

characterized as a "mistake." If Vietnam alone was at issue, it would be hard to fault the popular assessment. But the stake six years ago was more than Vietnam. Indeed, one of the extraordinary features of the Vietnam war is that despite the continuing and deepening debate about Vietnam most Americans have either forgotten or, worse, are unaware of the compelling circumstances which prompted Mr. Johnson's decision.

Many aspects of the Vietnam war may be faulted—and devastatingly so—from political strategy to military tactics. But it is a misleading oversimplification to write off the decision to intervene when we did as simply a "mistake."

There are, at a minimum, 42,000 reasons why we should not disregard the sequences of events in the 100-odd days preceding Mr. Johnson's fateful decision. A replay, however delayed, is the order of the day on the eve of what, for all practical purposes, marks the anniversary of the massive American intervention in Vietnam.

In October and November the military situation in the South was desperate. District capitals and villages were falling. For the first time since the creation of the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front in 1960, Hanoi introduced its first regular Army units into the South.

Against their will, Laos and Cambodia were being turned into North Vietnamese supply corridors. Indonesia's Sukarno conferred with the Peking leadership and his aides confirmed that the rapidly developing

alliance between Jakarta and Peking was aimed at a division of Southeast Asia into respective spheres of control. Sukarno quickened the pace of his armed forays against the Malay peninsula Singapore and the northern Bornean states.

Britain assembled 80 warships off Singapore, perhaps the last major naval concentration of the Royal Navy and, together with Australia and New Zealand, rushed to the defense of the Islamic Federation of Malaysia. Australian and Indonesian warships clashed off Singapore, the largest port in the Commonwealth after London.

Indonesia bolted from the United Nations and worked with China to lay the groundwork for a rival organization. At a New Year's day diplomatic reception in Peking, Field Marshal Ch'en Yi, the Chinese Foreign Minister, boasted, "Thailand is next." In January China and Indonesia concluded a pact which both later called the "Jakarta-Pnompenh-Hanoi-Peking-Pyongyang Axis." Each of the "Axis" powers except Cambodia was outside the United Nations. Sukarno, in a candid moment, said the "Axis" strategy for defeating the United States and its Asian-Pacific allies was for China to strike a blow against the Americans in Vietnam from the north while Indonesia struck Malaysia and Singapore from the south.

LOGIC OF HISTORY DEMANDED AMERICAN BOMBING IN 1965

Dr. Ismail bin Abdul Rahman, then Malaysia's Home Minister, publicly felt that "if the nutcracker with one prong stretching

southward from Hanoi and the other northward from Jakarta [succeeded], it would have been difficult for Malaysia, Thailand and Singapore to preserve their independence."

President Diosado Macapagal of the Philippines warned that if the United States abandoned Vietnam at that time, "how much more impatient would Sukarno's Indonesia be to bring the Philippine archipelago into its orbit." His Australian counterpart, Prime Minister Sir Robert Menzies, openly held that if Vietnam were abandoned at the outset of 1965 "in the long run, and not so very long at that" Australia would be menaced "almost at our doors."

As Clark Clifford, the former Defense Secretary and critic on Vietnam later observed, American indifference toward Vietnam in 1965 may have had a "disastrous" impact on the region.

Clearly, if the United States had not intervened when it did, the Commonwealth position to the south would have become untenable. A consolidation of the "Axis" would have confronted the United States and its allies with a line of hostile, militant and authoritarian states from Korea to New Guinea.

If the United States went to war to forestall control of the Korean-New Guinea perimeter by hostile forces twenty-five years before, then the logic of history demanded the same in 1965. If this strategic perspective is faulty, then the United States intervention in 1965 was, indeed, a "mistake"—and so was the war with Japan.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 10, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth and even forevermore.—Psalm 121: 88.

O God and Father of us all as we leave for our recess keep us aware of Thy presence wherever we go or wherever we stay. May our steps be ordered by Thee in all wisdom and in all good will. Grant that the work we do, the trips we take and the speeches we make honoring the Father of our Country and the savior of our Nation may add to the unity of our Republic and to peace in our world.

During these days be unto us and unto our people a tower of strength. Let Thy power support us, Thy mercy keep us, Thy grace guide us and Thy love redeem us. So may we live with faith and hope for the good of our land and the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from the close of business on Wednesday, February 10, 1971, until noon on Wednesday, February 17, 1971.

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

S.J. Res. 31. Joint resolution extending the date for transmission to the Congress of the Report of the Joint Economic Committee.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 754, 81st Congress, appointed Mr. Larry A. Herrmann to the Federal Records Council.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title 6, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee To Investigate Nonesential Federal Expenditures the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas; Mr. WATTS, of Kentucky; and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

And the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. MAHON, of Texas; Mr. WHITTEN, of Mississippi; and Mr. Bow, of Ohio.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), the Chair

appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. FLYNT, of Georgia; Mr. SIKES, of Florida; Mr. RHODES, of Arizona; and Mr. BROTZMAN, of Colorado.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 14 U.S.C. 194(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MONAGAN, of Connecticut; and Mr. STEELE, of Connecticut.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 46 U.S.C. 1126c, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. WOLFF, of New York, and Mr. WYDLER, of New York.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. TEAGUE of Texas; Mr. NATCHER, of Kentucky; Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin; and Mr. PIRNIE, of New York.

**APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC
ENERGY**

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 2251, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. HANSEN.

**APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF
THE BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S.
NAVAL ACADEMY**

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; Mr. STRATTON, of New York; Mr. MINSHALL, of Ohio; and Mr. BOB WILSON, of California.

**PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF
HOUSE FROM FEBRUARY 10, 1971,
UNTIL FEBRUARY 17, 1971**

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 135) providing for an adjournment of the House from the close of business on Wednesday, February 10, 1971, until noon on Wednesday, February 17, 1971, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "it" and insert "and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, February 11, 1971, they".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for next week following our return from the Lincoln Birthday recess.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the distinguished minority leader's question. As the distinguished minority leader knows, by the terms of the resolution just agreed to, we will adjourn today until next Wednesday, February 17. We will meet on February 17 and probably the next day.

Except for housekeeping resolutions, I do not know of any business next week.

However, committees are now meeting and I would expect a program for the following week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In looking over some of the problems that will undoubtedly relate to prospective legislation, I think there is a matter that will have to come up the following week, and that relates to the labor-management dispute in the railroad industry.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman will be back next week and, of course, we will confer further about that problem. It is a real problem and we understand that it does have to be considered.

**TO CREATE A SELECT COMMITTEE
TO REGULATE PARKING ON THE
HOUSE SIDE OF THE CAPITOL**

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 24 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 24

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of three Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom shall be designated as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) The said committee is hereby authorized to exercise direction over the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives in the assignment of space for outdoor parking of automobiles in squares 639, south of 635, and 692, located adjacent to the House Office Buildings, and for all other outdoor parking of automobiles on the House side of the United States Capitol Grounds.

Sec. 2. The House Office Building Commission, in carrying out the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Acts of March 4, 1907 (40 U.S.C. 175), May 28, 1908 (40 U.S.C. 183 and 184), and April 22, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 175), is hereby authorized to delegate so much of such duties as pertain to the direction and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol in the assignment of space for parking of automobiles in the garages in the Rayburn House Office Building, the Cannon House Office Building, and the two underground garages in squares 637 and 691, located adjacent to the House Office Buildings, and the issuance of regulations governing such assignments, to the select committee herein created.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 1, strike all after the word "Resolved" and insert "That (a) effective January 3, 1971, there is created a select".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**SELECTION OF SELECT COMMITTEE
TO REGULATE PARKING**

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I just simply would like to say that I am

happy to be here today, because I know how enthusiastic the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) is to receive this great responsibility, as well as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

In all seriousness, this is a responsible position, and I am happy to join in the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

**APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SE-
LECT COMMITTEE TO REGULATE
PARKING ON THE HOUSE SIDE OF
THE CAPITOL**

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make the following announcement: That pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 24, 92d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Regulate Parking on the House Side of the Capitol the following Members of the House: Mr. SISK, chairman; Mr. HAYS, and Mr. GROSS.

**CONGRESS VERSUS PRESIDENT—
ANTI-INFLATIONARY RECORD**

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that a few minutes ago the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REVUSS) introduced, for immediate consideration, legislation which would extend the presently existing authority of the President of the United States to impose wage and price controls.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has endeavored to lay the blame for our current inflation at the door of the previous Democratic administrations. This, Mr. Speaker, is patent nonsense. The worst inflationary rate under the Democrats was 4.7 percent in 1968, and the average for the 8 years of Democratic rule was approximately 2 percent. Consumer prices have skyrocketed by 11 percent in the past 24 months. Under Republican auspices, the real earnings of the average workingman's family have declined some 6 percent. Homeownership costs have increased over 20 percent. Fuel and utility prices have increased over 8 percent, and the spiral is still rising. Public transportation costs have risen over 20 percent.

The Democratic Congress has taken the initiative in the fight against inflation. In 1969, we gave the President standby credit controls which he has not used. He should have used them to funnel desperately needed credit into the homebuilding industry and other priority items, but it did not happen that way.

In 1970, we gave the President standby authority to freeze prices and wages. He has refused to use this authority.

Yesterday, Mr. Shultz appeared before the Joint Economic Committee, and despite rigorous examination by members of that committee, none of us were able to ascertain what the administration's program is, if there is any at all, in the fight against inflation.

I include a table of price increases during the 1960-68 Democratic administrations and the 1968-70 Nixon administration:

PRICE INCREASES DURING THE 1960-68 DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATIONS AND THE 1968-70 NIXON ADMINISTRATION

[In percent]

Commodities	Average yearly increase	
	1960-68	1968-70
Consumer prices:		
All items.....	2.2	5.8
Food.....	2.2	5.5
Housing.....	1.9	7.1
Transportation.....	1.9	4.6
Public transportation.....	3.7	11.4
Medical care services.....	5.4	7.9
Services.....	3.4	7.8
GNP deflator.....	2.3	5.2
Wholesale prices:		
All items.....	1.0	3.9
Farm products, processed foods, and feeds.....	1.1	4.6
Farm products.....	.7	4.2
Processed foods.....	1.8	4.8
Industrial commodities.....	1.0	3.6

THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE DRIVE MAKES A LOT OF SENSE

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it has not been many months since allied forces jabbed into Cambodia to destroy Communist supply depots. The venture was highly successful, and it also seriously disrupted Communist plans for further aggression in South Vietnam. One of the most important byproducts was the closing of Cambodia's ports to the Communists. The allied operation showed that the principal supply lines for Communist forces were through the port of Sihanoukville rather than down the Ho Chi Minh Trail. The critics of the allied operation insisted that the United States was getting more deeply involved in war in Southeast Asia but this has not been demonstrated by fact. U.S. forces were out of Cambodia on schedule. The new Government of Cambodia which replaced the Communist-oriented government of Sihanouk is holding its own against efforts for a Communist takeover. These efforts would long ago have been successful without allied destruction of Communist bases and supply depots in that country and without help which has been forthcoming from South Vietnam.

Nevertheless, the Communist forces continue to harass Southeast Asia. They hold much of the territory of Laos. They are jabbing at Cambodia's capital and they are in strength in parts of Cambodia.

The only effective supply line for Communist forces in these countries and support for Communist aggression in South Vietnam now is over the Ho Chi Minh Trail. A very substantial new buildup of North Vietnamese men and supplies has been observed and this must be assumed to be a prelude to further aggression. Consequently, a new offensive has now been launched by South Vietnam forces to sever the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

The military strength of the South Vietnamese has continued to develop in a very satisfactory way. It is now possible by using this strength to cut off Communist forces and materials close to the source, to place greater pressure on North Vietnam, and hopefully to convince that nation's government of the futility of continuing to seek the military

conquest of neighbor countries. The new drive by South Vietnam forces can provide additional protection for the northernmost parts of South Vietnam which now are the areas most vulnerable to enemy drives. It can give a further respite to the Governments of Laos and Cambodia in their efforts to resist Communist takeover. Militarily, the plan makes a lot of sense.

Diplomatically, it adds muscle and prestige to the allied efforts for a negotiated peace. There has been a stirring here at home by those who advocate immediate withdrawal of American forces from Indochina and the usual predictions have been made of dire consequences for American objectives abroad. Even so, these have been more muted than in the past, possibly because of the fact that their predictions of catastrophe in previous instances have fallen far short.

American forces are providing support for the drive in Laos, but they are not participating in the action itself. We have made it clear that we want the nations of Indochina to have the right to select their own form of government rather than have communism imposed on them by force. Previous defeats suffered by the Communist forces have made serious inroads into their manpower strength and into their capability for supply. Nevertheless, they are tough and disciplined and it is obvious they still intend to carry on aggression. Cutting the principal remaining supply line will further handicap their efforts. It is significant that the South Vietnamese forces have sufficient strength and esprit d'corps to carry the war to the enemy. The operation will save American lives by further weakening the ability of the Communists to wage war. It will support the President's schedule for the withdrawal of American forces from southeast Asia.

While this takes place, we are continuing maximum efforts at the Paris talks in the attempt to resolve the conflict through a negotiated settlement. This fact the Communists ignore. We have shown that we want peace and we are continuing to withdraw our forces from southeast Asia. The Communist North Vietnamese answer is to continue to infiltrate troops, weapons, ammunitions, and military equipment in preparation for the launching of new attacks and to continue the harassment of their neighbors. It would seem very clear that the action of the South Vietnamese forces is one which should have wholehearted support from the American public and from their elected Representatives in the National Congress.

We are fighting a new kind of war in a strange and faraway part of the world. Instead of the military defeat of the enemy, we now seek to convince him of the futility of continued aggression by gradually wearing down his strength. More and more of the fighting is being done by the South Vietnamese. This means fewer casualties for Americans and a further demonstration to the world that the Vietnamese have the will and the ability to fight for their own freedom. What is being done has been demonstrated to be the best means of concluding the war successfully. There is no basis for criticism in or out of Congress.

TIME TO REMOVE RESTRICTIONS ON THE SALE OF .22 CALIBER AMMUNITION

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing a measure designed to remove the remaining restrictions on the sale of .22-caliber rimfire ammunition. These restrictions were imposed as a part of the 1968 gun control law. In this I am joined by 63 Members of the House whose names appear below. A similar bill passed the House in the 91st Congress but failed of passage in the Senate.

Subsequent to the passage of the 1968 gun control law, restrictions on sales of other rifle ammunition and shotgun ammunition have been eliminated by Act of Congress but the sale of .22-caliber ammunition still requires reporting and recordkeeping by dealers. There has been general dissatisfaction with all features of the present gun control law. Law-abiding citizens simply resent the type of regulation which it requires. Criminals ignore the law and this the general populace realizes. At the time the bill was approved by Congress, it was the lesser of the evils which had been proposed as antigun legislation. This, however, has not made it palatable to the public.

Possibly the most aggravating single feature of the present act is the restrictions on the sale of .22-caliber ammunition. It is part of the pattern of our outdoor heritage in America that marksmanship training should begin at home or in clubs under proper supervision. Through this type of training, restraint, and good sportsmanship in the proper use of weapons is best taught. This is important not only in later life but important as an adjunct to the military training many young men will receive. It is more than a little significant that today young lads can be drafted to fight at age 19 in Vietnam but they are unable to purchase a box of .22-caliber ammunition for lawful sport or practice in their home areas. It is also inescapably true that States and cities which have the most stringent antigun laws, including Washington, D.C., are continuing to experience a very serious crime problem. The passage of antigun laws and regulations produced no reduction in crime rates.

The .22-caliber weapons are among those most generally used by law-abiding sportsmen, and particularly younger people. It should be very clear that the removal of the restrictions on the sale of .22-caliber ammunition will be welcomed by law-abiding sportsmen and in particular by young people who are just being taught the pleasures that come with the proper use of firearms. This action also will be welcomed by businessmen who have been steadily harassed by the recordkeeping restrictions required by the present law.

Cosponsors of the bill are: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. ZION, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. FISHER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SLACK, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. HALEY, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. LATTI, Mr.

DORN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. RARICK, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BRAY, Mr. STEED, Mr. BARING, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. SCHMITZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. FISH, Mr. WATTS, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and Mr. RONCALO.

ADMIRAL RICKOVER ON EDUCATION

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, Adm. Hyman G. Rickover has had to concern himself with the quality of American education at every crucial step of the way in the development of a nuclear submarine fleet for the United States of America.

Far too frequently he has found that the Nation's schools have not enabled our young men to step into society with the confidence, knowledge, and expertise so vital to the defense of our country.

As he explains, it is partly due to our Nation's preoccupation with egalitarianism which is so intense that we have extended it into our educational efforts at the expense of high quality attainment.

In a series of articles for the New York Times he has suggested that the United States examine educational systems that stress the "ability to learn" rather than the "ability to pay" as the measure in educational advancement.

Admiral Rickover feels that the Nation must pay special heed to developing the skills of its most able citizens and to helping them achieve their highest level of accomplishment through a long period of special and general schooling.

I recommend these provocative articles for thoughtful consideration.

Our society depends on a science-based technology which must run smoothly and in harmony with nature.

Without attention to real excellence in our schools such a society cannot be sustained and disaster would be invited for future generations.

I include Admiral Rickover's articles at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 1, 1971]

EDUCATION: WHAT IS IT FOR?

(By Adm. H. G. Rickover)

WASHINGTON.—I have been a critic of American education for close on a quarter of a century—not by choice but because my assignment to build nuclear submarines required a staff of intelligent and well-educated men—both for the engineering job of designing and supervising construction and for naval operation of these ships. I found none ready-made. I had to set up schools to train them.

Though we pick candidates with utmost care among those ranking at the top in their respective schools, we find few whose good minds have received the benefits of an edu-

cation suitable to their capacities. In my terms, nearly all have been under achievers—chiefly because our educational system does not provide the intellectual challenge that would motivate them to develop their talents.

Because there was so much else to do of a more immediately pressing nature, we did not for the first 300 years of settlement get around to thinking out carefully how to utilize the experience of European education. Because the concept that all men are endowed with equal rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness is basic to American thinking, our principal endeavor has been to make certain that no child should, for lack of money, be denied the best schooling we had to offer.

By concentrating on equality we have—so I contend—been led down a dead-end road to a politicized educational system, in which quality becomes almost "undemocratic."

The impact of sputnik shocked us temporarily into giving attention to the educational needs of the minority of abler children. But of late, we are well on the way of pivoting our whole school system on the minority of the below average.

As I see it, our educational philosophy and practice suffer from two fundamental defects.

First, we rush in all directions, pouring out vast sums of tax money for new "research" and "experimentation" concerning one of the oldest Western activities—transmitting the knowledge and intellectual skills accumulated in the past to the young—without asking ourselves why exactly schools are needed and what exactly they must do that no one else can do.

Second, we fail to think through how we can combine our commitment to equal educational opportunity for all with the sad but indisputable fact that of all the species on earth, human beings are the most unequally endowed.

As I have suggested in numerous speeches—which unfortunately have had no effect—we would be well advised to examine the most successful European school systems where "ability to pay" has for some generations been wholly removed as a factor in educational advance, but where "ability to learn" is recognized as the single most important factor.

In this country very little research money has gone into possible remedies for these two defects—chiefly because they are not admitted by those who dominate educational officialdom. The principal reason, I think, being that for half a century educational thinking has been swamped by the social scientists.

The social sciences concern themselves chiefly with group behavior, group needs and are therefore singularly susceptible to doctrinaire egalitarianism. They tend to treat children—in the name of equality and democracy—as an undifferentiated mass. Kant's admirable dogma that no man should be made the instrument of another's purposes is daily violated throughout our schools.

We will not face up to the fact that, beyond the most elementary level, children simply vary so greatly in their capacity to absorb a given body of knowledge that keeping them in the same class shortchanges every ability group.

Starting with Dewey's "learning by doing" philosophy, there has been a desperate search for some activity that all children could be engaged in simultaneously. Some of the reports of the new "free" or "experimental" schools raise the question why they could not be replaced by a community playground with a few mothers recruited to provide toys, gadgets, and noon meals. Other reports depict his own "teaching machine."

And all this costly nonsense just so that children might not separate when their educational paths take them naturally into different directions. Does anyone readily believe that such comprehensive education will in adult life bind rich man, poor man, beggar

man, thief, doctor, lawyer, and Indian chief into a warm togetherness of shared educational experience?

In preliterate societies, children learn by doing what the adult community around them does—parents, relatives, neighbors give a hand, so do older children. Learning and play are intermingled. But as a society moves up the ladder of civilization, the competencies people need shift more and more from the physical and manual to the intellectual. New occupations arise, which require more intensive, more theoretical, more sequentially programmed education, which can be obtained through apprenticeship to the adult world alone. This is the need that formal schooling should supply. This is what schools are for.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1971]

EDUCATION: WHAT DO WE NEED?

