A bill to provide that household appliances be conspicuously marked to show the foreign country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3983. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3984. A bill to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and of foreign origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 3985. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to avoid interruptions of railroad transportation that threaten national safety and health by reason of labor disputes and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 3986. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Longfellow National Historic Site in Cambridge, Mass., and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL (for himself and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H.R. 3987. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Bunker Hill National Historic Site in the city of Boston, Mass., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 3988. A bill to equalize the rates of disability compensation payable to veterans of peacetime and wartime service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3989. A bill to amend section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the residence requirements applied in determining whether an individual who is not a citizen of the United States qualifies as a dependent for income tax purpose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3990. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove the limitations (added by the Social Security Amendments of 1967) on the payment of benefits to citizens of certain foreign countries having social insurance or pension systems of general application; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3991. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the present dollar limits on the amount allowable as a child-care deduction, and to increase the income limits which are applicable in certain cases in determining eligibility for such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BARING, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 3992. A bill to provide for a program of Federal assistance in the development, acquisition, and installation of aircraft anti-hijacking detection systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. NIX, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SISK, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 3993. A bill to provide for a program of Federal assistance in the development, acquisition, and installation of aircraft anti-hijacking detection systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BRADEN, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3994. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for annual reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General concerning certain price increases in Government contracts and certain failures to meet Government contract completion dates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY,

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KEITH, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 3995. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for annual reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General concerning certain price increases in Government contracts and certain failures to meet Government contract completion dates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. THONE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 3996. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for annual reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General concerning certain price increases in Government contracts and certain failures to meet Government contract completion dates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 3997. A bill to establish a commission to review U.S. antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. ERLÉN-BORN, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ESCH, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 3998. A bill to assist school districts to meet special problems incident to desegregation and to the elimination, reduction, or prevention of racial isolation, in elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 3999. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to place employees under the Federal Reserve System in and under the competitive service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 4000. 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. RYAN (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BURTON of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DOW, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. KOCH, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REDD of New York, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 4001. A bill to provide supplemental appropriations and increased contract authority to fully fund the urban renewal, model cities, and rent supplement programs, and the low-income homeownership and rental housing programs, for the fiscal year 1971; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4002. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself and Mr. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 4003. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to restore the system of recomputation of retired pay for certain members

and former members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 4004. A bill to provide procedures for calling constitutional conventions for proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4005. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain expenses of child adoption shall be treated as medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4006. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize a deduction from gross income for certain expenses of employing full-time household help; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4007. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize a deduction from gross income for certain contributions to the support of an aged parent or divorced mother who is not gainfully employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4008. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of advanced education (including certain limited travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of providing entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4009. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize a tax credit for certain expenses of providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 4010. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase the Federal share for construction grants, in certain cases; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4011. A bill to assist in the efficient production of the needed volume of good housing at lower cost through the elimination of restrictions on the use of advanced technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4012. A bill for the general revision of the patent laws, title 35 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4013. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income any payments made under the retired serviceman's family protection plan by an individual who has waived his military retirement pay in order to receive a civil service retirement annuity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. MYERS, Mr. ZION, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. ROUSELOT, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. THONE, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. SIKES, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WIGGINS, and Mr. FOUNTAIN):

H.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning March 21, 1971, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself and Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

H.J. Res. 312. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the calendar week beginning on May 30, 1971, and ending on June 5, 1971, as "National Peace Corps Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 313. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.J. Res. 314. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.J. Res. 315. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.J. Res. 316. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORSYTHE (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. HORTON):

H.J. Res. 317. Joint resolution authorizing the President to declare the last Saturday in April of each year as "National Collegiate Press Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.J. Res. 318. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 319. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 320. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. STEELE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. LINK, and Mr. ULLMAN):

H.J. Res. 321. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLANTON (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. DOWNING, and Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania):

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution calling for humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY (for himself and Mr. ASPINALL):

H. Con. Res. 143. Concurrent resolution relating to a national Indian policy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent resolution urging the President to take requisite action to insure the safety of U.S. commercial fishing vessels on the high seas; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. PODELL, Mr. YATES, and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H. Res. 215. Resolution to express the sense of the House that the President set the date for withdrawal from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H. Res. 216. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Mr. DULSKI (for himself and Mr. CORBETT):

H. Res. 217. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct studies and investigations within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Res. 218. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and

study authorized by House Resolution 21; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. Res. 219. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

12. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to fisheries jurisdiction off the coast of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 4014. A bill for the relief of Benedicta Torremonia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4015. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Alosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4016. A bill for the relief of Damaso Cabebe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4017. A bill for the relief of Baldassare Claravino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4018. A bill for the relief of Oswaldo Falanga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4019. A bill for the relief of Antonio Augusto Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4020. A bill for the relief of Michele Florio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4021. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Florio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4022. A bill for the relief of Nicola Gagliardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4023. A bill for the relief of Antonio Gargano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4024. A bill for the relief of Lillian Marie Gederon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4025. A bill for the relief of Baldassare Mangiaracina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4026. A bill for the relief of Anna Marrazza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4027. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Morsello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4028. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Naso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BADILLO:

H.R. 4029. A bill for the relief of Joseph Paul Lucien Fontaine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4030. A bill for the relief of Loretta, Blondel, Bernalyn, Benaud, Beverly, and Brenda Lee Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4031. A bill for the relief of Faye Walters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 4032. A bill for the relief of Mark P. Hagood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4033. A bill for the relief of Nabil George H. Yaldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 4034. A bill for the relief of Graciano Q. Adajar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4035. A bill for the relief of Dionisio Bautista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4036. A bill for the relief of Mr. Leopoldo Murrillo Campos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4037. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Sabas Edrada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4038. A bill for the relief of Francisca Ocampo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4039. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Orlando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4040. A bill for the relief of Esperanza Sindol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):

H.R. 4041. A bill for the relief of Luigi Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 4042. A bill for the relief of John A. Martinkosky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4043. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ana Maria de Lima Sousa Raposo and her two children, Paulo and Carlos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4044. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ming Derek Chan, his wife, Belle Chan, and their two daughters, Evelyn and Jeannie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4045. A bill for the relief of Mario DiBattisto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4046. A bill for the relief of Joseph P. Mahady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4047. A bill for the relief of Domenico Stalteri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4048. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alfonso Vancheri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 4049. A bill for the relief of Vitorino da Costa Cabral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4050. A bill for the relief of Maria Manuela da Jesus Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4051. A bill for the relief of Argentina Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4052. A bill for the relief of Carlota Gujmares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4053. A bill for the relief of Dr. Raghuram Pothapu Reddy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 4054. A bill for the relief of Josephine Palazzolo and Michele Palazzolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALFE:

H.R. 4055. A bill for the relief of Sjoufjan Awal; wife, Sofie Awal; and son, Leksin Awal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 4056. A bill for the relief of Anna Veltri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 4057. A bill for the relief of Peter Heinrich Joehnsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4058. A bill for the relief of Agripino Erano Tenchavez, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4059. A bill for the relief of Gianiale and Anna Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 4060. A bill for the relief of Harvard Specialty Manufacturing Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4061. A bill for the relief of Julian G. Carr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4062. A bill for the relief of William H. Evans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4063. A bill for the relief of Edward M. Fleming Construction Co., Inc., a corporation in the process of liquidation represented by its surviving board of directors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4064. A bill for the relief of William H. Nickerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4065. A bill for the relief of World Mart, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 4066. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vita Oranza Praino and her children, Salvatore, Michele, and Marcello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 4067. A bill for the relief of Calogero Mendola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4068. A bill for the relief of Antonio Monticciolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 4069. A bill for the relief of Philemon M. Hou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4070. A bill for the relief of Mr. and

Mrs. Katse C. Semanya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 4071. A bill for the relief of Sein Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4072. A bill for the relief of Emanuele Catanzariti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4073. A bill for the relief of Herbert Chan, Szeto Wing Ha Chan, and son, Frank Chan and twin daughters, Martha and May Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4074. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kai-Loo Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4075. A bill for the relief of Andonios Merkouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4076. A bill for the relief of Marina Merkouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4077. A bill for the relief of Serafina Patti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4078. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angelo Zosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 4079. A bill for the relief of David Anthony Burch, born as Shigenori Ishihara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 4080. A bill for the relief of Mr. Duc Mau Nguyen and his wife Hien Thi Ngo Nguyen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4081. A bill for the relief of Lauro Eduardo Damerval; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4082. A bill for the relief of Arthur W. Feldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4083. A bill for the relief of Thomas William Greene and Jill A. Greene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

23. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Commissioners, Tarpon Springs, Fla., relative to Federal-State revenue sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DOUBLING OF PAY SCALES FOR FIRST-TERM MILITARY PERSONNEL RECOMMENDED

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when the Gates Commission was established to investigate the feasibility of creating a volunteer military force, it recommended, among other things, that pay scales for first-term personnel be raised to double their present levels. The Commission found that pay for soldiers with over 2 years of service had risen by 111 percent since 1948, but by only 60 percent for those with less than 2 years. Their report found that a volunteer force or, in other terms, a zero draft level could be achieved by correcting this unfair treatment of first-term servicemen. I agree wholeheartedly with that appraisal, and I recently cosponsored

legislation to see that it was put into effect.

The Gates Commission refuted every claim made against a largely volunteer service. They reported that it would cause only a small budget increase, most of the costs being absorbed by increased efficiency and professionalism. Volunteers would serve longer terms, a higher fraction would reenlist, and they would have a higher average level of skill. The armed services would waste fewer man-hours in training and being trained. Because manpower is cheap to the military, it now tends to waste it, using enlisted men for tasks badly suited to their abilities or for tasks that could be performed by civilians or machines. Better pay to volunteers, at the same time, would decrease the veteran's benefits we pay out annually. These now cost \$6 billion a year or one-third as much as current payroll costs for the active Armed Forces.

The Gates Commission reported further that a volunteer military could be achieved without impairing the Nation's ability to meet existing and anticipated

troop level requirements. Pay scales could be doubled for enlisted men and increased by 25 percent for officers—without, as we have pointed out, putting a severe burden on the Federal budget.

The argument that a volunteer professional Army would develop into a threat to our civilian institutions was likewise refuted by the Gates study. Such a threat would come from the officer corps rather than the enlisted personnel, and officers currently are, and always have been, recruited voluntarily. Moreover, our tradition of civilian control of the military has always been sufficiently strong to minimize any possibility of a military takeover.

With these considerations in mind I believe we can move toward an all-volunteer force. The first step must be the reduction of the draft call to a zero level; then, with the weight of evidence on our side, we may begin the long process of repealing the draft law. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that my bill will give us evidence—conclusive evidence—that an all-volunteer Army can work.