"If we adult Americans are not intelligent enough to figure out a way to improve American education, we cannot hope that our children will be intelligent enough to keep our nation strong and prosperous and capable of living up to its task or leading the free world."—from "American Education—A National Failure."

(By Adm. H. G. Rickover)

WASHINGTON.—Rarely have the ideas dominating education anywhere been so wholly at odds with the needs of society than at this moment and in this country. Life in America depends on the smooth functioning of a complex science-based technology. The routine management of this technology is difficult enough. Far more difficult is the crucially important task of devising new ways to bring modern technology into harmony with nature.

This demands long-range prognostication of the effects of new techniques both on man himself and on the environment. Only intelligent people, with a broadly liberal education and special professional expertise are able to perform these functions, and only an intelligently planned and competently managed educational system will provide us with enough of them.

To discover children with the qualities of mind, will, and character for these categories of competence, and to educate them to this end in the manner most suited to their special talents is—or ought to be—the primary responsibility of our costly public school system—the costliest in the world and the least productive in quality education of any in the world.

True professionals must have high intelligence, strong motivation, and be willing to undergo a very long period of general and special schooling. We will discourage many if we continue to prolong their training period needlessly by keeping them cooped up for long years in comprehensive schools that waste roughly four of their best learning years. For semiprofessionals and skilled technicians—of whom we currently have far too few—the intellectual and vocational requirements are somewhat less stringent but still well above what our comprehensive schools provide, so that they too must bear the cost of the egalitarian dogmas of the progressive educationists.

Paradoxically, we don't even succeed with the least able as well as do the Europeans who have long since brought ALL their people to the level of literacy.

Without enough people having the competencies of professionals, semi-professionals and skilled technicians, the level of life, health, comfort and security would drop for everyone. There has never been a time when the great mass of society has been so dependent on the services of our ablest, most rigorously trained people; nor, conversely, a time when the highly intelligent could live so well without going through the time consuming and difficult learning process that turns them into scientists, engineers, doctors, etc. It is therefore suicidal for a modern

nation to neglect the special schooling needed to develop the capacities of its abler children.

Progressive education with its egalitarian ideology, its ineffective methods and diffuse goals—now in force for half a century—has dismally failed to develop the capacities most needed at present levels of civilization and technology. It is a national disgrace that mere literacy has been set as our "official" goal for the 1970's—a goal achieved generations ago, and with far less expenditure of money and learning time, in Europe and Japan.

The very terms in which the goal is couched—guaranteeing a "right to literacy"—reveals misconceptions pervading the educational establishment that constitute the greatest barriers to quality public education.

I mean the notion that "education" is a product that should be shared out equally by government, when obviously education is something everyone must strive to acquire by his own efforts, society being able to do no more than offer every child an equal chance to do so.

There is much evidence that not only Europe and Japan, but the Soviet Union as well, bring their children to higher levels of achievement in larger numbers and within a shorter time span than do we. Educational terminology hides the truth from us.

We must know how our children compare with children in countries at comparative stages of civilization. Yet every effort to make objective comparison tests is fought tooth and nail understandably, perhaps, since such tests would reflect adversely on our school system.

But can we doubt the ultimate outcome if we continue to follow ineffective educational methods and goals—in particular the delusion that in a democracy all children must move through school together at the pace set by the dead average—while countries such as the Soviet Union bring out the varied capabilities of their children? Disaster may not come in this generation, but do we not care what happens to the next?

And, Mr. Speaker, the American university has existed as an institution for passing on the wisdom of a society, for researching the complexities of our present world, both social and physical, and for providing a forum where opposing ideas may clash in an atmosphere of neutral protection.

Recently the university community has been affected so intensely by the divisions in our American society that it is itself in danger of losing that freedom which has been of importance to its intellectual mission.

It seems to me that it is necessary at this time to discuss the true nature of the universities and the purposes for which our Nation's youth attend them.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the thoughts of two university educators who have recently expressed their deep concern over the politicization of the universities and its effect on our national life.

With permission I include here in the RECORD a speech to the faculties of Alfred University by its president, Leland Miles explaining his stand against politicizing the universities and a letter to *Change* magazine by Prof. Bower Aly of the University of Oregon discussing the changing character of today's university student:

DYNAMIC NEUTRALITY: A STAND AGAINST
POLITICIZING THE UNIVERSITY
(By Leland Miles)

One of the most important events of Alfred's 1970-71 academic year will be the stand

which this faculty takes on the "Princeton Plan" problem.

I should like to speak concerning the implications of the Princeton Plan, because I interpret the Plan as a further step toward politicizing the university. I oppose this politicizing process, and I would like to explain why.

As I understand the university, it is a protective shield beneath which all points of view can be expressed and cherished. Unlike the church, its mission is not to propagandize, not to preach some particular gospel. Its mission is rather to tolerate—in John Stuart Mill's sense—every conceivable shade of opinion, and to subject each such opinion to rational analysis. In a social or political sense, this means that the university as an institution is neutral. But I deny that this neutrality is passive or sterile. On the contrary, I regard it as a dynamic neutrality for several reasons: First, the university's neutrality is dynamic because of the constant collision within it of rival ideas. Second, the university's neutrality is dynamic because each individual protected by the university can himself be dynamic—i.e., each student and professor may, under the protective shield of the university, vigorously advance his own idea in theory, and just as vigorously seek to implement that idea in the outer society. Third, the institution's neutrality is dynamic because the university teaches that knowledge and inculcates those skills by which the graduate may more accurately assess the political scene, and may more effectively improve his society. For example Alfred University has not, as a university, taken a position on American intervention in Latin American affairs. But it *does* teach the skills of political science to a student like Jerome Slater, who then goes on—after graduation—to write the definitive book on American intervention in the Dominican Republic.

My argument is that the University should resist politicizing, that it should adopt a posture of dynamic neutrality. This argument has important implications for the role of the University president. A president is of course a citizen, and has just as much right as any other citizen to speak out on public issues. The cardinal question is not whether he has this right, but whether he should exercise this right.

Generally speaking, it is my growing conviction that a president should not speak publicly on political and social issues, even when he carefully specifies that he is speaking as a private citizen. In point of fact, the president cannot in any practical sense speak as a private citizen, for the simple reason that the outside world won't let him. I could write a letter to a newspaper editor attacking President Nixon's Vietnam policy, and sign the letter "Leland Miles, 71 Pine Hill Drive, Alfred, New York." But everyone knows that the citizen residing at 71 Pine Hill Drive is also president of Alfred University. And everyone knows that the president, to a greater degree than any other single individual symbolizes and speaks for his institution. In short, the tenuous distinction between the president as citizen, and the president as president, breaks down in the face of indiscriminating public (and faculty) reaction. The president who speaks out on a specific public issue inevitably damages the intellectual neutrality of his institution as a corporate entity. Once a president has denounced Nixon or praised Agnew, he has irreversibly generated among his colleagues the uneasy feeling that the university does after all have an "official line."

Once this uneasiness has evolved into an atmosphere, the University has lost its sacred character as a shield under which all views are equally cherished. It is my considered judgment that when an Ivy League college president publicly attacks the American judicial system, or a particular court verdict, or the Federal government's political or military policies, he runs the risk of damaging

the academic freedom of his own faculty. He also runs the risk of damaging the public image of his university as an institution which objectively welcomes all viewpoints, including the viewpoint that the American presence in Vietnam is justified. If a president wishes to speak publicly on political and social issues, he should resign his presidency and promote himself to a professorship. In a society where his every word will be taken as the university's official view, the president cannot afford the luxury of a loose lip.

Let me hasten to qualify what I have just said by emphasizing that I *would* speak out on public issues in two special situations. First, I would speak out if I felt that any public issue or movement threatened the dynamic neutrality of my university. For example, I would not hesitate publicly to denounce hardhats who beat up student activists, or student radicals who burned down banks. In either case I would regard such fascistic action as the antithesis of the University spirit. In either case I would regard such action as a threat to the dynamic neutrality of the university. For if society at large tolerates the persecution of individuals for their ideas, then that persecution will ultimately reach the college professor himself.

Second, I would feel grudgingly obligated, as the representative of the University, to convey the University's sentiment on a public issue if a majority of all the constituencies (trustees, administration, faculty, and students) freely voted to place the University on record as opposing or supporting a particular political viewpoint. However, I hope that day will never come. Because when it comes, we will have established an orthodoxy which will leave no room for the unorthodox. We will have created an atmosphere in which those who decline to subscribe to the majority credo will feel pressured to move elsewhere. As Irving Kristol has said in a recent *New York Times Magazine* article, a majority faculty vote against the Vietnam War has one obvious expectation, namely, to "intimidate the minority into silence—through fear, shame, or embarrassment. The present demand that the university, by a majority vote, take a stand on such political issues, is nothing but an expression of McCarthyism from the Left."

When the day comes that we take majority votes on political issues, the university will no longer be a protective shield under which all ideas are freely exchanged on an equal footing. When that day comes, the university, as I have come to cherish it, will be dead.

It is obvious that I feel strongly about this matter. In act, I want to go on record today as stating that I will fight with all my strength and resources at my command, against any attempt by any student or faculty group to politicize this institution. To put the matter in a more positive vein, I will exert every effort to maintain the dynamic neutrality of Alfred University. My aim now and in the future is to keep this institution neutral for the simple reason that corporate neutrality is the absolute prerequisite to academic freedom. Only through such corporate neutrality is each of you guaranteed the unhampered right dynamically to advocate and to implement your own divergent views.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oreg., February 5, 1971.

The Editors, *CHANGE* MAGAZINE,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: With his characteristically perceptive intelligence, Dr. W. Todd Furniss has analyzed the current American state of mind concerning college and university professors (*Change*, November-December, 1970). Doubtless it would be unfair to expect prognosis as well as diagnosis in a single short statement. Yet the most deeply interested readers—i.e., the professors—would be glad

to have from Dr. Furniss not only a prognosis but a remedy. I hope that the editors of *Change* will open their pages to him again.

Meanwhile I venture my own thoughts concerning the ills of academe. I suggest that they derive largely from the answer credited to a number of university presidents to the question, "How many students do you have?" The somewhat biased answer, according to report, is "Oh, about one in ten." The ratio of students to non-students may be somewhat changed from time to time and from college to college; but many inhabitants of the colleges—both professors and enrollees, to use a neutral term—would concede that the term 'student' (meaning *one who studies*) is a misnomer for a great many young people on the campus.

To be sure, this condition is not new. The American college has always harbored a good many young men—and in recent times, young women—who were chiefly engaged in growing up or in "climbing fool's hill," as one sophisticated lady of my acquaintance once referred to adolescence, delayed or otherwise. The attitude of more than on father toward higher education must surely be that expressed by Finley Peter Dunne's hero, Mister Dooley, who on being asked by his interlocutor, "Would you send your boy to college," he replied, "Sure, and when a boy is of an age to go to college, I wouldn't have him around the house."

The difference between current and former times seems to be that in the so-called good old days the young women who came to college to find a sorority or a husband, and the young men who came to college to escape from father's business or to learn the ways of the undergraduate world—or as one young man once explained to me, just to be eligible to join the University Club in Kansas City—these young people did not much disturb the students, i.e. those who came to study. Nowadays, however, the non-student comes to campus with fire in his eyes and passion in his innards: he is going to move and shake the world or know the reason why. In consequence, he gets in the way of those who see clearly, as they suppose, their mission to learn agronomy, or medicine, or economics, or physics, or one of the other mysteries.

What can be done? Perhaps nothing at all—the fever may wear itself out. This outcome, however, would appear to be unlikely. In the Occident the universities have often been given over to other uses than the advancement of learning. Francois Villon, who might well be chosen as the patron saint of some of our young people today, was presumably not given to studious discourse. Many a young man at the University of Paris, I daresay, took the name of student to gain the benefits of clergy and to escape the obligations lying outside the precincts. Were not both Oxford and Cambridge once politicized, the one as Tory, the other as Whig?

A look at the past may give us patience but it does not offer a solution to the problems of millions of young Americans who demand higher schooling—not to say higher education. Suppose we adopt the California principle, as we seem more or less to be doing—of extended schooling for everybody who wants it. I suggest that in these circumstances, the proper rationale for establishing differing institutions is not to set them up for blacks, or whites, or men, or women, or young or old: the two types of institutions should be clearly defined to include in one of them the people who know who they are—or think they do—and where they want to go. The second type of institution should be reserved for the multitude of young Americans who are in search of themselves, who strive to find an identity.

I do not wish to be thought frivolous nor do I wish to suggest that one of these institutions is more important to the national life than the other. If the United States is to provide any kind of answer to the many

problems that perplex the nation and all mankind, American universities must continue to engage young people in the uninterrupted study of mathematics, logic, rhetoric, grammar, and—yes—poetry. For those young people who may require more time to become adult, or who need counseling, guidance, hope, understanding, perhaps a bit of quasi-psychiatry, some kind of institution—call it college if you like—may well be found to serve. Meanwhile the best entrance examination for the two types of colleges will include the question, "Do you know who you are?"

BOWER ALY.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives met yesterday and organized. Committee rules were adopted. Subcommittees have been appointed. Distribution of the work of the committee has been arranged. We are prepared to move shortly to begin hearings on the new budget.

We plan to commence our hearings with an open hearing on the overall budget for the fiscal year 1972 with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Chairman of the Council on Economic Advisers.

As chairman of the committee, I have moved to strengthen the organizational alignment of several subcommittees and I have also made several new assignments of subcommittee chairmen.

The distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), the ranking Democrat on the committee, will head a newly designated Subcommittee on Agriculture and Environmental and Consumer Protection.

The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) will move from his chairmanship of the Independent Offices—HUD Subcommittee to chair the Public Works Subcommittee.

I have appointed the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) to chair the newly designated Subcommittee on HUD-Space-Science.

The distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) succeeds Mr. BOLAND as chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee.

The distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED) will head the newly designated Treasury, Post Office, and General Government Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a list of our subcommittees and the membership of each:

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection.—Whitten, Natcher, Hull, Shipley, Evans of Colo., Andrews of N. Dak., Michel, Scherle.

Defense.—Mahon, Sikes, Whitten, Andrews of Ala., Flood, Addabbo, McFall, Minshall, Rhodes, Davis, Wyman.

District of Columbia.—Natcher, Gialmo, Pryor, Obey, Stokes, McKay, Davis, Scherle, McEwen, Myers.

Foreign Operations.—Passman, Rooney, Long, Roybal, Hathaway, Galifianakis, Shriver, Reid, Riegle, McEwen.

HUD-Space-Science.—Boland, Evins of Tenn., Shipley, Gialmo, Pryor, Roush, Jonas, Talcott, McDade, Clawson.

Interior.—Hansen, Flynt, Obey, Yates, Galifianakis, McDade, Wyatt, Clawson.

Labor-Health, Education and Welfare.—Flood, Natcher, Smith, Hull, Casey, Patten, Michel, Shriver, Reid, Conte.

Legislative.—Andrews of Ala., Casey, Evans of Colo., Hathaway, Roush, Bow, Cederberg, Rhodes, Wyatt.

Military Construction.—Sikes, Patten, Long, Hansen, McKay, Cederberg, Jonas, Talcott.

Public Works.—Evins of Tenn., Boland, Whitten, Andrews of Ala., Slack, Rhodes, Davis, Robison.

State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary.—Rooney, Sikes, Slack, Smith, Flynt, Bow, Cederberg, Andrews of N. Dak.

Transportation.—McFall, Boland, Yates, Steed, Conte, Minshall, Edwards.

Treasury-Post Office-General Government.—Steed, Passman, Addabbo, Roybal, Stokes, Robison, Edwards, Riegle, Myers.

CONTINUED OPERATION OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITALS AND OUTPATIENT CLINICS

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

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ) hoped to be able to present this address to the House this afternoon, but he was unable to attend. He has asked me to address the House as follows:

Mr. Speaker, there has been a move within the executive branch of the Government to close the eight remaining Public Health Service Hospitals and the 30 outpatient clinics. Today, I am introducing a concurrent resolution with 24 cosponsors expressing it to be the sense of the Congress that these hospitals and clinics not only remain open and funds be made available for the continued operation of these hospitals and clinics, but that additional funds be made available for the modernizing, upgrading and expanding of these existing facilities in order for the Public Health Service to provide optimum medical care and treatment to the eligible beneficiaries.

Seven other identical concurrent resolutions are being introduced simultaneously with my resolution. These seven identical resolutions are each being introduced by a Member with a Public Health Service Hospital located in his city. As of today, there are 181 sponsors of these eight concurrent resolutions. We expect to be able to add more signatures to these resolutions.

AND NOW FROM THE PEOPLE WHO BROUGHT YOU CAMBODIA

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, almost a year ago after the Cambodian invasion, the United States is again faced with a similar scenario—only this time the site is Laos. This time it is Laos that is being billed as the critical test of American policy. It may seem different because the

President says he is conforming with the Cooper-Church amendment by sending no ground troops into Laos. Yet he is not conforming with the true meaning and the spirit of the amendment as intended by the Congress. Americans are being killed and wounded as they take part in air operations over Laos.

Also the arguments in favor of this most recent incursion remain painfully familiar—"Let us widen the war so that we can end it sooner." It is in this statement that we have the paradox of American policy in Vietnam.

America is justifying her new moves by reference to the old policy of Vietnamization. From most accounts, this policy does not seem to be succeeding in Vietnam, and yet we continue to justify our actions in its name. Indeed, we undertake new operations in an attempt to make it successful.

How can the South Vietnamese army be successful in Laos or in Cambodia when these same troops have been unable to defend their homeland without American help? In addition, why do we continue even to think in terms of military solutions—solutions which never prove as decisive as the administration would have us believe at their outset. The rationale behind the invasion has been the buying of time. We have been hearing that for years now. Why are we buying time when we should be looking toward a more permanent solution to this entire conflict? If supply routes are closed during the operation, there can be new supply routes in the space of several months.

In a speech I presented in July of last year, I noted that the Communists controlled more of Cambodia than they had prior to the invasion. I am afraid this scenario may be repeated in Laos too, despite administration assurances to the contrary.

We have justified our incursions into these neighboring territories by stating that they are required to protect the remaining American troops in Vietnam. I believe that these maneuvers serve merely to extend the stay of American troops in Vietnam. All our troops should be withdrawn within the next year, and we must begin thinking in terms of a permanent political solution to the entire Southeast Asian conflict.

The American people have grown tired of the war and have grown tired and skeptical of the assurances that an end is in sight—when every few months bring an expansion. They are asking, and rightly so, will the war stop in the Laotian panhandle or will it continue to expand? I ask the same question.

Each new incursion is billed as an attempt to bring about an honorable withdrawal, but the fact of the matter is that in a conflict that has lasted 6 years, that has seen tens of thousands of American men killed in action, that has seen an entire country disrupted—there can be no such thing as an honorable withdrawal. We passed that stage long ago.

In the process we have divided our own Nation, sowed the seeds of mistrust and discontent because of false promises, and we have siphoned off valuable resources that could have been used to build and improve lives here and abroad rather than to destroy them.

Today, with many of my colleagues in

the House and Senate, I have taken several steps which I feel will speed American disengagement and aid in the achievement of a settlement: I have co-sponsored a bill prohibiting any further American action in Laos by any type of force. Last week, I took similar action on Cambodia.

Finally, I have called for an end to offensive operations and the withdrawal of all American troops from Vietnam by the end of this year. If the war is ever to be brought to an end, if our prisoners of war are ever to be released, Congress must take the initiative by establishing definite guidelines for American disengagement.

Seventy-three percent of our citizens have called for an end to American involvement by the end of this year. It is Congress' duty to exercise its constitutional authority to reflect these wishes and to end the war in Vietnam.

AN ALTERNATE APPROACH IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, Congressman WILLIAM ANDERSON and at least three of his colleagues will be introducing in the House today legislation similar in spirit and intent to a resolution which Congressman JAMES SYMINGTON and I introduced in the last Congress.

The resolution authored by Congressman SYMINGTON and I would have limited the expenditure of funds in South Vietnam to only that amount required to finance the release and return of American prisoners of war, to provide assistance to South Vietnam in amounts and for purposes specifically authorized by the Congress, and to carry out the safe and orderly withdrawal of American military personnel from South Vietnam. A deadline of April 30, 1971, was established for combat troops, and October 31, 1971, for all support and advisory personnel, unless the Congress by joint resolution approved a finding by the President that an additional stated period of time was required.

When we introduced our resolution last year, we did so in the belief that it is important to restore public confidence in the Congress as an institution capable of asserting its appropriate responsibility in the conduct of international affairs and in the belief that we could do so without irrevocably tying the hands of the President in the process. We believe our resolution reflected that.

The legislation introduced by Congressman ANDERSON and others today makes it a finding of Congress "that the President and the Congress share the responsibility for establishing, defining the authority for and concluding foreign military commitments."

First, it prohibits the expenditures of funds to maintain a troop level of more than 284,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam after May 1, 1971; and

Second, it limits the expenditure of funds in or over Vietnam to that amount required to bring about the orderly termination of military operations and the safe and systematic withdrawal of re-

maining American troops by December 31, 1971; to insure the release of prisoners of war; to arrange asylum or other means to assure the safety of South Vietnamese who might be physically endangered by withdrawal of American forces; and to provide assistance to the Republic of Vietnam consistent with the above stated objectives.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation which Congressman SYMINGTON and I are introducing in this House today varies from the Anderson measure in two respects:

First, while our bill would require the withdrawal of American Armed Forces from Vietnam by December 31, 1971, it would do so "unless the Congress by joint resolution approves a finding by the President that an additional stated period of time is required"; and

Second, while our bill would also limit the expenditure of funds to the Republic of Vietnam consistent with certain stated objectives, such assistance would have to be "in amounts and for purposes specifically authorized by the Congress."

Mr. Speaker, we believe both of these additions to Congressman ANDERSON's proposal emphasize the shared responsibility between the Congress and the President in the area of foreign military commitments.

The first change makes it clear that the Congress does not intend to tie the hands of the President, but also retains for the Congress the authority to determine the extent of our commitment in Vietnam.

The second change makes it clear that it is the Congress which has the authority and the responsibility to specify the amount and purposes for which funds can be expended in connection with our efforts to withdraw from Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, as I said when Congressman SYMINGTON and I introduced our resolution last year, for too long the office of the Presidency has had to bear the full burden of the conduct of this war. That is not good for the Congress. It is not good for the Presidency, and it is most certainly not good for the country.

Our legislation is an attempt to again establish the principle of cooperative responsibility between two branches of Government, and it is hoped in the process, suggest a way to obtain release of American prisoners of war and end our involvement in a war in Indochina which has been going on for too long.

A BILL TO AMEND THE OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1968

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

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide grants to States for the establishment, equipping, and operation of emergency communications centers to make the national emergency telephone number "911" available throughout the United States. This bill

	In service	Scheduled	Population served (in thousands)		In service	Scheduled	Population served (in thousands)
DELAWARE				NEW HAMPSHIRE			
Kent County		October 1971	66.0	NEW JERSEY			
New Castle County		March 1973	308.0	Atlantic City	July 1970		58.0
Sussex County		September 1972	75.0	NEW MEXICO			
FLORIDA				Albuquerque		November 1971	300.0
Jacksonville		(¹)		Las Cruces	August 1970		40.0
GEORGIA				Los Alamos	February 1970		16.0
Albany	July 1970		89.0	Roswell	November 1969		40.0
Macon	May 1970		130.0	NEW YORK			
Thomasville		May 1971	35.0	Batavia	March 1970		20.0
IDAHO				Buffalo	July 1969		530.0
ILLINOIS				Nassau		April 1971	1,413.0
Evanston	March 1970		88.0	New York	July 1968		8,000.0
Mount Vernon	May 1970		16.0	Olean	July 1970		20.0
Oak Park		February 1971	62.0	Riverhead	June 1969		20.0
Salem	December 1969		6.0	Southold	do		20.0
Vandalia	September 1970		6.0	Suffolk County	do		1,000.0
INDIANA				NORTH CAROLINA			
Huntington	March 1968		16.0	Newland	August 1969		10.0
IOWA				NORTH DAKOTA			
Burlington	October 1970		35.0	OHIO			
Clinton	November 1970		35.0	Sandusky	January 1969		50.0
KANSAS				Toledo		March 1971	400.0
Lawrence	November 1969		34.0	OKLAHOMA			
KENTUCKY				OREGON			
Frankfort	March 1970		21.0	PENNSYLVANIA			
Mayfield	April 1970		11.0	Bradford	November 1970		27.0
Paducah		August 1971	35.0	Clearfield		December 1970	22.0
Paris	June 1970		17.0	Du Bois	September 1968		18.0
LOUISIANA				Milton	February 1970		10.0
Alexandria	April 1970		58.0	Norwood	December 1969		30.0
Baton Rouge	September 1970		149.0	Tarentum	January 1970		54.0
Rayne		July 1971	10.0	RHODE ISLAND			
Tallulah	November 1970		10.0	SOUTH CAROLINA			
MAINE				SOUTH DAKOTA			
Boothbay		April 1972	.6	TENNESSEE			
Boothbay Harbor		do	1.9	Brownsville	August 1969		6.0
Camden	October 1969		3.5	Cleveland	June 1970		20.0
Southport		April 1972	.7	Coveington		June 1973	6.0
MARYLAND				Dayton	June 1969		5.0
MASSACHUSETTS				Dickson	August 1970		8.0
Amherst	November 1970		10.3	Gallatin	June 1969		14.0
Dalton		June 1971	7.4	Harriman-Rockwood	do		20.0
Tremingham		August 1971	52.3	Humboldt	July 1969		9.0
Haverhill (Haverhill-Groveland)		May 1971	42.0	Lebanon	October 1969		12.0
Mattapoisett		March 1971	1.8	Maryville	November 1968		21.0
Quincy		October 1971	87.2	Milan		January 1971	5.0
Randolf		June 1971	21.7	Morristown		July 1971	23.0
Southbridge		October 1971	19.4	Murfreesboro	January 1969		34.0
Southwick		February 1971	1.2	Nashville		April 1972	335.0
Springfield	April 1969		174.5	Newport		July 1971	7.0
Westfield	February 1970		26.3	Oakridge		May 1971	30.0
Worburn		June 1971	35.1	Philadelphia	November 1970		5.0
Worcester	August 1970		186.6	Moss Point		December 1970	7.0
MICHIGAN				Ripley		December 1971	7.0
Monroe	October 1970		8.0	Springfield		September 1973	14.0
Oak Park	do		30.0	TEXAS			
MINNESOTA				UTAH			
MISSISSIPPI				Bountiful	July 1969		30.0
Belzon		December 1971	4.0	VERMONT			
Canton	August 1970		11.0	VIRGINIA			
Cleveland		May 1971	23.0	Nelson County	March 1970		10.0
Crystal Springs	October 1970		5.0	WASHINGTON			
Greenville		January 1971	55.0	Puyallup	December 1969		14.4
Greenwood		December 1970	24.0	Renton		April 1971	26.0
Hattiesburg	November 1970		39.0	Mercer Island	do		17.7
Indianola	January 1970		10.0	Seattle	do		524.0
Jackson	April 1969		165.0	WEST VIRGINIA			
Louisville	September 1970		5.0	Summersville	January 1970		4.0
Magee	October 1970		5.0	WISCONSIN			
McComb	July 1970		17.0	Eau Claire		September 1971	38.0
Mindenhall	October 1970		3.0	Whitewater	October 1969		20.0
Moss Point		December 1970	7.0	WYOMING			
Philadelphia	November 1970		5.0	Basin	July 1970		3.5
Vicksburg	December 1929		24.0	Evanston	April 1970		4.9
MISSOURI				Gillette	August 1969		4.5
MONTANA				Green River	January 1970		3.5
Conrad		January 1971	7.2	Jackson	June 1970		1.4
Glendive	March 1970		11.2	Riverton	February 1970		6.8
NEBRASKA				Rock Springs	January 1970		10.3
Alliance		September 1971	8.5	Thermopolis	November 1969		3.9
Chadron		August 1971	6.2	Wheatland	January 1970		2.3
Grand Island	May 1970		40.0	NON-BELL			
Kimball		February 1971	5.8	Haleyville, Ala			
Norfolk		January 1971	16.0	Bloomington, Ill			
North Platte	September 1970		20.0	Hebron, Nebr			
Ogallala		May 1971	5.7	Lincoln			
Omaha	April 1970		475.0	Butler, Pa			
Sidney	August 1969		8.0	New Bethlehem, Pa			
NEVADA							
Humboldt County and city of Winnemucca		July 1971	5.0				

¹ No date specified.² Estimated.

POLITICAL APPOINTMENTS IN VIOLATION OF MINE SAFETY LAWS

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 6 weeks ago today the lives of 38 coal miners were snuffed out in the Hurricane Creek mine in Hyden, Ky., where repeated violations of the Federal mine safety law had been cited by Federal inspectors. If the mine safety law passed by Congress in 1969 had been enforced, this tragedy need not have occurred.

At the time of the Hyden disaster, President Nixon indicated he wanted to fly to Kentucky to console the widows and survivors, but the weather was too bad and he canceled the trip. Instead of consoling widows, the President should insist that the mine safety law be enforced, and thereby make it unnecessary to have so many coal miners' widows in the future.

But what has happened? After the Hyden tragedy, an Iowa fund-raiser and lobbyist was appointed as chief enforcer of the coal mine safety act in the Bureau of Mines. And now today comes even more shocking news in the appointment of the Advisory Committee on Coal Mine Safety Research, which is required by section 102 of the 1969 act.

This panel makes recommendations on grants and contracts to be made in coal mine safety research. Now listen to this. Congress specifically provided in the act that the members be "knowledgeable in the field of coal mine safety research."

Listen to some of the appointees of this panel. Mrs. Jo Anne Gray of Denver, Colo., a former stewardess and supervisor of stewardess training for Continental Airlines. Is she according to the law "knowledgeable?" Well, that does not matter, because Mrs. Gray is the Republican national committeewoman from Colorado.

Then there is Mrs. Sara Abernathy, who is on the board of regents of Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts, but has nothing to qualify her to be "knowledgeable in the field of coal mine safety" as the law requires. But she has Capitol Hill Republican friends who have taken credit for her appointment.

Then there is Robert F. Ziems, an attorney from Arlington, Va. Is he knowledgeable, as the law requires? Well, he just finished a 2-year term as the Republican chairman in Fairfax, Va.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon, who urges us to declare war on crime and lawlessness, is turning his back on violations of the mine safety law. How long is the President going to tolerate the appointment of party hacks and political muscle men to subvert the safety of the men who work in the mines?

How long is the President going to turn his back on the human sacrifices being made by coal miners every day the law is not being enforced?

This callous catering to politicians in order to pay off political debts must stop.

The President must insist on the appointment of qualified and fearless men and women to carry out the law.

The President must insist on enforce-

ment of the law, or the slaughter will increase in the coal mines.

The following is a list of appointees to the Advisory Committee on Coal Mine Safety Research:

APPOINTEE LIST

Walter Hibbard, Jr., Chairman (former Director of the Bureau of Mines).

Earl Hayes, Executive Secretary (Chief Scientist of the Bureau).

Mrs. Sara Abernathy, Board of Regents (Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts, Altus, Oklahoma).

H. Lynne Barber, Retired Mining Executive, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Dr. William D. Carlson, President, University of Wyoming.

Dr. Ben Chastain, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Samford University, Birmingham, Alabama.

Lewis Evans, UMW.

Robert E. Ferguson, National Bureau of Standards.

S. David Freeman, Office of Science and Technology.

Dr. John M. Ide, National Science Foundation.

Mrs. Jo Anne Gray (former director Stewardess Training, Continental Airlines).

Frank L. Craft, President, Craft Enterprises (Former rep. of Cargill, Inc. (which controls Belle Isle Salt Mines in Louisiana where 20 miners died in '67)).

Cloyd D. McDowell, President, Harlan County Coal Operators Association, Harlan, Ky.

Frederick J. Robbins, Bliss & Laughlin Industry, Illinois.

Harold T. Suter, V-P Consolidation Coal Company.

Ted Q. Wilson, Attorney, Tennessee.

Robert F. Ziems, Attorney, Arlington, Va.

EXPANSIONS OF THE WAR

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, while talking about winding down the war in Southeast Asia, the administration has acted to wind it up. "Watch what we do, not what we say" were the words of a prominent member of the President's cabinet. I agree that the actions of the administration are revealing—even if by a news blackout.

The latest actions of the administration in Southeast Asia—organizing and supporting a full-scale invasion of Laos—demonstrate again the necessity for Congress to end the war. It is clear that the administration does not have a plan to do so. Inherent in the so-called policy of Vietnamization is the extension of the war beyond the perimeters of South Vietnam. Thus, the battle was pushed into Cambodia. Now, it is being pushed into Laos—engulfing both countries in further death and destruction.

Last May, without consultation with or approval by Congress, the President ordered United States combat forces into Cambodia. After U.S. troops were withdrawn from Cambodia and after prolonged debate the Congress adopted the modified Cooper-Church amendment to the Special Foreign Assistance Authorization Act—Public Law 91-652—which bars the use of funds to "finance the introduction of United States ground combat troops into Cambodia, or to provide United States advisers to or for Cambodian military forces in Cambodia."

In 1969, a provision had been adopted in the Department of Defense appropriations bill—Public Law 91-171—barring the use of funds "to finance the introduction of American ground combat troops into Laos or Thailand." Like language has been embodied in ensuing authorization and appropriations bills for the Defense Department, and in this year's appropriation bill—Public Law 91-668—the use of funds is prohibited "to support Vietnamese or other free world forces in actions designed to provide military support and assistance to the Government of Cambodia or Laos." The loophole lies in the additional words providing that this language should not be construed to "prohibit support of actions required to insure the safe and orderly withdrawal or disengagement of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia or to aid in the release of Americans held as prisoners of war."

Since the use of U.S. airpower in Cambodia and Laos was not prohibited, the administration has not hesitated to use U.S. airpower in Cambodia and Laos in support of Cambodian and South Vietnamese forces. Obviously the administration will take advantage of any loophole in the law.

If Congress is to exercise its powers to end the war, then at a minimum the loopholes must be closed. Therefore, I have joined with a group of my colleagues in the introduction of an amendment to the Special Foreign Assistance Authorization Act—Public Law 91-652—which bars U.S. involvement, whether direct or indirect, in military operations concerning Laos.

This bill is a correlative to House Resolution 48, which I introduced at the beginning of the new Congress for myself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. ROSENTHAL. In the 91st Congress it was House Resolution 899. It bars the use of U.S. forces in combat in or over Laos without affirmative action first being taken by the Congress to sanction such use.

As long as the administration refuses seriously to seek a negotiated peace and insists upon pursuing a military solution, there will be no peace. Congress must not continue to stand by, but must exercise its responsibilities.

I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 50, in which 26 of my colleagues have joined to produce an immediate halt to all offensive actions by U.S. forces and complete withdrawal by June 30, 1971. Since I support any legislation aimed at ending this nightmare of war afflicting our Nation and the peoples of Southeast Asia, I have joined in sponsoring the Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971—the so-called McGovern-Hatfield amendment to end the war.

But more important than the introduction of bills and resolutions is the arousal of the public to demand the end of the war. According to the latest Gallup poll, 73 percent of the American people demand a complete withdrawal by the end of this year, at the latest. This statistical reflection of the prevailing attitude of America must be translated into vocal, insistent pressure exerted upon the Congress and the administration to end the war.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL SECURITY COMMISSION

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the past year saw a significant—and long overdue—reassertion of congressional oversight regarding our foreign and military policy. Despite this resurgence of congressional responsibility, we are now witnessing the invasion of another nation in Southeast Asia—Laos. This follows by only months the displacement of the war into Cambodia. Clearly, the role of Congress has not yet been sufficiently asserted.

There are several means to accomplish this assertion. One is the passage of legislation. To that end, I have introduced, with 26 cosponsors, House Concurrent Resolution 50, which calls for an immediate halt to all offensive actions in Southeast Asia by United States forces and for complete withdrawal by June 30, 1971. In addition, I have cosponsored H.R. 1738, which amends the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, Public Law 91-652, to bar the use of United States funds and forces in or over Cambodia. And I have introduced House Resolution 48, barring the use of American forces in or over Laos.

Other legislation, aimed similarly at bringing a halt to, or at least limiting, United States involvement in the misguided war in Southeast Asia, has been and will be introduced. I intend to sponsor all such legislation: for example, a bill barring the use of United States funds and forces in and over Laos; and the Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971—the so-called revised McGovern-Hatfield amendment to end the war.

Affirmative action must be taken on this legislation, since it is obvious that this war will not end until the Congress acts to end it by cutting off all funds and authority for United States involvement, whether direct or indirect.

Another means to accomplish the assertion of congressional authority is to continue speaking out loudly and clearly, as some of us have done, and as more are beginning to do.

Still another means to accomplish the assertion of congressional authority—not just regarding the war, but as to our entire foreign and military policy structures—is to create a body which can assess these structures and the institutions which create them, influence them, and implement them. To this end, I have introduced H.R. 3578, in which 24 of my colleagues have joined as cosponsors, to establish a Temporary National Security Commission.

The genesis of this bill lies in a congressional conference which two Senators and eight Members of the House, including myself, convened in March of 1969 to study the military budget and national priorities. That conference set the stage for the subsequent debates on the military budget which have occupied both Houses of Congress in subsequent years. Almost 2 years have passed, but the need for a commission which we previously proposed remains.

The establishment of the Temporary National Security Commission will enable Congress to assert its proper role in the determination of foreign and military policy, which have joined so tragically to produce a war in which this Nation has been involved for 10 years now. The Commission would examine the institutional structure of the military-industrial complex, the relation between military policy and the economic interests which depend on the Military Establishment, and the economic and social impact of the military-industrial complex.

The Commission would consist of 17 members: five Senators, five Representatives, six private citizens appointed by these 10 elected officials, and a representative of the Comptroller General. The congressional membership would bring to bear the exercise of the Congress responsibilities. The private citizens would be persons of the highest professional and technical capacity, some scientifically trained in matters relevant to defense, and others who are experienced in international affairs. The representative of the Comptroller General would provide needed budgetary and fiscal knowledge.

The Temporary National Security Commission would make a broad-scale study of defense and security areas. While the bill we have introduced to create the Commission intentionally does not stipulate exactly which agencies and departments are to be encompassed within this study, so as to avoid undue rigidity, it does specifically require a study of those agencies and departments established by the National Security Act of 1947. These include the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency. Likewise, all components of the National Military Establishment provided in the 1947 act would be included.

The Commission would study the foregoing agencies and their activities with a view to determining:

First, what are the current national policies and objectives in the area of defense and security and, in view of such policies and objectives, whether the national interest is being properly served by the existing agencies of Government;

Second, whether existing and projected weapons systems, military installations, management procedures, and fiscal performance of such agencies conform to national policy in the area of defense;

Third, to what extent the Defense Establishment as an institution affects individual judgment in the making and execution of policy; and

Fourth, whether the relationships between agencies of the Federal Government responsible for procurement and suppliers of goods and services require modification.

The Commission would be required to make recommendations—including suggested legislation—to the Congress, particularly with regard to the improvement of policy for national security and the effectiveness of procedures and organizations in those agencies of the Federal Government which function in the area of defense.

In brief, no aspect of defense or national security would be overlooked.

The concept of such a temporary Commission of investigation derives from the Temporary National Economic Committee, established in 1938 and chaired by Senator O'Mahoney, which conducted a study into the concentration of economic power. The findings of that committee, which existed until 1941, gave impetus to the antitrust prosecutions of that period. They generated an atmosphere which achieved basic reforms—the same atmosphere which we intend that the Temporary National Security Commission would generate.

Anyone who has watched the agonized contortions of successive administrations in justifying the war in Southeast Asia cannot help but acknowledge that a major reassessment of our foreign and military policies is in order. In some regards, it is now impossible to even determine whether—to use a colloquialism, the dog wags the tail, or the tail the dog. Does our foreign policy determine our military actions and systems, or does our Military Establishment determine our foreign policy? Do we fight a war in South Vietnam, and then Cambodia, and now Laos, because our foreign policy—misguided in any case—so dictates, or do we fight because the Pentagon has so acted, and then left the foreign policy justifications to be constructed as rationalizing afterthought?

Congress must answer these questions. The Temporary National Commission can help us to do so.

The Members who have joined me in sponsoring H.R. 3578, to create the Temporary National Security Commission, are:

Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DOW, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WOLFF.

DRAFTEES SHOULD NOT BE SENT TO VIETNAM WITHOUT THEIR CONSENT

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as I did in the last Congress, I have introduced in the 92d Congress my bill to bar the sending of nonconsenting draftees to Vietnam and the waters adjacent thereto. The bill is H.R. 1564. It is particularly timely for the Congress to act affirmatively on this legislation since the question of extending the Selective Service Act is again before Congress. It is particularly incumbent upon the Congress to face this issue because the sending of unwilling draftees year after year to die in an undeclared war in Southeast Asia is grievously wrong.

The tragic figures of deaths and casualties starkly reveal what an inequitable burden draftees have borne in this

war. While draftees comprise only about 10 percent of the men serving in the Army, more than 30 percent of the men serving in Vietnam are draftees. Draftees account for 32 percent of the American deaths which have been sustained in Vietnam. And looking only at Army personnel, draftees account for 55 percent of the battle deaths among Army enlisted men.

A recent article which appeared in the August 15, 1970, issue of the National Journal, entitled "Defense Report—Draftees Shoulder Burden of Fighting and Dying in Vietnam," showed that an Army draftee's chances of going to Vietnam have fluctuated between 50 and 80 percent. And his chances of being killed or wounded are about 54 percent greater than that of his Regular Army counterpart.

It is insupportable that draftees—conscripted without reference to their feelings regarding the tragic Vietnam war—are the fodder which feeds the death machine in Asia. If a draftee does not consent to serve in Vietnam, he should not be sent there; he should not be called upon to risk his life for the repressive Thieu-Ky regime in what is essentially a civil war. If Congress is unwilling to end the war, as I believe it should by ceasing to appropriate the money, the least Congress can do is to end sending young men to fight in it without their consent.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR ESSENTIAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, for myself and 25 of my colleagues, H.R. 4001 and H.R. 4160, legislation to provide supplemental funding for fiscal year 1971 for five essential programs—urban renewal, model cities, rent supplements, the section 236 rental assistance program, and the section 235 homeownership assistance program.

I initially introduced this legislation as H.R. 1115 on the opening day of this Congress, in order to bring the appropriation levels—that is, the funds actually available for use or the authorizations actually available for contracting—up to their fully authorized levels.

Thus, for urban renewal, this bill appropriates an additional \$1,087,500,000—the amount representing the gap between what has been authorized by the Congress and what has in fact been appropriated by Congress. For model cities, the bill provides an additional \$836,600,000; for rent supplements, \$113,000,000; for section 235, an additional \$25 million; and for section 236, an additional \$25 million.

Each of these programs is integral to the commitment to provide a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American. The tragedy has been—and continues to be—that, while the Congress engages in handsome rhetoric and passes carefully constructed, workable programs, it fails to provide

sufficient funds to make this rhetoric and these programs meaningful.

The name of the game is money. There is simply no way around that. Without that money, the cities are stymied. They do not have the funds to produce the housing which is needed. And, as the growing housing crisis across the Nation demonstrates, without Federal funds, that housing just will not be built—at least, not housing within the financial reach of low- and moderate-income families.

Let me discuss this need just in terms of section 236, as an example. The section 236 program, enacted by passage of the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act, provides for assistance to lower income families for rental or cooperative housing, in the form of periodic payments to the mortgagee on behalf of the mortgagor. These payments serve to reduce interest costs on a market-rate project down to that which would have to be paid if the mortgage bore an interest rate of as little as 1 percent. The tenant pays no more than 25 percent of his income per month for rent.

This program is absolutely essential in New York City and New York State. It is the major Federal program relied upon by the State and city Mitchell-Lama programs. Yet, New York City alone needs approximately \$40 million of section 236 funds for fiscal year 1971. How much has it received? In fiscal year 1971, New York City's Housing and Development Administration has received, as of January 20 of this year, \$1,777,675. It may receive an additional \$321,656.

Even if it did, it would still only be receiving a little more than five percent of its actual needs.

Obviously, even the \$25 million appropriated by H.R. 1115, H.R. 4001 and H.R. 4160, with cosponsors, were provided by the Congress, New York City's needs would still far exceed the amount it would, in fact, receive. And so, too, would the needs of virtually every urban area. So, of course, we must constantly strive for greatly increased authorizations for the section 236 program, and for every other housing program. And once having succeeded, we must obtain full funding, so that the laws on the statute books have some reality in the worlds of inadequate and insufficient housing.

This year, we must obtain the additional funds—which are already authorized—for section 236, for section 235, for rent supplements, for urban renewal, and for model cities. Of course, that costs money. But, when the administration hails a trillion dollar gross national product, how can we accept any excuse for not providing the money so that the American people can live in decent housing, in decent environments, at costs they can afford? The question is, needless to say, rhetorical. No excuse is acceptable.

The following Members have joined me in cosponsoring the full funding housing supplemental appropriations bill:

Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, 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, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. O'NEIL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REID of New York, and Mr. WOLFF.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this week we are joining with over a million Americans of Lithuanian descent in commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day.

The Lithuanians are a peaceful people, ethnically related to neither Germans nor Russians. In 1251, 720 years ago this month, all the Lithuanian principalities were united into one kingdom. Thus they have a long tradition of self-determination. On February 16, 1918, the modern Republic of Lithuania was formed. This month marks the 53d anniversary of this event.

It is, however, a grim and tragic observance. The independent state of Lithuania was short lived. In 1939 Kremlin troops moved into Lithuania. By 1941 the Soviet Army had taken control, beginning an era of brutal occupation that continues today.

This tiny nation, held by force, is being denied its right to independence. The Lithuanian people, accustomed to freedom and self-determination, have never ceased in their efforts to rid their country of the Communist regime. The freedom of these brave people must remain a goal and duty of Congress.

Congress has annually memorialized the establishment of the modern Lithuanian Republic. It is proper that we do so, for despite their occupation by the Soviets, the Lithuanians maintain the belief and hope that they will regain their independence.

UKRAINIANS AN INDEPENDENT PEOPLE

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in 1918, the time when war and revolution spread across Europe, the Ukrainians fought for and won their independence from the Russian Empire. Within 2 years their country was overrun by the Red army and incorporated into the Soviet Union. As a result, today over 45 million Ukrainians are living under Kremlin domination.

These people, non-Russians, are victims of Soviet colonialism imposed by the force of the Red army. They are held in bondage, denied the blessings of liberty.

Since 1920 our Ukrainian friends have fervently desired to practice the ways of democracy. They have engaged in numerous struggles against their captors who have retaliated with weapons of starvation and execution. Despite the constraints of the Communist Party, the Ukrainians still live in the faith that their nation will be free again. Their

unfailing devotion to this goal stands as a banner to all believers in liberty.

Each year we have made a practice in the House of declaring our support for an independent Ukrainian state. It is a privilege for me to again join all those who today speak in favor of this principle.

Today, as we commemorate the 53d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, let us take time to renew our pledge to the principle of freedom and self-determination for all peoples.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has sent to all Members, officers, and designated employees of the House the forms for making the annual financial disclosure reports required by the rules of the House.

I call attention to this, as chairman of the committee, in the hope of expediting the filing of these reports. While the deadline for the filings is not until April 30, earlier filing will facilitate the processing work of the committee staff and alleviate an 11th-hour jam. The processing requires considerable time of the committee's small staff.

So I urge all who are required to file to get their reports to the committee as early as possible. Additional forms, if needed, plus any help needed, are available from the committee's office.

Instructions and certain definitions will be found on the reverse side of the forms.

I should like to urge also that Members and officers of the House who have not already done so, advise the committee as soon as possible of their designated principal assistants, as provided in House rule XLIV, so that disclosure forms may be sent to them. Such employees, as well as professional staff members of committees, are required to file.

TRIBUTE TO LATE HONORABLE RICHARD RUSSELL—ARTICLES BY SYLVAN MEYER

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Miami News, a great American newspaper, was fortunate nearly 2 years ago to find in Mr. Sylvan Meyer an able successor to the late William C. Baggs, one of the most brilliant and compassionate journalists it was ever my privilege to know.

As editor in Gainesville, Sylvan came to know the late senior Senator from Georgia, the distinguished Richard Russell, as well as any journalist could. In two articles which appeared in the January 22 and January 25, 1971, editions of the Miami News, the editor remembered the statesman.

So that colleagues might share in Mr. Meyer's observations of this great Georgian and American, I include both articles at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Miami News, Jan. 22, 1971]

NATION KNEW RUSSELL'S GREATNESS, AND ITS LIMITS

In the hot night of the summer of 1952, I walked through the trainload of Southerners churning toward Chicago on the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, riding the "Dick Russell" special to the Democratic National Convention.

The Senator was not to be seen. He retired early while his supporters reveled. They never thought he would win the Democratic Nomination for President. He would make a respectable showing and he would demonstrate to the rest of the party that not all Democrats went for that civil rights and racial equality business.

Of course, they didn't know Sen. Russell very well. Few people called him "Dick," for one thing. The presence and the dignity of the man suggested immediately that such familiarity would be out of place. They knew that he did not go along with the Dixiecrats, that he was not among the demagogues who used race politically and that he avoided talk of violence and hate. He had principles he believed in and they dictated to him a way things should be done; civil rights legislation he saw as unnecessary implementation of existing constitutional provisions. They didn't know he did not expect to win. They didn't know he was not anti-Negro in his personal views.

In Richard Russell's tradition of Southern patrician thought, the leading white establishment helped Negroes, joined with them politically against excesses of populism and other crudities common to the rambunctious when they seized power. In his opposition to civil rights legislation, Sen. Russell was never called, nor did he deserve to be called a racist.

Headed for Chicago, he was a man for whom the time was absolutely right, save for one issue and it became so dominant that the time frustrated his talent for the only job in the nation more powerful than the ones he held anyway. His ambition never led him to repudiate his section for national support, nor to wholly embrace its follies for its own.

The L&N train held every brand of Southerner there was, the liberals, the segregationists, the elite of establishment and the peckerwood politicians from the pine flat and hillcountry boondocks. Richard Russell had brought together every faction just because he was who he was. He personified judicious, thoughtful and progressive government, a government of compassion for all people but one whose processes must be studied minutely and carefully, never rudely jostled nor too swiftly carried past the lens of patient scrutiny by men who understood it.

Even those who wanted change then, now, understood that the country needed men like Richard Russell just to make sure that in changing the nation's attitudes no one changed its basic processes nor threatened its ability to protect every man's liberty.

Sen. Russell was the man in Chicago everyone thought would make a great President, but could never win a national election. So serious a man could not be taken seriously. If defeat bothered him he didn't show disappointment. Neither did he compromise before the enticing bait of instant national popularity.

It is hard to believe that he was younger than 55 at that time, a leader in his prime, a lifelong student and practitioner of government.

Now the trainride is long forgotten. The man Russell died as a giant of his country, bearing every honor except the Presidency. His integrity benefited the republic, perhaps even saved it from disaster, in times of military and moral peril. The country has need of men so widely recognized as perfectly honorable that their very presence, as was his on the Kennedy assassination investigation commission, carries assurance into every quarter that justice will be done.

They will say, as Sen. Russell is laid into the red earth of North Georgia, that an era has closed, a chapter in history ended. I hope that isn't true. He had a regard for the American principle that his memory should reinforce. He was both ahead of his time and very much of it, and he was largely wise in guiding it.

A modern Russell, this one unbound by that single chain of sectional history, must emerge and soon, or the nation is in the greater peril for his absence.

[From the Miami News, January 25, 1971]

RUSSELL KEPT RACIAL BATTLE FROM DESTROYING UNITED STATES

The national obituaries are saying that the late Sen. Richard Russell of Georgia became lonely and embittered during the final years of his service, hurt because a Southerner could not become President.

I think "lonely and embittered" overstates the case. Sen. Russell always kept to himself, preferring to read and study alone rather than socialize around Washington. His concentration on being a Senator and on the nation's directions fully occupied him. His singleness of purpose explains why he was right most of the time.

Some biographer, after four or five years of study, will let us know more about Sen. Russell. Meanwhile, the role of such a man in the making of America tells us a great deal about how our system works and shows us how critical to the national life one man in one place at a time of historical turmoil can be.

I last talked to him about three and half years ago. He felt terrible. His aides limited my time in his office to ten minutes and I was through with my business in eight. Although the senator was totally attentive, his lips and hands trembled and he looked washed out.

We needed a bridge in Georgia, an inexpensive little span to cost about \$550,000. It crossed a Corps of Engineers reservoir to a group of islands destined to be a state-developed resort and recreation center. We had put together an incredible combination of state moneys, federal grants in aid and matching monies and expected leases from private enterprise. But there was no money with which to build the bridge. No bridge, no project.

We asked Sen. Russell to urge the Corps of Engineers to build the bridge. They were the only agency legitimately entitled to do so. All the Senator said after the meeting was, "I'll look into it."

Two months later, he called to say the bridge was OK. Now it is built. The project is moving forward. He had simply called the Corps and told them to build it, and they did.

About that time, new civil rights legislation was popping. He performed as general of the opposition. Vietnam was erupting. He was chairman of the Senate Armed Forces Committee. He was the second ranking Senator in the United States. He was ill. But he kept up with everything.

It will long be debated whether this capable and dedicated man slowed down the country's march toward racial equality or,

because of his absolute allegiance to our political system, speeded it along.

Sen. Russell defended his position, and that of the Southern Old Guard, through every accepted parliamentary device and every tactic of honorable politics. In the course of the battles in which he served as strategy chief he put down his wilder and less responsible colleagues. Except for one brief demagogic dodge—a proposal that two million Negroes be transplanted to Northern states to help Northerners' appreciation of the South's problems—he deliberately avoided the inflammatory rhetoric of the typical racial hardliner.

And when Sen. Russell lost, he lost. He did not beat dead horses. He discouraged his colleagues from engaging in recriminations. Such was his conviction that the democratic process had to be sustained that once a vote came and once the vote went against him and there was nothing left to do, he accepted the verdict of the system.

This is the essence of democratic philosophy. Those who do not accept defeat at the end of the battle are in fact conceding that they never respected the rules in the first place.

Had one of the wild ones controlled Southern senators rather than Russell, unspeakable disintegration of the processes of government could have occurred. Russell yielded inch by inch, giving his recalcitrant brothers time to absorb their shocks. He would not permit the defeated group to maintain perpetual guerrilla warfare nor violate the essential process of national decision making.

For the nation's sake, he was the best man to lead the wrong side at that time. He must have been aware of the fact that he was the only Southerner with the prestige and skill to command a retreat that would save the skins of his political brethren and at the same time prevent the country from tearing itself apart.

MARY PERKINS' STORY

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, few news-stories should give us greater pause for thought than those reporting the recriminations suffered by 11-year-old Mary Perkins of Sweetwater, Fla., for the act of giving her Christmas savings to a family in need.

Her crime, I suppose, was not in giving her small savings of \$10 to a family evicted from their home, but, rather, for extending such a kind and generous hand to persons born of skin other than her own. Some of Mary's neighbors found this act objectionable. Some of her classmates at school inflicted abuse, both verbal and physical, to the extent that Mary's parents thought it wise to transfer her to a private school.

That the incidents of recrimination directed against Mary were few in number compared to the hundreds of warm and loving letters that poured in from Americans across the country is indeed heartening. But that she should suffer at all for putting into practice those ideals and principles this Nation holds dear is most regrettable.

Today, I offer a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the generous and unselfish act of Mary Perkins be commended to all Americans as the practice of public policy we pro-

mote and private conscience we espouse and worthy of emulation.

So that the widest possible audience might know the full story concerning Mary Perkins' act of generosity, I submit for the RECORD the transcript of a WFUN radio interview with Mary, a series of articles which appeared in the Miami News, and a copy of my concurrent resolution commending her for that act:

[From WFUN radio, South Miami, Fla.]

MARY PERKINS STORY

NEWSMAN. "It's seldom that good news makes the headlines, but this morning the headlines are being made by a piece of good news and by a ten-year-old girl from Sweetwater, the small community off the trail in Miami. The little girl heard about a black policeman in the small town who had to evict a needy family from their apartment, the fact that the policeman himself gave \$36 to the family and Mary who got \$10 for Christmas gave the \$10 to the needy family. This morning WFUN News had talked with Mary Perkins and her mother, Isabel Perkins, and I first asked Mary, why she decided to give the money away."

MARY. "Well I thought that they needed it and they needed a Christmas just like everybody else did and I didn't want them to go without a Christmas. Well, I thought maybe I could help with my \$10 even if it wasn't the best thing."

NEWSMAN. "How did it turn out?"

MARY. "Pretty good, it turned out real good. It was a real good Christmas."

NEWSMAN. "That was Mary Perkins who gave away her \$10 for Christmas to that needy family. Other children, some of them, have been shouting obscenities embarrassing little Mary and she was attacked several times and beaten up by a group, but she still says, along with her mother, that she's very proud that she did give the \$10 away at Christmas time. Mrs. Isabel Perkins is the mother of five children. Mary is the oldest at ten years old, and I asked Mrs. Perkins this morning to tell us about how her daughter made her decision."

Mrs. PERKINS. "Well she just simply read the story in the paper, you know and felt very depressed and very badly about it and asked her father and I if she could take her \$10 and buy a little something for their Christmas which turned out to be a bigger thing than we expected, because we got several gifts you know for the children and everything, and it is the happiest Christmas we ever had and it's still the happiest Christmas in spite of what happened."

NEWSMAN. Our good story that makes headlines this morning despite a few calls of harrasing and threats toward little Mary Perkins who did a good deed at Christmas time. A good deed now that is news headlines.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, Jan. 7, 1971]
SHE GAVE GIFTS TO BLACKS; TEENS PUNISH MARY FOR CRIME OF CARING

(By Ian Glass)

It seems that Mary Perkins' crime was that she gave her heart at Christmas-time to a needy family.

But Mary is white and the family is black, and life for Mary has been a slice of hell ever since.

In the section of Sweetwater (pop. 3,357) where the Perkins' family lives, a few teenagers have assumed the role of avengers—to punish Mary for her crime.

Mary, 11, spent \$10 on Christmas presents for four black children whose parents had just been evicted from their apartment. The \$10 originally had been intended for her parents' presents.

She had been touched by the action of

Metro Sgt. Bill Kimbro, a black police officer overseeing the eviction, who had dug into his pocket and given the family the \$36 he had saved for Christmas.

For Mary, retribution came swiftly . . . ironically, on Christmas Day.

She left the house to go riding on her brother's bicycle and a few minutes later, she said, she was attacked by the white and girls, aged about 14. They piled the bike on top of her, jumped on it, then started beating her, she said.

And they called her "nigger-lover."

When Mary returned to her home in tears, her mouth bleeding—her mother, Isabel Perkins took her to the police station.

"The police officer there said he couldn't do anything about it because he didn't see the incident happen," said Mrs. Perkins.

But the harassment continues. The same group gathers regularly in front of the Perkins' house where Mary lives with her sister Susie, 4, brother Sandy, 2, and six-year-old twins Penny and Randy.

Their chant is one of unrelieved sameness.

"Nigger-lover."

"They throw in a lot of obscenities, too," said Mrs. Perkins. "The house is just in a complete state of nerves. Mary doesn't dare leave it now except to go to school." (She is a sixth-grader at Seminole Elementary.)

"She weeps all the time and can't sleep. I'm afraid her school work is going to be affected," her mother said.

"All she was trying to do was to help people who had fallen on bad times."

Although the police say they can do nothing, Ivan Nachman, who is constable for District 1, which includes Sweetwater, has come to their aid.

Nachman was filing charges of assault against four of the teenagers—two boys and two girls—through Juvenile Court today.

"I am filing as a law enforcement agency, acting on the basis of Mrs. Perkins' affidavit," said Nachman.

Sweetwater 10 miles west of downtown Miami and north of the Tamiami Trail, has no police chief at the moment.

Its last chief, Jack Knight, retired at year's-end after 17 years of service.

But Mayor Lacey said today of the Mary Perkins' case: "I certainly don't condone this, but our hands are tied. Can you tell me a law that says you can't harass your neighbor?"

"I know the kids involved and they are a constant problem to this city. But it is difficult to take lawful action against juveniles these days. They're so well protected."

"They can taunt you and dare you to hit them, and you'd better make sure you don't."

"However, the council has asked our city attorney, Ed Moore, to see if he can come up with some kind of law to protect the Perkins' family."

"Though we can't get at the children, we might be able to get at their parents who aren't able to control them."

"The parents have been told what their children are doing."

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, Jan. 8, 1971]
MARY PERKINS "FEELS SAFE AGAIN" IN WARMTH OF COMMUNITY'S CONCERN

(By Ian Glass)

An outpouring of understanding, following the Miami News report of a little girl's ordeal with a gang of teenagers, has "made her feel safe again," said the mother of 11-year-old Mary Perkins.

Mary learned last night that she has more friends than she ever dreamed of.

"She is so happy," her mother said today. "This has restored all of her faith."

The calls were a spontaneous outpouring of sympathy and admiration for the girl

whose Christmas gift to a black family brought her a lot of suffering.

Mary read that the family, including four children, had been evicted from their apartment just before Christmas.

So she used the \$10 she had saved to buy her parents gifts to give toys to the children.

On Christmas Day, a gang of white teenagers beat her up. And they have since gathered in front of the Perkins' house shouting obscenities—the mildest of which is "nigger-lover."

Assault charges against four of the gang have been filed in Juvenile Court. A hearing has been set for Jan. 29.

When the story of Mary's ordeal was told yesterday, in *The Miami News*, the reaction was incredible.

"People called from all over South Florida," said Isabel Perkins, Mary's mother. "And not one of them was a hate call. All were sympathetic.

"Everybody asked if there was anything they could do. One woman, who didn't give her name but said she was well known, offered to take Mary into her home until the trouble blew over.

"A professor at the University of Miami called. A lot of teenagers did, too, wanting to talk to Mary and reassure her.

"A neighbor called and said, 'Maybe because of this, we'll have a peaceful town again and learn to love one another.

"Everybody was behind us 100 per cent. Mary feels safe again."

Sweetwater's mayor, Allen Lare, even stopped by and spent several hours with the family. Earlier, he had said police hands had been tied over the assault.

Mary's mother said many older people had called because they felt Mary had set an example that should be followed.

Miami businessman Robert M. Traugott wrote: "We thank you for doing what many of us have failed to do. Your action should have been our actions.

"Where we stood silent and still, you moved in a quiet and wondrous way to ease the sufferings of others."

He added: "Your faith and good will and your dearness give all men hope that some day the dark and sickly venom to which you have been exposed will vanish from the earth."

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, Jan. 13, 1971]
AMONG MAIL RECEIVED FROM AROUND COUNTRY: LOVING LETTERS TO MARY POUR IN FROM ACROSS NATION

(By Ian Glass)

The letters continue to pour in. Some are addressed merely to "The Little Girl with a Big Heart, Sweetwater, Fla." Many contain checks. All contain loving sentiments.

Mary Perkins, 11, has become a kind of symbol of what we would like to be, a symbol of simple generosity motivated only by a desire to help less fortunate people—an old-fashioned, straight-forward benevolence.

After *The Miami News* story about Mary was picked up by wire services and sent around the country, a man phoned Mary's mother, Isabel Perkins, from Canada.

MARY'S STORY OF GIVING MADE HIM FEEL ASHAMED

"I am the hardest man in the world and the most selfish," he told her. "I have never done anything in my life for anybody.

"But I have just sat and thought about this story of Mary, and felt ashamed. I am going to find the neediest families in this town and I am going to do something for them."

Mary is the girl who gave up \$11 she had saved to buy Christmas presents for her parents and donated it instead to four black children in a family which had been evicted from its apartment just before Christmas.

She said she was inspired by the action of Sgt. Bill Kimbro, a Metro police officer, who gave up his \$36 Christmas fund to put the family up in a motel.

FOUR TEENAGERS SERVED WITH ASSAULT CHARGES

Mary's action, however, resulted in her being beaten up by a half-dozen white teenagers in Sweetwater who called her "nigger-lover," then gathered in front of her home shouting obscenities.

Four of the teenagers are being charged with assault in Juvenile Court at the end of the month on a complaint filed by Constable Ivan Nachman.

But the harassment continues even now. The brother of one girl being charged continues to taunt Mary at Seminole Elementary, where she is a sixthgrader. "Aunt Jemima," he calls her.

Actions like this puzzle Mary. "I did what I did because I wanted to," she says. "Nobody suggested it. Why did it cause trouble? You can help people through a heart fund or something like that and not get beaten up for doing it."

One of the boys who beat her comes from a needy family for whom Mary and her mother collected food and clothing a couple of years ago.

Mary does not like trouble. She is not looking forward to going to court to give evidence. "We talked about whether we should go ahead with it," said Mrs. Perkins. "We decided we would. We don't want to hurt these kids, but this may help straighten them out. We feel their parents are more responsible for this kind of thinking, anyway."

A few Sweetwater city officials have accused us of causing trouble in the town. But I don't think that's right. I think most people are glad it came out in the open."

MARY PERKINS: SHE'S NO POLLYANNA

What kind of girl is Mary Perkins? She is certainly no Pollyanna. Oh, she believes in God and goes every Sunday to the Expressway Baptist Church on W. Flagler Street. But then, so does the rest of the family: mother, father (who sings in the choir) and Susie, 4, Sandy, 2, and six-year-old twins Penny and Randy.

She is helpful around the house, says her mother, especially in taking care of the little ones. She can be sassy and grouchy, sometimes, and her bedroom, adorned with pictures of her heroes, the Osmond Brothers, could be a bit tidier.

But her grades are normal. She is bad at math, good at science. She is an accomplished baton twirler and has won 20 trophies. She likes to ride horses, and when she grows up, she wants to be an actress.

Mary has benefited not one cent from her action. All of the checks rolling in (one Miami Beach man yesterday sent \$100) go into "The Mary Perkins fund" opened by Sgt. Kimbro after people started sending him checks. The money will go to needy families.

But people all around the country have offered to take Mary into their homes to escape harassment. And this weekend Air Canada is arranging for Mary and her mother to fly to Toronto for two days to appear on a children's TV show called, appropriately, "Heart."

Mary has never been on an airplane before. She has never been out of Florida. And she has never seen snow.

Despite the harassment, Mary says she feels "great." All of her friends have told her they are proud of her. She has started replying to the hundreds of letters she has received (the whole sixth-grade class at Cutler Ridge Elementary wrote to her.)

"Many of them tell about their own bitter racial experiences," says Mrs. Perkins. "Some have made me feel quite ashamed. I have thought an awful lot about the world these last few days . . ."

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, Jan. 15, 1971]
TEARFUL MARY FLIES AWAY TO BE TV STAR IN CANADA

(By Ian Glass)

Mary Perkins, the little girl with the big heart, flew with her mother to Canada today. It was her first time in a plane.

"I have goose bumps," she said as she got aboard. She then wept with excitement.

"Mary didn't sleep a wink all night," said her mother as they arrived at Miami International Airport at dawn.

Mrs. Perkins stayed up all night, too, replying to the writers of the hundreds of letters which have poured into the Perkins' Sweetwater home.

"I wanted to get my thanks back first to the many servicemen who have written," she said.

The letters are from people all over the country who read how 11-year-old Mary gave up \$10 she had saved for her parents' Christmas presents to help the children of a black family which had been evicted.

Mary later was beaten up by white teenagers.

Mary was flying today to Toronto at the invitation of the Canadian Broadcasting Co. officials of which had also read the story. She will appear on a children's TV program.

She turned up at the airport wearing a brand new outfit for the big adventure—a purple velvet pleated tunic dress, with matching suede shoes and white stockings and a white silk blouse with lavender polka dots.

On her finger she wore a ring sent by a young admirer. She carried a heavy coat because she was told it was snowing in Toronto.

"It will be the first time I ever saw snow," she said excitedly. "My mother wanted to take a Thermos, but I said it would melt."

Mary also carried a couple of school books because she would be missing a day's school. She is in the sixth grade at Seminole Elementary School.

"But my teacher told me not to worry about math this weekend—just to enjoy myself," she said.

Mary and her mother were waved off on the plane by Mary's father, Dan Perkins, an office employe at Aerodex, who shouted, "Don't forget to take lots of pictures."

Later he said, emotionally, "I am very proud of that girl."

Also at the airport was Metro Police Sgt. Bill Kimbro, whose gesture in giving up his \$36 Christmas savings to help the evicted family sparked Mary's response.

Like Mary, Sgt. Kimbro has received hundreds of letters commending him for his deed. This week he received a check for \$50 from TV star Steve Allen. Like all other checks which have come in, it went immediately into the "Mary Perkins Fund" which has been opened at Northside Bank of Miami to help needy children.

The balance has now reached almost \$1,500.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, Feb. 3, 1971]
MARY PERKINS MOVES TO ALL-WHITE SCHOOL

(By Ian Glass)

Mary Perkins, the 11-year-old Sweetwater girl who gave up her \$10 Christmas savings to help an evicted black family, has switched to a new school—the private Florida Christian School.

Ironically, it is all-white.

Mary's mother, Mrs. Isabel Perkins, said today she had made the decision because of incidents between her sixth-grade daughter and other students at Seminole Elementary School following Mary's Christmas gesture.

"We thought it best she make the break," she said. "Mary is very happy at the new school. The students all made her feel very welcome."

Why did she choose Florida Christian? "Because I wanted Mary to get a good education, and a good religious education. They read the Bible there."

"Obviously color had nothing to do with it. I guess there are no black children there because it is so far out." Florida Christian is located at 4200 SW 89th Ave.

After Mary made her Christmas gesture, she was beaten by several other white children who called her "nigger-lover." The story, reprinted throughout the United States, shocked the nation.

Among the 4,000-5,000 letters received by Mary was one yesterday, enclosing a signed picture of the first family, from Mrs. Nixon.

Mrs. Nixon wrote that she was distressed to learn of Mary's unhappiness because of her good deed. "It is as difficult to understand discrimination as it is to understand violence," she wrote. "You have set a shining example by your selfless act."

Last week, President Nixon awarded Mary a commendation "in recognition of exceptional service to others."

Despite all this, Mrs. Perkins said today, "Very few people in Sweetwater speak to us now. And many who do don't speak to us in public because they don't want to get involved."

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, all Americans joined those Americans of Ukrainian descent and Ukrainians all over the world in celebrating the 53d anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic as a free and independent nation. At the same time, those Ukrainians in their native land, behind the Iron Curtain had to observe the anniversary secretly, if at all.

I took the occasion of this year's observance to introduce legislation that calls for national recognition of Ukrainian Independence Day. My bill, which is identical to one I cosponsored in the 91st Congress and is similar to bills introduced by several of my colleagues, authorizes and requests the President to issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day. The proclamation would formally invite the people of the United States to join with Ukrainian nationals in observing the anniversary of the day in 1918 that the people of the Ukraine proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic.

A national proclamation on Ukrainian Independence Day, as provided in my bill, House Resolution 137, would be appropriate to honor the nation that has to this day refused to bow to the yoke of Soviet oppression. For 2½ centuries prior to their independence, the Ukrainians were under the domination of Russian czars. During that time, the Ukrainian people never lost their dream of independence and, when the czarist government was overthrown in 1918, the Ukrainians took advantage of the opportunity and declared their independence as a nation.

We hear talk today, especially from some Members of the other Chamber of Congress, about the Soviet threat being

a myth, and that Russia's desire for world domination is an unfounded fear. The talk continues in spite of the Czechoslovakian invasion and in spite of Russia's most recent activities in the Middle East.

The attitude and goals of the Soviets were as painfully obvious back in 1918 as they are today. One of the countries to quickly recognize the sovereignty and independence of the Ukrainian National Republic was the new Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic. Despite this recognition, Moscow soon militarily invaded the Ukraine and, after 4 years of bloody warfare, the poorly equipped Ukrainians again found themselves under the rule of a Russian Government.

During the ensuing 48 years, the Ukrainians have not let up on their drive for freedom, in spite of the constant threat of execution deportation or starvation by Communist authorities.

The determination of the people of the Ukraine should serve as a reminder to Americans that there are people in the world who do not cease to struggle for the freedom they cherish. This struggle for freedom symbolized by Ukrainian Independence Day, January 22, should serve as an example to all of us, and a national Ukrainian Independence Day proclamation as called for in my bill would contribute to a full appreciation of that fine example.

Since I came to Congress in 1959, I have joined each year in this observance and have worked for the liberation of all captive nations. I am proud of the fact that in 1969 I was awarded the Shevchenko Freedom Award by the Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent for my efforts and for my support of Americans of Ukrainian descent, and I pledge to continue to work for the day that all those behind the Iron Curtain will once again be free as the proud people of the Ukraine were on January 22, 1918.

A SALUTE TO THE USO ON ITS 30TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, over 30 years ago President Franklin D. Roosevelt called together leaders of five agencies representing the three major faiths of this country to find a way to serve the men and women of the recently mobilized forces. The YMCA, the National Catholic Community Service, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the YWCA, and the Salvation Army met with the President, agreed upon an idea and upon principles and on February 4, 1941, were chartered in New York State as the United Service Organization.

Shortly after, the Travelers Aid Association joined the USO and the organization did yeoman service, bringing a touch of home to GI's fighting a war that stretched from the South Pacific to the Elbe. The USO shows and the USO centers will always be remembered with fondness by soldiers and sailors who served in that war.

When the war ended we realized that the USO would be needed as much or perhaps even more in peacetime than in wartime, as our commitment continued around the world. In the absence of actual conflict men and women in uniform, with more free time on their hands, found isolation, boredom, and loneliness weighing even more heavily. It is completely true that as long as even one serviceman is away from home, there will continue to be a need for the USO.

As a consequence, USO has continued and has helped our servicemen and women during periods of peace as well as during the Korean conflict and now in the Vietnam conflict. Today, the USO is providing entertainment and recreation for our service people all over the world from Schenectady to Saigon.

And all of this without a cent of Federal funds. It is easy to lose sight of the fact that USO does its wonderful work with volunteers and with voluntary contributions, without once dipping into the Treasury.

And so this month marks 30 years of unparalleled service that has earned the gratitude of millions of Americans. As a former serviceman and one who is still closely involved with our men in uniform today, I take this opportunity to salute the thousands of people, mostly volunteers, who have kept the USO going over the years, with their voluntary contributions of money. It is with a tremendous amount of pleasure that I say to the USO: Thanks. Well done. Happy birthday and may you have many more years of continued service to all men and women in uniform.

THE McCLODY-STRATTON ACT, ESTABLISHING FOUR NATIONAL HOLIDAYS ON MONDAYS, GOES INTO EFFECT FEBRUARY 15

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, next Monday February 15, the Nation will observe our traditional Washington's Birthday holiday for the first time under the provisions of the Monday holiday law, Public Law 363 of the 90th Congress, approved by President Johnson on June 28, 1968—the McClory-Stratton Act.

I am proud of course, to have been the original author of this legislation, which I introduced in the House when I first came here, 12 years ago, in 1959. And the legislation which was finally adopted in 1968, the McClory-Stratton Act, was a bill which I cosponsored with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLODY who did such a brilliant job of steering it through the House Committee on the Judiciary, of which he was a member, together with our former colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ROGERS) who was then the chairman of the subcommittee that handled the Monday holiday legislation.

Mr. Speaker, few people in legislative office ever have an opportunity to make an impact on so many Americans as is made in effecting a major change in our

national calendar. The last major change in this calendar was made in 1752 with the adoption here in the American colonies of the Gregorian calendar in place of the Julian calendar.

Under the provisions of the McClory-Stratton Act Washington's Birthday falls each year, beginning in 1971, on the third Monday in February rather than automatically on February 22. Ironically enough, February 22 this year is a Monday, but it happens to be the fourth rather than the third Monday, and hence we are celebrating Washington's Birthday on Monday, February 15, the earliest date it can ever be observed under our new legislative change.

Also ironically, this year we will be observing Lincoln's Birthday, February 12, on the Friday before Washington's Birthday which comes on Monday, February 15. Of course, Lincoln's Birthday is not a national holiday, but it is observed in many States, including my own State of New York. So in these States we will find ourselves blessed not merely with a 3-day weekend—which was the basic purpose of the Monday holiday law—but with a 4-day weekend.

Some persons have expressed concern that this new holiday schedule may interfere with proper efforts to honor, for example, the life and achievements of the Father of our Country, since February 15 is not the exact date when George Washington was born. But the fact is that Washington was actually born on February 11. At the time of his birth, in 1732, we were still operating under the old Julian calendar. Eleven days were lost when we finally switched to the Gregorian calendar in 1752, which is the reason why the date of February 11 had to be changed to February 22. And to be perfectly accurate in matching the exact sidereal moment of Washington's birth, the day should be increased by one day in every 128 years since 1752, so that to be perfectly exact it should now be February 24, not February 22.

What is important, of course, is not the precise calendar date, but rather that we should have adequate time and opportunity to pause to recall the life and works of our first President. That should certainly be easier to do in a 3- or, as is the case this year, a 4-day period. And I certainly believe the opportunity for that kind of mature reflection will be considerably greater this year than it has traditionally been in previous years in the Washington-Virginia area, when February 22 was principally devoted to a flurry of cutrate sales.

Other people have been concerned that 3-day weekend holidays would mean an increase in the highway traffic death toll. But only a few weeks ago some authoritative figures were released, I believe by the National Safety Council, to support a contention that I have been making since I first introduced the Monday holiday bill; namely, that taken on a strictly per-day basis, the traffic death toll on long holiday weekends is actually less than it is on ordinary weekends. That should be reassuring to those who may hesitate to travel on these new holiday weekends because of traffic dangers.

Mr. Speaker, I imagine it will take

some time for people to get adjusted to the new holidays. But I am confident they will prove beneficial, not only in providing greater opportunities to discover America, but also in greater family togetherness. And that is something we need today.

Experience may possibly suggest some changes or improvements. No law is perfect. But I am confident that as the American people get accustomed to the benefits of the McClory-Stratton Act—provided to them incidentally, without any increase in the budget or any increase in their taxes—they will insist that even more of their regular holidays be established on this same basis. And then we who were fortunate enough to be able to help in putting this new legislation on the statute books will certainly be most happy to oblige.

Let me conclude, therefore, Mr. Speaker, by wishing all my colleagues a happy holiday weekend: Happy Lincoln's Birthday and Happy Washington's Birthday, all in a single, action-packed weekend.

THE MARTIN LUTHER KING HOLIDAY BILL

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing today a bill which would designate the birthday of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., January 15, as a national holiday. Joining me in this effort are 69 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle. This bill was originally introduced during the tragic days following Dr. King's death in April of 1968, and again in the 91st Congress.

We seek to set 1 day aside in honor of Dr. King because we believe his example to be of singular importance to our country. The magnitude of his contribution cannot be questioned. He lived and died by his personal conviction that "injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." He was a man of wisdom and eloquence whose struggle for justice was persistent and peaceful. His was a continued dedication to the goals of a brotherhood of man with true freedom and quality of opportunity for all our citizens. I call on every American to look to the example of Dr. King's philosophy and seek solutions to the problems of war, racism, and poverty.

This past January 15 was marked across the Nation by numerous commemorative observances, school closings, and official proclamations. The States of Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, New York, Tennessee, Washington, and the District of Columbia officially honored Dr. King through either proclamations or legislative action. Innumerable municipalities and local governments observed January 15 in a variety of appropriate ways.

Dr. Ralph David Abernathy, head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, led a delegation to the Capitol and presented Congress with signed petitions calling for the annual holiday observance. It is estimated that 3 million

people had signed the petitions which were carried that day. Since July of 1968, my office alone has received more than 700,000 individual letters and petitions carrying over 7 million signatures calling for the enactment of a holiday in honor of Dr. King. We are overwhelmed. But what is the most impressive fact is not just the amount of mail, but that most of it comes from people who seldom write Congressmen. The King holiday is obviously an issue that carries great meaning for millions of Americans.

This winter the momentum for the enactment of the King holiday increased substantially. In December, Mrs. Coretta Scott King, Dr. Abernathy, and I announced the formation of an ongoing Dr. Martin Luther King Legal Holiday Committee which is calling for passage of this bill. This national citizens committee is composed of approximately 100 representatives from government, business, labor, religion, and the arts.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to note that this bill will be introduced in the other body by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Mr. McGOVERN, and the distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS. I would hope that we as Members of this great body will indicate our support and esteem of Dr. Martin Luther King, a great leader for peace, non-violence, justice, and human dignity, by designating him as the first black American to be honored by our country with a holiday observance.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD several of the State proclamations I have received in connection with the observances of last month. I also insert the list of cosponsors to this bill:

EXECUTIVE ORDER PROCLAMATION: NATIONAL HUMAN RELATIONS DAY, JANUARY 15, 1971

Whereas, the contributions of all of the various ethnic, racial, and cultural groups have been essential in the development of the heritage and values which have strengthened our pluralistic society;

Whereas, an appreciation of our heritage, values, and those contributions continues to be essential to the development of improved appreciation, respect, and understanding between the members of our society;

Whereas, a strong commitment by all of the members of our society to the goals of better human relations is essential to the continuation and preservation of the democratic traditions of our United States;

Whereas, January 15 is the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who epitomized the values of non-violence, peace, and democratic changes as means for providing equality of opportunity for all of our citizens;

Now, therefore, I, John A. Love, Governor of the State of Colorado, do hereby proclaim that January 15, 1971, be designated as National Human Relations Day in memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the goals and values for which he gave his life.

Given under my hand and the Executive Seal of the State of Colorado, this fourth day of January, A.D., 1971.

JOHN A. LOVE,
Governor.

PROCLAMATION

(By His Excellency Thomas J. Meskill, Governor, State of Connecticut)

Martin Luther King once said, "In the final analysis all humanity is involved in a single process, and all men are brothers. To the degree that I harm my brother, no mat-

ter what he is doing to me, to that extent I am harming myself. Why is this? Because all men are brothers. If you harm me, you harm yourself."

Dr. King's words reflect his continued dedication to the goals of a brotherhood of man with true freedom and equality of opportunity for our black citizens.

The General Assembly has directed that a day be set aside each year to honor Martin Luther King "for his selfless devotion to the advancement of equality and the preservation of human rights." Accordingly, I proclaim January 15, the anniversary of the birth of this outstanding American leader, to be Martin Luther King Day in the State of Connecticut.

I urge that flags be flown on public buildings and private homes and that there be suitable observance of this occasion in the schools of this state and in our communities.

Given under my hand and seal of the State at the Capitol, in Hartford, this seventh day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy-one and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and ninety-fifth.

THOMAS J. MESKILL.

By His Excellency's command:

Secretary of the State.

STATEMENT BY GOV. RUSSELL W. PETERSON IN OBSERVANCE OF MARTIN LUTHER KING DAY

The Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Jr., dedicated his life to the goal of brotherhood between black and white Americans. By word and by action he significantly advanced the cause of good race relations. He achieved this in an atmosphere of non-violence.

His life work is a reminder that we must persist in the struggle to overcome hatred and work to achieve the good will among men which he so fervently and courageously sought. His sacrifice must not be forgotten.

Accordingly, as Governor of the State of Delaware, I designate the anniversary of his birth, Friday, January 15, 1971, as Martin Luther King Day in Delaware, and urge residents of the First States as individuals and as members of community groups to honor his memory by promoting his aims of racial understanding and good will.

RUSSELL W. PETERSON,
Governor.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Martin Luther King, Jr. lived and died by his personal conviction that "injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere;" and

Whereas, today, January 15, is the anniversary of the birth of Martin Luther King, Jr.;

Now, therefore, I, CECIL D. ANDRUS, Governor of the State of Idaho, do hereby proclaim January 15, 1971 as Martin Luther King, Jr. Day in Idaho, confident that the citizens will join me in this day of special observance.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the Great Seal of the State of Idaho, at Boise, the Capitol, the fifteenth day of January, in the year of our Lord, Nineteen Hundred and Seventy-one and of the Independence of the United States, the One Hundred and Ninety-sixth.

CECIL D. ANDRUS,
Governor of the State of Idaho.

Attest:

Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the late Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was the nation's leading advocate of seeking a solution to our national problems without violence; and

Whereas, he is still remembered as the one

who brought a sense of hope not only to this country but to the entire world; and

Whereas, his tragic death robbed the world of one of its most eloquent voices in behalf of compassion, love, brotherhood and peace; and

Whereas, he lived and died by his personal conviction that "injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere;" and

Whereas, his deep commitment to the concept of racial harmony has made him one of our greatest Americans;

Now, therefore, I, Kenneth M. Curtis, Governor of the State of Maine, do hereby proclaim January 15, 1971, as Martin Luther King, Jr. Day in the State of Maine.

Given at the office of the Governor at Augusta, and sealed with the Great Seal of the State of Maine, this fifteenth day of January, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred Seventy-one, and of the Independence of the United States of America, the One Hundred and Ninety-fifth.

KENNETH M. CURTIS,
Governor.

Attest:

JOSEPH T. EDGAR,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION: MICHIGAN HUMAN RELATIONS DAY

The contributions of the various ethnic, racial, and cultural groups have been essential in the development of the heritage and values which have strengthened our pluralistic society.

An appreciation of our heritage, values, and these contributions continues to be essential to the development of improved appreciation, respect, and understanding among the members of our society.

A strong commitment by all of the members of our society to the goals of better human relations is essential to the continuation and preservation of the democratic traditions of our United States.

January 15 is the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who epitomized the values of non-violence, peace, and democratic change as means for providing equality for all of our citizens.

Therefore, I, William G. Milliken, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim January 15, 1971, as Human Relations Day in Michigan and urge all Michigan citizens to observe programs and other commemorative efforts, whether in schools or various communities, which seek to encourage promotion of those vital goals which Martin Luther King so well exemplified and sought throughout his lifetime.

Given under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of Michigan on this eighth day of January in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred Seventy-one, and of the Commonwealth, One Hundred Thirty-fourth.

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN,
Governor.

Attest:

RICHARD H. AUSTIN,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION

The fifteenth of January is the anniversary of the birth of a great and courageous American, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

He was a man of wisdom and eloquence who gave his life in the quest for justice, equality and decency. His was a life of peaceful but persistent struggle. He fought for the rights of all Americans to share fully in the bright promise of America.

It therefore is appropriate to set aside a day to show our appreciation of what Martin Luther King, Jr., tried to bring about.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim January 15, 1971, as Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial Day in New York State.

Given under my hand and the Privy Seal

of the State at the Capitol in the City of Albany this thirtieth day of December in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy.

By the Governor:

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

Attest:

ALTON G. MARSHALL,
Secretary to the Governor.

A STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNOR

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was a major contributor to the economic, social, religious, educational and cultural progress of our nation.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., had an especially important role in the minority communities as the catalyst for progress within those areas.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. dedicated his life to the fulfillment of the dream that all men are created equal.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was a drum major for truth, peace, love (through non-violent means).

Now, therefore, I, Daniel J. Evans, Governor of the State of Washington, do hereby designate Friday, January 15, 1971, as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day and I call upon all citizens to reflect upon and rededicate themselves to solving the problems he addressed, bearing in mind that discrimination and social injustices in all their forms are destructive of the nation's unity and, therefore, its strength.

DANIEL J. EVANS,
Governor.

SPONSORS OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., HOLIDAY BILL, 92D CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Bella Abzug, Democrat, of New York.
Joseph P. Addabbo, Democrat, of New York.
Glenn M. Anderson, Democrat, of California.

Frank Annunzio, Democrat, of Illinois.
Herman Badillo, Democrat, of New York.
William Barrett, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Mario Biaggi, Democrat, of New York.
Edward G. Biester, Jr., Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Jonathan B. Bingham, Democrat, of New York.

Richard Bolling, Democrat, of Missouri.
John Brademas, Democrat, of Indiana.
Frank J. Brasco, Democrat, of New York.

Phillip Burton, Democrat, of California.
Hugh L. Carey, Democrat, of New York.
Charles J. Carney, Democrat, of Ohio.

Shirley Chisholm, Democrat, of New York.
William L. Clay, Democrat, of Missouri.
George Collins, Democrat, of Illinois.

John Conyers, Jr., Democrat, of Michigan.
James C. Corman, Democrat, of California.
William R. Cotter, Democrat, of Connecticut.

John Culver, Democrat, of Iowa.
Ronald V. Dellums, Democrat, of California.

Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Democrat, of Michigan.

John G. Dow, Democrat, of New York.
Don Edwards, Democrat, of California.
Thomas S. Foley, Democrat, of Washington.

Edwin B. Forsythe, Republican, of New Jersey.

Donald M. Fraser, Democrat, of Minnesota.

Ella T. Grasso, Democrat, of Connecticut.
William J. Green, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Seymour Halpern, Republican, of New York.

Michael Harrington, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Augustus F. Hawkins, Democrat, of California.

Ken Hechler, Democrat, of West Virginia.

Henry Helstoski, Democrat, of New Jersey.
Frank Horton, Republican, of New York.
Andrew Jacobs, Jr., Democrat, of Indiana.

Robert W. Kastenmeier, Democrat, of Wisconsin.
 Edward I. Koch, Democrat, of New York.
 Robert L. Leggett, Democrat, of California.
 Ray J. Madden, Democrat, of Indiana.
 Romano L. Mazzoli, Democrat, of Kentucky.
 Lloyd Meeds, Democrat, of Washington.
 Ralph H. Metcalfe, Democrat, of Illinois.
 Abner J. Mikva, Democrat, of Illinois.
 Joseph G. Minish, Democrat, of New Jersey.
 Patsy Mink, Democrat, of Hawaii.
 Parren J. Mitchell, Democrat, of Maryland.
 F. Bradford Morse, Republican, of Massachusetts.
 John E. Moss, Democrat, of California.
 Claude Pepper, Democrat, of Florida.
 Bertram L. Podell, Democrat, of New York.
 Charles B. Rangel, Democrat, of New York.
 Thomas M. Rees, Democrat, of California.
 Ogden R. Reid, Republican, of New York.
 Henry S. Reuss, Democrat, of Wisconsin.
 Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Republican, of Michigan.
 Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey.
 Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat, of New York.
 William F. Ryan, Democrat, of New York.
 James H. Scheuer, Democrat, of New York.
 John F. Seiberling, Democrat, of Ohio.
 Samuel S. Stratton, Democrat, of New York.
 Louis Stokes, Democrat, of Ohio.
 Frank Thompson, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey.
 Morris K. Udall, Democrat, of Arizona.
 Lionel Van Deerlin, Democrat, of California.
 Jerome R. Waldie, Democrat, of California.
 Lester Wolff, Democrat, of New York.

NURSE MANPOWER TRAINING ACT OF 1971

(Mr. ROGERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation, along with my colleagues, Messrs. JARMAN, KYROS, PREYER of North Carolina, CARTER, and HASTINGS, to extend for 3 fiscal years and modify title VIII, the nurse training section, of the Public Health Service Act. The present law expires on June 30, 1971.

This law was first enacted by the 88th Congress and signed into law on September 4, 1964. It was amended by Public Law 90-490, which extended the program for 2 fiscal years, through fiscal year 1971.

Basically, the nurse training title authorized grants-in-aid to collegiate, associate degree, or diploma schools of nursing, assistance grants for advanced training of nurses, and established the National Advisory Council on Nurse Training.

Health-care delivery has become one of our most important national priorities in recent years. Rising costs have placed adequate medical care beyond the reach of a sizable portion of our population. An inadequate supply of trained nursing personnel has contributed to this problem. It has been estimated that we have a shortage of over 150,000 registered nurses alone. To help meet this critical shortage, this act would provide increased grants for the construction of new and expanded facilities as well as for the replacement and rehabilitation of ex-

isting facilities for nurse training. This section also increases grants to be used in the development of new programs of nursing education.

Educational institutions have found it increasingly difficult to meet the direct costs of training nurses. Many nursing education facilities have found themselves in serious financial straits which threaten their continued operation. To help meet the rising costs of nurse training, this act would establish a new system of institutional grants based on a capitation formula for allocation of funds to nurse training facilities. This would provide a more realistic approach to meeting the financial needs of these institutions.

The need for health manpower has become acute in many areas of our country. To provide for the increased personal costs associated with nursing education, this bill would increase Government loan ceilings for nursing students. In addition it would provide a mechanism to attract nurses to areas with an acute shortage of health personnel through an accelerated loan cancellation formula.

Finally this act would increase scholarship grants to nursing schools. These grants would be made available to schools and in turn to the students of these schools on the basis of exceptional financial need.

In conclusion, let me say that we must continue to recognize the problems of health-care delivery. These problems are directly related to the adequate supply of properly trained health personnel. In order to overcome the deficit which now exists in the nursing field, we must continue to expand and support our nurse training facilities, and allow for the distribution of these nurses in the areas which have the most critical need for them.

I am hopeful that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare will be able to hold hearings on this legislation in the near future.

HEALTH MANPOWER TRAINING ACT OF 1971

(Mr. ROGERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am today joined by my colleagues, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS, in introducing the Health Manpower Training Act of 1971. This legislation would extend and modify title VII, the health research and teaching facilities section, of the Public Health Service Act for 3 fiscal years. The present law expires on June 30, 1971.

During the last 50 years, our technical ability to deal with health problems has increased dramatically. However, in this same period our ability to deliver these technical innovations to certain segments of the population has not kept pace with the technology. Health-related educational facilities in the United States have consistently provided a product second to no others in the world. Yet, a number

of our finest medical, dental, and other health educational facilities have found themselves in serious financial straits in recent years. Several of these facilities have been forced to close their doors because of this financial crisis. Still others are operating with inadequate or outdated facilities which threaten the quality of their final product. To maintain the quality and supply of trained health manpower, we must continue to assist these institutions in meeting the increasing costs of training these personnel. In addition we must look to new categories of health personnel to meet our expanding needs.

The provisions of this act would provide for continued and increased grants for the construction of new and expanded teaching facilities as well as the replacement or rehabilitation of existing facilities for the training of physicians, dentists, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, osteopaths, veterinarians, or professional public health personnel through fiscal 1974. Presently, there is a backlog of nearly \$500,000,000 in approved applications for construction under this section for which there are no Federal funds available. This act would also provide for project grants for the advanced training of these types of personnel in a teaching or educational capacity.

This bill would further authorize an increase in the loan ceiling of Federal loans to students enrolled in public or other nonprofit schools of medicine, dentistry, optometry, osteopathy, pharmacy, podiatry, or veterinary medicine. In addition it would provide a mechanism to attract these personnel to areas of the country with an acute shortage of these professions through an accelerated loan cancellation formula.

To allow institutions to more adequately meet the increasing costs of health manpower training, this act would establish a new system of institutional grants based on a capitation formula. This would provide funds to a school on the basis of enrollment and represents a more realistic approach to meeting the financial needs of these institutions. Grants would also be authorized to meet the costs of special projects designed to develop new programs of health-care delivery, new types of health personnel, interdisciplinary training, and others.

Finally, this act would increase scholarship grants to students in such schools. These scholarships would be made available to schools and in turn to their students on the basis of exceptional financial need.

In conclusion let me say that we must not be lax in recognizing the magnitude of the health manpower problem in the United States. Health manpower shortages have already become acute in many areas of our country. To meet the present crisis in health care and provide for future needs, we must continue to support and expand our health educational facilities.

I am hopeful that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare will be able to hold hearings on this legislation in the near future.

THE NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE ACT OF 1971

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, 30 Members of the House today join me in introducing the Newsmen's Privilege Act of 1971.

This legislation permits newsmen to keep confidential information as well as sources of that information except where disclosure is necessary to protect human life or to prevent espionage or foreign aggression against the United States.

The bill was originated in the 91st Congress but failed to gain passage. Since the initial introduction of the bill in March 1970, there has been some judicial progress as a result of certain cases along the lines of this bill. However, I believe that the broader coverage provided by this legislation, which would include the Congress, agencies, and departments, is necessary to preserve fully the intent of the first amendment.

Further legislative reinforcement also is in order because of the surprising, if not alarming, amount of public support of press censorship identified in a recent national poll. Any erosion of freedom of the press diminishes the rights of every single citizen of this country. Thus, even the slightest restriction of this freedom cannot be tolerated.

There have been attempts during the last year to bring into the courts the notes, unedited film and tapes of newspaper and television reporters. Such actions clearly are a threat to freedom of the press and the time-honored right of newsmen to protect confidential sources. If the news media are prevented from affording informants the protection of anonymity, the atmosphere we so dearly prize within the Nation gradually will become less free than the Founding Fathers intended. As one former Government official put it, newsmen are to be held accountable only for what they publish or broadcast, not for what they have in their notes.

There are some who feel that we are overreacting to this issue.

In my view, too few people, including the press itself, are reacting sufficiently to the threat to the free and uninhibited functioning of the American press and to the first amendment guarantees upon which its independence is based. It will be too late to cry "fire" when the barn is already burned to the ground.

It is worth noting that whenever a takeover of an existing government is attempted, it very frequently involves silencing or censoring the newspapers and seizing the television and radio stations. One of the principal hallmarks of the totalitarian state is control of the media.

Endorsement of this legislation, however, does not imply that the apex has been reached in the present operation of journalism in the United States today. The press is hardly perfect. Most reporters and editorialists will agree that improvement is needed. It has been traditional for the press to ignore its own warts and concentrate instead on everyone else's. But this hidebound posture is

gradually changing and an era of self-scrutiny now seems to have begun.

The Washington Post, for example, which frequently draws the great ire of many public figures, has given one of its editors the license to talk about its flaws on the editorial page. Its columnist, Nicholas von Hoffman, has ventured also into this hitherto forbidden territory, apparently raising the hackles of many colleagues in the process.

I call upon my colleagues in the House to consider this bill carefully and to support, if not introduce it. I believe it will go far to insure that the freedom of the press will be preserved.

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING WITH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

(Mr. BETTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday President Nixon sent to the Congress a message spelling out in detail his recommendations for a program of general revenue sharing with State and local governments. Yesterday the President transmitted to both Houses of the Congress the actual legislation for the implementation of those recommendations.

Over the past week Congressman HAROLD COLLIER of Illinois, Congressman BARBER CONABLE of New York and I have been in contact with the general membership of the House, inviting our colleagues to join in the sponsorship of this historic legislation. Mr. Speaker, the results of this effort are most gratifying. Over 130 Members of the House have agreed to join as cosponsors. This unusually large number of cosponsors represents nearly one-third of the total membership of the House of Representatives.

That so many Members of Congress have agreed to sponsor the President's proposed legislation at this early stage in the process provides impressive evidence that revenue sharing is, indeed, an idea whose time has come. Furthermore, during our contacts, we have found many Members, who—though unwilling to sponsor a specific bill at this time—have, nonetheless, expressed strong support for the basic concept of general revenue sharing. I think it is fair to state that the concept enjoys support from a clear majority of the House membership.

Mr. Speaker, joined by Congressman COLLIER and Congressman CONABLE, I am most pleased to introduce seven bills presenting the text of the President's general revenue-sharing legislation, carrying the names of 139 Members of the House. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis be printed in the Record immediately following my remarks.

In his state of the Union message to the 92d Congress, President Nixon stated:

The time has come for a new partnership between the Federal Government and the States and localities—a partnership in which we entrust the States and localities with a larger share of the Nation's responsibilities, and in which we share our Federal revenues with them so they can meet those responsibilities.

This proposal for general revenue sharing represents the key element in the President's overall program to move a portion of governmental power away from Washington and closer to the people. The general revenue-sharing bill proposes to distribute among the States and their local units of government approximately \$5 billion of Federal revenues during the first full year of operation. This program is a fair, simple, and direct means of moving to solve the growing fiscal impairment of State and local governments—an impairment which threatens the capacity of these units of government to provide the people with basic public services.

President Nixon's general revenue-sharing plan is fair in that it proposes to share with States and localities the progressive benefits of our Federal income tax system primarily on the basis of population, with a modest adjustment made for the respective revenue efforts of the several States. It is simple because it proposes to utilize readily available governmental statistics on population, personal income, and revenue effort for the mathematical formulations of distribution. It is direct because it proposes to move fiscal resources immediately from the Federal level to the State and local level without the necessity for creating a new layer of governmental bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, no one can predict today what final disposition the Congress will make of this most far reaching proposal. However, the important fact for the present is that President Nixon has presented to us an explicit plan for beginning to redress the serious political and fiscal imbalance which now obtains between the Federal Government and our State and local governments. His courageous action has set the stage for a great national debate on the means and methods by which we may improve Government at all levels and make those units of Government more responsive to the people. The distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means has assured the President that public hearings will be held on this proposal. To assure that our legislative deliberations will result in a meaningful end product, I sincerely hope that all of my colleagues in the House will begin to publicly articulate their thoughts on this most important issue of our times.

The bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to restore balance in the Federal system of government in the United States; to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101. This Act may be cited as the "General Revenue Sharing Act of 1971".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 201. (a) For purposes of this Act—
(1) except where otherwise indicated, the term "fiscal year" means the fiscal year of the Government of the United States;

(2) the term "general revenue" means general revenue from own sources, as defined and used by the Bureau of the Census, provided that in the case of the District of Columbia it shall include the Federal payment authorized under 47 D.C. Code § 2501(a) (81 Stat. 339);

(3) the term "Governor" means the chief executive officer of each State or his delegate;

(4) the term "individual income tax returns" means the returns of tax required to be filed on the income of individuals under the internal revenue laws of the United States;

(5) the term "local government" means a municipality, county, or township (but does not include independent school districts or special districts) as such terms are defined and used by the Bureau of the Census;

(6) the term "personal income" means personal income as defined and used by the Office of Business Economics of the Department of Commerce;

(7) the term "population" means total resident population as defined and used by the Bureau of the Census;

(8) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate;

(9) the term "Attorney General" means the Attorney General of the United States or his delegate;

(10) the term "State" means the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia;

(11) the term "Bureau of the Census" means the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce;

(12) the term "taxable income" means taxable income as defined by the internal revenue laws of the United States;

(13) the term "units of government" means all units of local government (including independent school districts and special districts) as such terms are defined and used by the Bureau of the Census;

(14) the term "major municipality" means any municipality with a population of 2,500 or more as reported by the Bureau of the Census;

(15) the term "major township" means any township—

(a) with a population of 2,500 or more as reported by the Bureau of the Census, and

(b) the employment ratio for which is not less than one-half of the average employment ratio of all major municipalities in such State; and

(16) the term "employment ratio" means a fraction the numerator of which is the total number of employees of any major municipality or major township as reported by the Bureau of the Census and the denominator of which is the population of such governmental unit.

(b) Where appropriate, the definitions in subsection (a) shall be based on the latest published reports of the Department of Commerce, and on the internal revenue laws in effect, on the date of enactment of this Act. The data used in applying these definitions shall be the latest published data referable to the same point or period in time. The Secretary may, by regulation, change or otherwise modify the definitions in subsection (a) in order to reflect any change or modification thereof made subsequent to such date by the Department of Commerce or by a revision of the internal revenue laws.

REVENUE SHARING APPROPRIATION

SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby appropriated for general revenue sharing for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount, as determined by the Secretary, equal to the percentages provided in subsection (b) of this section multiplied by the total taxable income reported on Federal individual income tax returns for the calendar year for which the latest published statistical data are available from the

Department of the Treasury at the beginning of such fiscal year.

(b) For the purposes of subsection (a), the applicable percentage is 0.96 percent for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971, and 1.3 percent for each fiscal year thereafter.

(c) Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available without fiscal year limitations for the expenditures authorized by this Act.

PAYMENTS TO THE STATES

SEC. 401. (a) For any fiscal year, each State is entitled to an amount as determined by the Secretary, equal to—

(1) (i) the amount appropriated for such year pursuant to section 301 plus any amount not distributed during the previous fiscal year pursuant to subsection (b), less

(ii) an amount equal to 10 percent of the sum of the amounts described in subparagraph (1), and

(2) multiplied by the factor for such State.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (f) each State which has filed an alternative formula under section 501(c) shall receive an amount equal to the amount described in subparagraph (a) (1) (ii) multiplied by the factor for such State.

(c) Each State's factor shall be obtained by—

(1) multiplying such State's population by its revenue effort, and

(2) dividing the product obtained in paragraph (1) by the sum of such products for all States.

(d) For purposes of subsection (c), the revenue effort of each State for any fiscal year shall be obtained by dividing—

(1) the total general revenue derived by such State and all of its units of government by

(2) the total personal income for such State.

(e) The amount determined under subsection (a) of this section shall be paid by the Secretary to each State at such times as the Secretary may determine during any fiscal year, but not less often than once each calendar year quarter. A pro rata portion of the amount described in subsection (b) shall be paid by the Secretary for each calendar year quarter to which an alternative formula applies, at such times as the Secretary may determine during any fiscal year but not less often than once each such quarter.

(f) The District of Columbia shall receive its share of the amount described in subsection (b) notwithstanding the requirements of section 501(c).

(g) All computations and determinations by the Secretary under sections 301 and 401 shall be final and conclusive.

PAYMENTS BY STATES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

SEC. 501. (a) The local governments of each State shall be entitled to receive an amount equal to the payment to such State pursuant to section 401(a) multiplied by a fraction the numerator of which is the sum of the general revenues of all units of government of such State and the denominator of which is the sum of the general revenues of such State and all of its units of government. Such amounts shall be computed by the State on the basis of the latest data available from the Department of Commerce at the beginning of the fiscal year.

(b) Within 30 days after receipt of a payment pursuant to section 401(a), each State shall pay to each of its local governments an amount, computed on the basis of the statistical data used in subsection (a) of this section, equal to—

(1) the amount determined under subsection (a) of this section, multiplied by

(2) the ratio of each such local government's general revenue to the total general revenue of all local governments in such State.

(c) To encourage States to take the ini-

tiative in strengthening the fiscal position of their local governments and to maximize flexibility in the use of the payments authorized by this Act for meeting the particular needs of differing State and local fiscal systems, the Secretary shall accept an alternative formula for the allocation of funds as required by subsection (a) of this section (and any modification or termination of such formula) if requested by the State, provided such formula (or modification or termination of such formula) is—

(1) enacted by the State in the same manner as authorized in such State's constitution for the enactment of State laws, and

(2) approved by a formal resolution by more than one-half of the governing bodies of each of the following classes of government in such State:

- (i) major municipalities,
- (ii) counties, and
- (iii) major townships.

In each such class of government, approval must be by governing bodies representing a majority of the population in such class. A statement of such formula indicating approval thereof in accordance with this paragraph (including a certification by the Bureau of the Census which enumerates major municipalities, counties, and major townships included in the classes referred to above) shall be filed by the Governor with the Secretary not later than 90 days preceding the first calendar year quarter to which such formula would be applicable. The provisions of such formula shall govern the use of funds allocated by this Act to local governments and shall apply for the next five fiscal years or for any lesser period approved pursuant to this subsection.

(d) Except when a formula has been adopted pursuant to subsection (c), a State's aggregate payments to all of its local governments for such State's fiscal year (from all sources other than amounts received under this Act) shall be an amount which represents not less than the average proportion of such State's general revenues received by its local governments for the three fiscal years of such State next preceding the date of enactment of this Act, unless such state demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that there has been a transfer from local governments to the State of financial responsibility for the direct support of facilities or services previously the responsibility of local governments.

QUALIFICATIONS

SEC. 601. Participation by a State in the program established by this Act shall constitute a waiver by the State of its immunity from suit by its local governments pursuant to this Act. The Governor shall, on behalf of the State and any local government which may receive any payments pursuant to this Act, give to the Secretary such assurances as he may require that such State and its local governments will—

(a) use such payments for its governmental purposes;

(b) use such fiscal and accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure (1) proper accounting for payments received by such State and its local governments, and (2) proper disbursement of amounts to which the local governments are entitled;

(c) provide to the Secretary or his representatives, on reasonable notice, access to, and the right to examine, any books, documents, papers, or records as he may reasonably require for the purposes of reviewing compliance with this Act; and

(d) make such reports to the Secretary as he may reasonably require, including any computations made pursuant to section 501.

POWERS OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 701. (a) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe reasonable rules and regulations

for carrying out the provisions of this Act and to request from any Federal agency statistical data and reports and such other information which he may deem necessary to carry out his functions under this Act, and each Federal agency is authorized to furnish such statistical data and reports and other information to the Secretary to the extent permitted by law.

(b) If the Secretary determines that a State has failed to comply substantially with any provision of this Act, other than section 1101, or any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto,

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

(2) after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the Governor of such State, he shall notify the Governor that if such State fails to take corrective action within 60 days from the date of such notification, further payments to such State in excess of the amounts to which the local governments of such State are entitled under section 501 shall be withheld for the remainder of the fiscal year and for any subsequent fiscal year until such time as the Secretary is satisfied that appropriate corrective action has been taken and that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is satisfied, the Secretary shall make no further payments of such amounts. In the case of the failure of the State to comply, for a period in excess of 6 months after the expiration of the 60-day notice, the Secretary shall forthwith cancel any payments withheld pursuant to this paragraph for the current and for any subsequent fiscal year and shall reappropriate and pay such canceled payments to all other States then entitled to receive payments under section 401 in proportion to the original installments paid to such States for the fiscal year to which such canceled payments pertain. Such payments to all other States shall be considered payments made pursuant to section 401.

(c) If a payment to a State is withheld or canceled pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall continue to pay to such State the amount to which the local governments of such State are entitled, as determined pursuant to section 501, and such State shall continue to distribute such amounts among its local governments pursuant to section 501.

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

(e) The Governor shall be responsible to the Secretary for determining that local governments within his State have complied with the provisions of this Act, other than section 1101, and the rules and regulations issued pursuant thereto. If, after giving reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the chief executive officer of a local government of such State, the Governor determines that such local government has failed to comply substantially with any provision of this Act, other than section 1101, or any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto, the Governor shall forthwith notify such local government that if it fails to take corrective action within 60 days from the date of such notification, further payments to it under this Act will be withheld for the remainder of the fiscal year and for any subsequent fiscal year until such time as he is satisfied that appropriate corrective action has been taken and that there will no longer be any failure to comply. The Governor shall forthwith notify the Secretary of his action.

(f) In the event of a failure by such local government to comply for a period in excess of 6 months after the expiration of a 60-day notice issued by the Governor pursuant to a determination under subsection

(e), the Governor shall forthwith cancel any payments withheld for the current and for any subsequent fiscal year and shall reappropriate and pay such canceled payments to all other local governments of such State then entitled to receive payments pursuant to section 501, in proportion to the original payments made to such local governments for the fiscal year to which the canceled payments pertain.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 801. (a) Any State or local government which receives a 60-day notice under section 701 may, within 60 days after receiving such notice, file with the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which such State or local government is located, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, a petition for review of the Secretary's action. A copy of the petition shall forthwith be transmitted to the Secretary; a copy shall also forthwith be transmitted to the Attorney General, who shall represent the Secretary in any litigation.

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

(c) The Court shall have jurisdiction to affirm or modify the action of the Secretary or to set it aside in whole or in part. The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. However, if any finding is not supported by substantial evidence, the Court may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous actions. He shall certify to the Court the record of any further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(d) The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification, as provided in section 1254 of Title 28, United States Code.

(e) In the event that judicial proceedings are instituted pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall after the expiration of the 6-month period provided in sections 701(b) or 701(f), or the point in time when any judicial decision becomes final and the time for appeal or rehearing has expired, whichever period is later, cancel, reappropriate and pay any payments withheld pursuant to section 701 for the current and for any subsequent fiscal years.

(f) For purposes of this section, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury or the Governor of a State, whichever is appropriate.

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY

SEC. 901. The Secretary shall report to the President of the United States and the Congress as soon as is practicable after the end of the fiscal year on the operation of this Act during the preceding fiscal year.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

SEC. 1001. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the administrative expenses required to carry out the functions of the Government of the United States under this Act.

NONDISCRIMINATION PROVISION

SEC. 1101(a). No person in the United States shall on the ground of race, color or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity funded in whole or in part with general revenue sharing funds.

(b) (1) Whenever the Secretary determines that any State has failed to comply with subsection (a) or an applicable regulation, he

shall attempt to secure compliance by voluntary means. If the Secretary determines that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means, he shall have the authority to (i) refer the matter to the Attorney General with a recommendation that an appropriate civil action be instituted; (ii) exercise the powers and functions provided by title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d); or (iii) take such other action as may be provided by law.

(2) Whenever the Secretary determines that a local government has failed to comply with subsection (a) or an applicable regulation, he shall notify the Governor of the State in which the local government is located of the noncompliance and shall request the Governor to secure compliance. If within a reasonable period of time the State fails or refuses to secure compliance, the Secretary shall have the authority to (i) refer the matter to the Attorney General with a recommendation that an appropriate civil action be instituted; (ii) exercise the powers and functions provided by title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d); or (iii) take such other action as may be provided by law.

(c) When a matter is referred to the Attorney General pursuant to subsection (b), or whenever he has reason to believe that a State or local government is engaged in a pattern or practice in violation of the provisions of this section, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court for such relief as may be appropriate, including injunctive relief.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 1201. The effective date of this Act shall be the date of enactment; however, the first payment shall cover the period beginning October 1, 1971.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF BILL

SECTION 101—SHORT TITLE

(a) *Short title.*—Subsection (a) of section 101 provides that the Act may be cited as the "General Revenue Sharing Act of 1971."

SECTION 201—DEFINITIONS

(a) *In general.*—Subsection (a) provides general definitions for purposes of the Act.

Fiscal year. Paragraph (1) provides that the term "fiscal year" means the fiscal year of the Government of the United States.

General revenue.

Paragraph (2) provides that the term "general revenue" of State and local governments means general revenue from their own resources, as defined by the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce, provided that in the case of the District of Columbia it includes the Federal payment authorized under 47 D.C. Code section 2501 (a).

Governor. Paragraph (3) provides that the term "Governor" means the chief executive officer of a State or his delegate.

Individual income tax returns. Paragraph (4) provides that the term "individual income tax returns" means the returns of tax required to be filed on the income of individuals under the internal revenue laws of the United States.

Local government. Paragraph (5) provides that the term "local government" means a municipality, county or township (but does not include independent school districts or special districts) as such terms are defined and used by the Bureau of the Census.

Personal income. Paragraph (6) provides that the term "personal income" means personal income as defined by the Office of Business Economics of the Department of Commerce.

Population.

Paragraph (7) provides that the term "population" means total resident population, as defined and used by the Bureau of the Census.

Secretary.

Paragraph (8) provides that the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

Attorney General.

Paragraph (9) provides that the term "Attorney General" means the Attorney General of the United States, or his delegate.

State.

Paragraph (10) provides that the term "State" means the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia.

Bureau of the Census.

Paragraph (11) provides that the term "Bureau of the Census" means the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce.

Taxable income.

Paragraph (12) provides that the term "taxable income" means taxable income as defined by the internal revenue laws of the United States.

Units of government.

Paragraph (13) provides that the term "units of government" means all units of local government (including independent school districts and special districts) as defined by the Bureau of the Census.

Major Municipality.

Paragraph (14) provides that the term "major municipality" means any municipality with a population of more than 2,500 as reported by the Bureau of the Census.

Major Township.

Paragraph (15) provides that the term "major township" means any township with a population of more than 2,500 as reported by the Bureau of the Census if its employment ratio is not less than one-half of the average employment ratio for all major municipalities in such State.

Employment ratio.

Paragraph (16) provides that the term "employment ratio" means a fraction the numerator of which is the total number of employees of any major municipality or major township and the denominator of which is the population of such governmental unit.

(b) **Changes and modifications in definitions.**—Subsection (b) of section 201 provides that the definitions in subsection (a) shall be based on the latest published reports available and the internal revenue laws in effect on the date of enactment. The data used in applying these definitions shall be based on the latest published data which are referable to the same point or period in time. The Secretary may, by regulation, change or otherwise modify the definitions in subsection (a) in order to reflect any change or modification thereof made subsequent to such date by the Bureau of the Census, or by a revision of the internal revenue laws.

SECTION 301—REVENUE SHARING APPROPRIATION

(a) **Appropriation.**—Section 301 provides for each fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 1971, there shall be appropriated an amount equal to the percentages specified in subsection (b) multiplied by taxable income reported on Federal individual income returns for the calendar year for which the latest published statistical data are available from the Department of the Treasury at the beginning of such fiscal year.

(b) Subsection (b) provides that for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971, the applicable percentage is 0.96 and that it will be 1.3 percent for each fiscal year thereafter.

(c) **Fiscal year limitation.**—Subsection (c) provides that amounts appropriated pursuant to this Act shall remain available without fiscal year limitation for the expenditures authorized by this Act.

SECTION 401—PAYMENTS TO STATES

(a) **In general.**—Subsection (a) provides that for any fiscal year each State is entitled

to an amount, determined by the Secretary, equal to the amount appropriated for such year pursuant to section 301 plus any undistributed amount of the prior year's incentive allocation (less 10 percent of the sum of such amounts) multiplied by the factor for such State.

(b) **Incentive payment.**—Subsection (b) provides that any State which together with its local governments adopts an alternative formula for the distribution of funds among the State and its local governments shall receive an amount equal to the 10 percent incentive allocation multiplied by the factor for such State.

(c) **State factor.**—Paragraphs 1 and 2 of subsection (c) provide that each State's factor shall be obtained by (1) multiplying such State's population by its revenue effort, and (2) dividing the product obtained in paragraph 1 by the sum of such products for all States.

(d) **Revenue effort.**—Subsection (d) provides that the revenue effort of each State for any fiscal year is obtained by dividing the total general revenue derived by such State and all of its units of government from their own resources by the total personal income for such State.

(e) **Payments.**—Subsection (e) provides that the payments determined under subsection (a) of this section shall be paid by the Secretary to the State at such times as the Secretary may determine during any fiscal year, but not less often than once each calendar year quarter.

(f) **District of Columbia payment.**—Subsection (f) provides that the District of Columbia will receive the incentive payment notwithstanding the provisions of section 501(c).

(g) **Final and conclusive determinations.**—Subsection (g) provides that all determinations by the Secretary under sections 301 and 401 shall be final and conclusive.

SECTION 501—PAYMENTS BY STATES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

(a) **Computation of pass-through amount.**—Subsection (a) of section 501 provides that the local governments of each State are entitled to an amount equal to the payment to such State pursuant to section 401 multiplied by a local distribution factor computed on the basis of the latest data available from the Department of Commerce, referable to the same point or period of time.

Numerator.
The numerator of the local distribution factor is the total general revenue derived by all units of governments in such State from their own resources.

Denominator.
The denominator of the distribution fraction is the total general revenue derived by such State and all of its units of government from their own resources.

(b) **Payment to each local government.**—Subsection (b) provides that each State shall pay to each local government an amount equal to the amount determined under subsection (a) of section 501 multiplied by the ratio of such local government's general revenue from its own resources to the general revenue of all local governments in such State from their own resources.

(c) **Alternative distribution formula.**—Subsection (c) of section 501 provides that the Secretary shall accept an alternative formula for the distribution of funds, when filed by the State, provided such formula is approved by the State and by its general-purpose local governments.

Approval.

(1) **State.**—Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) provides that the alternative formula must be approved by the State in the same manner as authorized in such State's constitution for the enactment of its own laws.

(2) **General-purpose local governments.**—Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) provides that the alternative formula must be ap-

proved by a formal resolution by more than one-half of the governing bodies of each of the following classes of government in such State: (a) major municipalities, (b) counties, and (c) major townships. In each such class of government, approval must be by governing bodies representing a majority of the population in such class.

Filing.

The alternative formula must be filed not later than 90 days preceding the first calendar year quarter to which it would be applicable.

Period of effectiveness.

The provisions of the formula are effective for the period provided in such alternative formula or for a 5-year period, whichever is shorter.

Modification or termination of formula.

The alternative formula may be modified or terminated if such modification or termination is approved by the State and its local governments in the same manner as provided for adopting such formula.

(d) **Maintenance of existing payments.**—Subsection (d) of section 501 provides that, except when an alternative formula is adopted pursuant to section 501(c), a State's aggregate payments to all of its local governments for such State's fiscal year (from all sources other than amounts received under this Act) shall be an amount which represents not less than the average proportion of such State's general revenue received by its local governments for the three fiscal years of such State next preceding the date of enactment of this Act. A State may show to the satisfaction of the Secretary that it should not be required to meet this maintenance standard where there has been a transfer from local governments to the State of financial responsibility for direct support of facilities or services.

SECTION 601—QUALIFICATIONS

In general.—Section 601 provides that participation by any State in this Act is a waiver by any such State of its immunity from suit by its local governments pursuant to section 801. The Governor must give the Secretary such other assurances as he may require that the State and its local governments will use and account for such revenue sharing funds in accordance with this Act.

Governmental Purposes.

Subsection (a) provides that payments received pursuant to this Act shall be used for a State or local government's governmental purposes.

Accounting and disbursement.

Subsection (b) provides that a State and its local governments shall use procedures necessary to assure proper accounting for payments received under this Act and proper disbursement of amounts to which the local governments are entitled.

Compliance.

Subsection (c) provides that a State and its local governments must provide the Secretary, on reasonable notice, access to, and the right to examine any book, document, paper or record that he may reasonably require for the purpose of reviewing compliance with this Act.

Reports.

Subsection (d) provides that a State and its local governments shall make such reports to the Secretary as he may reasonably require, including any computations made pursuant to section 501.

SECTION 701—POWERS OF THE SECRETARY

(a) **Regulations.**—Subsection (a) of section 701 provides that the Secretary is authorized to prescribe reasonable rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this Act and to request from any Federal agency statistical data, reports and such other information as he may deem necessary for the purpose of carrying out his functions under this Act.

(b) **Failure of Compliance by State Government.**

In general. Subsection (b) of section 701 provides that if, after giving reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing, the Secretary determines that a State has failed to comply with any provision of the Act (other than section 1101) or any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto, he shall proceed as specified in this section.

Referral.

The Secretary may refer the matter to the Attorney General with a recommendation that appropriate action be taken.

Notification.

The Secretary may notify the Governor that if the State fails to take corrective action within 60 days from the date of a notification that it has failed to comply, further payments to such State in excess of the amounts to which the local governments of such State are entitled under section 501 will be withheld for the remainder of the fiscal year and for any subsequent fiscal year, until such time as the Secretary is satisfied that appropriate corrective action has been taken and that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is satisfied, the Secretary shall make no further payments of such amounts.

Cancellation of payments.

Section 701 also provides that if a State fails to comply for a period of six months after the expiration of a 60-day notice that its payments will be withheld, the Secretary shall cancel any payment withheld pursuant to subsection (b) for the current and for any subsequent fiscal year.

Reapportionment of payments. The Secretary shall reapportion any cancelled payments to all other States then entitled to receive payments under section 401 of this Act, in proportion to the original installments paid to such States for the fiscal year to which such cancelled payments pertain. Amounts redistributed to States pursuant to section 701 are considered payments made pursuant to section 401.

(c) *Payments to local governments.* Subsection (c) of section 701 provides that if payments to a State are withheld or cancelled pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall continue to pay to such State the amount to which the local governments of such State are entitled under section 501 (computed as if the payment to such State had been made) and such State shall continue to distribute such amount among its local governments.

(d) *Power of the Attorney General.* Subsection (d) provides that when a violation is referred to the Attorney General under section 701(b), he may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court for such relief as may be appropriate, including injunctive relief.

(e) *Failure of compliance by local government.*

In general.—Subsection (e) of section 701 provides that the Governor shall be responsible for determining that local governments within his State have complied with the requirements of this Act (other than section 1101) and the rules and regulations issued pursuant thereto.

Notice of failure of compliance. Subsection (e) also provides that if after giving reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the chief executive officer of a local government, a Governor determines that a local government within his State has failed to comply, he shall notify such local government that if it fails to take corrective action within 60 days from the date of such notification, further payments to such local government will be withheld for the remainder of the fiscal year and for any subsequent fiscal year until such time as he is satisfied that appropriate corrective action has been taken.

Notification to Secretary. The Governor shall notify the Secretary of his action.

(f) *Cancellation of payments.*—Subsec-

tion (f) provides that if a local government fails to comply for a period of six months after the expiration of the 60-day notice, the Governor shall cancel any payments withheld for the current and for any subsequent fiscal year.

Reapportionment. The Governor shall reapportion and pay any cancelled payment to all other local governments of such State then entitled to receive payments pursuant to section 501, in proportion to the original payments made to such local governments for the fiscal year to which the cancelled payments pertain.

SECTION 801.—JUDICIAL REVIEW

(a) *Filing of a petition for review.* Subsection (a) of section 801 provides that any State or local government which receives a 60-day notice under section 701 pursuant to a determination that payments to it will be withheld may, within 60 days after receiving such notice, file with the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which such State or local government is located, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, a petition for review of the Secretary's action. A copy of the petition shall be transmitted to the Secretary and the Attorney General.

(b) *Objections to Secretary's action.*—Subsection (b) of section 801 provides that no objection to the action of the Secretary shall be considered by the Court unless such objection has been urged before the Secretary.

(c) *Jurisdiction of Court.*—Subsection (c) of section 801 provides that the Court may affirm or modify the Secretary's action, or set it aside, in whole or in part.

Findings of fact.

The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. If any finding is not supported by substantial evidence, the Court may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new findings of fact and may modify his previous actions.

(d) *Review.*—Subsection (d) of section 801 provides that the judgment of the Court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification, as provided in section 1254 of Title 28 of the United States Code.

(e) *Cancellation of Payments.*—Subsection (e) of section 801 provides that, in the event that judicial proceedings are instituted pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall, after the expiration of the six months period provided in section 701 or the point at which any judicial decision becomes final, whichever is later, cancel, reapportion, and pay any payments withheld pursuant to section 701 for the current and any subsequent fiscal year.

(f) *The term "Secretary."*—Subsection (f) of section 801 provides that, for the purposes of section 801, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Governor of a State, whichever is appropriate.

SECTION 901.—REPORT BY THE SECRETARY

In general.—Section 901 provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to the President of the United States and the Congress, as soon as is practicable after the end of the fiscal year, on the operation of this Act during the preceding fiscal year.

SECTION 1001.—ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

In general.—Section 1001 authorizes an appropriation for general administrative expenses required by this Act.

1101.—NONDISCRIMINATION PROVISIONS

(a) *In general.* Subsection (a) of section 1101 provides that no person shall be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin under any program or activity funded in whole or in part with general revenue sharing funds.

(b) (1) *Failure of Compliance by State.*

When the Secretary determines that a State has failed to comply with this section, he shall attempt to secure compliance by voluntary means.

If the Secretary determines that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means, he may—(1) refer the matter to the Attorney General with a recommendation that appropriate civil action be instituted, (2) exercise the powers and functions provided by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d), or (3) take any other action as may be provided by law.

(2) *Failure of compliance by local government.*

When the Secretary determines that a local government has failed to comply with this section, he shall notify the Governor of the State in which the local government is located that the local government is in violation of this section and he shall request the Governor to secure compliance. If the State is unable or refuses to secure compliance, the Secretary may—(1) refer the matter to the Attorney General with a recommendation that appropriate action be instituted, (2) exercise the powers and functions provided by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d), or (3) take such other action as may be provided by law.

(d) *Power of the Attorney General.*

When a violation is referred to the Attorney General or whenever he has reason to believe that a State or local government is engaged in a pattern or practice in violation of provisions of this section, he may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court for such relief as may be appropriate, including injunctive relief.

SECTION 1201.—EFFECTIVE DATE

The effective date of this Act shall be the date of enactment. The first payment shall be for the period beginning October 1, 1971.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. GEORGE F. GRAF, OHIO NATIONAL GUARD

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

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding citizens of my home community, Gen. George F. Graf, of Findlay, Ohio, is retiring from the Ohio National Guard after a distinguished military career.

I mention this not only because of my close personal friendship with General Graf but mostly because I know my colleagues are interested in the record and achievements of men who have given so much of their lives in the defense and protection of our country.

General Graf has amassed an impressive list of accomplishments and honors both in his military and civic life. Too often our military leaders associate themselves solely with military activities. But General Graf has unselfishly responded at all times to the demands of his community. In many ways and in many fields he has worked for social, economic, and cultural improvement. Identification with such worthy causes commands the kind of respect which definitely increases the stature of a military leader.

The Armed Forces will lose the services of a valued officer with his retirement and I am hopeful that his record will be a standard for those who, in military or other involvements, are seeking a better America. I am also hopeful that my colleagues will share in the pride of

our local community over General Graf's accomplishments and join me in extending our gratitude and best wishes.

LINCOLN AND THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the campaign to abolish the electoral college method of choosing the President will undoubtedly be renewed in the near future. Joint resolutions providing for the submission of a constitutional amendment for consideration by the States have been reintroduced in the present Congress.

Both proponents and opponents will be interested in what Abraham Lincoln had to say on the subject. While a member of this great body from Illinois, he became acquainted with Patrick W. Tompkins, a fellow-Whig from Mississippi. Tompkins showed Lincoln a letter from Josephus Hewett, a Natchez lawyer who had formerly practiced in Springfield.

In a communication to his former fellow-townsmen dated February 3, 1848, from Washington, Congressman Lincoln put the case for retention of the electoral college tersely but adequately. The pertinent paragraph from his letter follows:

Your whig representative from Mississippi, P. W. Tompkins, has just shown me a letter of yours to him. . . . I was once of your opinion, expressed in your letter, that presidential electors should be dispensed with; but a more thorough knowledge of the causes that first introduced them, has made me doubt. Those causes were briefly these. The convention that framed the constitution had this difficulty: the small states wished to so frame the new government as that they might be equal to the large ones regardless of the inequality of population; the large ones insisted on equality in proportion to population. They compromised it, by basing the House of Representatives on population, and the Senate on states regardless of population; and the executive on both principles, by electors in each state, equal in numbers to her senators and representatives. Now, throw away the machinery of electors, and the compromise is broken up, and the whole yielded to the principle of the large states.

THE CURRENT OPERATION IN LAOS

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the current operation in Laos, which is being carried out by ARVN forces.

This long overdue operation is designed to cut the Communists' last major remaining supply line—the Ho Chi Minh Trail. The successful Cambodian operation, which closed the port of Sihanoukville to the Communists, has forced North Vietnam to become almost completely dependent on the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

Disruption of this supply line will protect the continued withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. To not have acted at this time, when the movement of supplies along the Ho Chi Minh

Trail is reaching a peak, would have enabled the enemy to inflict heavier casualties on our forces and would have slowed the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. Our failure to act would have permitted the North Vietnamese to continue with impunity to use Laos as a staging grounds for aggressive action in South Vietnam.

Finally, as the North Vietnamese aggressors come face to face with the improved fighting capability of the South Vietnamese forces, this may well have a sobering effect on the Communists. It may well cause Hanoi to see that they cannot succeed in their aggression and meaningful negotiations could commence to bring a lasting peace to Southeast Asia.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. In 1916 Einstein predicted the existence of gravity waves in his general theory of relativity. It was not until June 1969 that his theory was confirmed by Dr. Joseph Weber of the University of Maryland. Weber's resourcefulness and years of hard work and dedication led to the perfection of a system of gravity wave detectors which confirmed that signals he detected originating from the Milky Way Galaxy were gravitational waves. Just as the confirmation of the existence of electromagnetic waves over 80 years ago led to a scientific revolution so may the work of Joseph Weber open up the mysteries of our universe.

APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Economic Development of the Senate Public Works Committee has been conducting hearings this week on the authorization of funds for the Appalachian development program. In that 12 of the 13 counties in Ohio's 10th Congressional District are in the Appalachia region, I would like to share with my colleagues of the House the remarks I have offered the subcommittee outlining our experience with the Appalachia program. This brick-and-mortar type program has been most effective and important to Appalachia Ohio in solving the problems unique to our area and providing us with a Federal-State commitment which is necessary for the continued economic development of the area.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely grateful for this opportunity to express my views to this Subcommittee on the Appalachian Regional Development Program, a program which has

had a profound impact in the Tenth Congressional District of Ohio which I am privileged to represent.

I have noted that while many Senators on the Committee are familiar first hand with the results of this program in their own states, neither of the Senators from Ohio are on the Committee.

I want to take this opportunity to reinforce the evidence that the Appalachian Program has been successful by describing for you some of the results in Ohio's Tenth Congressional District.

There is no disputing the fact that in all too many instances the mountain counties in many of our Appalachian States have been orphans. For too long our hill counties were ignored by the State Capitol and the Federal Government. The one great virtue of the Appalachian Regional Development Program has been that through the unique political partnership of the Federal Government, the states, and the localities, these Grievances of the past have been remedied and we are now making good headway in meeting our needs and solving our problems.

Certainly in our district, we can point to a substantial turnaround in emphasis and attention from our State Capitol as well as the Federal Government.

But the great virtue of this program has been that it does not attempt to dictate to us from the top. Instead, we make our own plans and devise our own solutions at the local level and through the Appalachian Regional Commission, the State Government and the Federal Government join forces to help us get the job done.

Equally important from the point of view of Congress, the dollars under this program are not wasted but are spent in a very orderly and systematic way.

Much of the Tenth District has been isolated from the economic activity occurring in other parts of Ohio and nearby areas. Appalachian Development Highway Corridor "D" is being built through the heart of our district to eliminate that isolation. When the highway is finished, we will be on one of the main arteries linking the St. Louis and Cincinnati areas to Washington and Baltimore, and we expect to reap many economic benefits as a result.

We are getting ready for the expected impact which that highway will have by attempting to upgrade the abilities of our work force through improved health and education.

It would be impossible to adequately describe in the short time available the dramatic improvement in vocational education in our district which has been made possible under the Appalachian Program.

Fortunately, since the Appalachian Act was passed in 1965, Ohio has adopted a new state vocational education program. So our progress in vocational education has accelerated even more and no small share of the credit goes to the Appalachian Program.

We have built two major area vocational and technical centers in Southeastern Ohio with Appalachian funds. The new Tri-County Joint Vocational High School and Technical Institute at Nelsonville, Ohio, has been in operation for two years. Student response has been so enthusiastic that we now find that the facility is not large enough. The school was planned for 300 11th and 12th grade students. The first year, 450 were enrolled and the second year, 600. Applicants have come from all parts of Appalachian Ohio and neighboring West Virginia.

The demand for entrance to the post-high school Technical Institute has been just as great. Instead of the expected 100 applicants in the first year we had 265 full-time and 150 part-time students enrolled. And this year there are 541 full-time students.

Perhaps we can appreciate the enormous success of this new center when I point out that it was the first facility of its kind in the entire state.

Of the 225 students from outside the tri-county school district, we have students from 68 of Ohio's 88 counties and four West Virginia counties.

We have a big program for adults during the evenings. Over 950 adults have taken advantage of the courses during the two years the center has been open. Because of the demands of the students, the curriculum has been steadily expanded so that we now have courses in practical nursing, forestry, and business and management, in addition to all the other courses originally planned for the center.

At the Technical Institute, associate degrees are offered in electrical engineering data processing and computer technology, secretarial occupations, industrial engineering, mechanical engineering, accounting, environmental health, and retail hotel-motel management. The forestry course is the first such two-year course in the State of Ohio. Students in the school are prepared to build a motel-restaurant complex for training people in motel and hotel management. I might add that the school has just been named one of the nation's ten outstanding vocational and technical educational institutions by the U. S. Office of Education.

As I pointed out, the Nelsonville vocational education center was the first to open in our area and has served as a model for others in the State. Since then, a second one has opened in our district, the Muskingum Vocational Technical School in Zanesville. That facility will train students from 11 school districts and technical training will be available for students from five counties.

These centers are playing a key role in our development plans for the area.

For example, the Appalachian Regional Commission has just funded at the Nelsonville School, a new Human Resources Development Center which will assist the area in designing a comprehensive program for correcting many of its manpower problems.

So far, we have identified 15 separate manpower needs in the area and soon we hope to be undertaking programs in those fields. These include programs to improve the educational skills of adults; upgrade job capabilities of many of our unemployed people; education and training programs for employed workers in order to enable them to advance in their jobs; a new approach to pre-professional education for high school youth; new services for pre-school children so that they can compete on an equal footing when they enter the school system; new health and nutrition services for students in our schools; new health manpower training programs; and a new program for the mentally handicapped.

Emphasis on improving health conditions has been just as great. There are many communities in our area where there are no doctors younger than 55. We are facing a very real and serious problem with the shortage of medical manpower. The only doctor in one of our counties has made plans to relocate. It has been difficult to recruit physicians into many of our communities because of the lack of adequate facilities.

However, in seven counties of Southeastern Ohio with a population of nearly 213,000 people, local leadership united in an Ohio Valley Health Foundation supported with Appalachian funds over the last three years has been demonstrating a new approach to making available adequate health services to the people of the area. With a large measure of help under the Appalachian Program, eight hospitals have been constructed or are nearing completion along with facilities for extended care and outreach. Thus, with Appalachian assistance, modern facilities are being provided not only to serve the people in our section of the State, but also to provide modern medical services to those across the river in West Virginia. These are truly region-serving facilities. With ARC assist-

ance we are providing the type of facilities and service so necessary and vital to attract physicians.

Great strides have been made in providing speech, hearing, and visual screening programs for children. With help from the Appalachian Program, a mental retardation program is underway. Both the retardation and the screening programs are designed to detect incapacities among children before they reach the stage where costlier remedial treatment is necessary or, unfortunately, where even such protracted care comes too late.

Since 1968—less than three years ago—the Appalachian Program has provided approximately \$8.6 million for improving health conditions in our area.

There are many other ways this program has brought new hope to Appalachia Ohio.

I understand Governor Moore of West Virginia has already described to you the outstanding leadership of the Appalachian Regional Commission in constructing a new bridge across the Ohio River after the tragic collapse of the Silver Bridge a few years ago; a terrible incident which caused tremendous loss of life and serious disruption of commerce.

The Commission actually advanced \$2 million to get the bridge under construction as soon as possible. And today people in the Point Pleasant, West Virginia-Gallipolis, Ohio, area can once again move back and forth across the river between West Virginia and Ohio, thanks to that effort.

Appalachian investments have been used to promote industrial development in the area. We have also used Appalachian help to develop some of our superb recreational potential. A brand new park facility with modern accommodations and a lodge has opened in my district, and the Commission has provided assistance in constructing an access road to the lodge.

Under Section 205 of the Act, the Commission has helped us reclaim several abandoned strip mine areas so that they could be used for recreation.

These experiences in our district have persuaded me that, under the Appalachian Act, we have found a way to unite the different levels of government in a new kind of partnership under which we can develop coordinated approaches to local problems.

It would be tragic to stop these efforts just as they are getting started; if anything they should be encouraged and expanded.

I am in favor of increased flexibility to enable the Appalachian Regional Commission to do more in the field of educational improvement.

If the Commission can accomplish the same kind of results in improving primary and secondary education and higher education as it has vocational education, our Region and the Nation will greatly benefit. I earnestly recommend that this Committee consider giving the Commission some additional flexibility in coping with other educational problems in the Appalachian Region.

I would also urge this Committee to seriously consider improving the flexibility of the Commission to deal with the many environmental problems which plague our Region. We are an area which in the past has suffered great damage from coal mining and mine acid drainage, from logging, from industrial and municipal pollution of our waterways, and from air pollution.

I believe the Commission has demonstrated an unusual capability and commitment to work with the States and localities in developing comprehensive approaches to such problems without being confined by the narrow requirements of categorical grants-in-aid.

This Committee has frequently described the Appalachian Program as an experiment

and the Appalachian Region as a national laboratory. I fully agree.

And it would seem to me to be in the best national interest to carry the experiment forward and to grant the Commission broader authority to deal with the problems of our Region and, thereby, develop improved techniques for dealing with these many complex social, economic, and physical problems—techniques which could well be applied to other sections of the country.

We would win a double bonus:

A more productive Region adding still greater contributions to the national economy.

Well-tested approaches that could be applied in other sections of the United States.

UNAUTHORIZED USE OF NAMES BY EAST-WEST TRADE MISSION

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, recently a private organization, the East-West Trade Mission located in San Francisco, conducted a mailing to a great many people throughout the country. The purpose of this mailing was to solicit participants for an alleged trip to Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, and into Communist China.

My name was listed on the letterhead of this solicitation as a member of the organization's advisory board. Three other Members of Congress, Congressman ROBERT LEGGETT, Senator WALTER MONDALE, and Senator CHARLES PERCY were similarly listed on the letterhead.

Mr. Speaker, in fact none of us had ever authorized the use of our names in connection with this enterprise. We were neither advisers to this group nor sponsors of the proposed trip.

Naturally, we were all extremely concerned about this misuse of our names. I have sent the following letter to Mr. Paul Sjeklocha of the East-West Trade Mission:

Mr. PAUL SJEKLOCHA,
East-West Trade Mission,
World Trade Center,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. SJEKLOCHA: As you know, the use of my name in connection with your recent mailing to solicit members for a trip to China, the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia was completely unauthorized.

I have never in any way associated myself with your mission as an advisor or sponsor and consider it imperative that immediate steps be taken to inform all of the people you contacted about the unauthorized use of my name.

This position, as you are aware, is shared by my colleagues in Congress, Senator Walter Mondale, Senator Charles Percy and Congressman Robert Leggett, all of whose names were also used without any authorization.

It is my intention to work closely with Senators Mondale and Percy and Congressman Leggett to see that all possible steps are taken to correct this situation.

Very truly yours,

SILVIO O. CONTE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Congressman LEGGETT, Senator MONDALE, and Senator PERCY have also expressed their concern to Mr. Sjeklocha and we are presently taking all possible steps to contact everyone who received this solici-

tion and inform them that we did not give permission for our names to be used, are not members of the so-called Advisory Board, and do not have any connection with this enterprise.

THE CATERPILLAR CO. AND OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

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

Mr. MICHEL, Mr. Speaker, the Caterpillar Tractor Co., headquartered in my hometown of Peoria, Ill., recently issued its annual report for 1970. This report reveals some important facts about Caterpillar which I believe will be of major interest to my colleagues, for it shows the extent of this company's contributions to our national economy as well as to our overall balance-of-payments situation.

The report states that sales of \$2.1 billion in 1970 exceeded all previous records, and were 6 percent higher than in 1969. Sales outside the United States reached an all-time high of \$1.1 billion and provided a record \$791 million favorable contribution to our balance of payments. This is \$104 million higher than the 1969 total of \$687 million. The total Caterpillar contribution for the past 10 years has been \$4.7 billion.

The outstanding success of this company which employs more than 50,000 persons here in the United States has been due in large measure to the quality of its management. Recognition of this fact came last year when Caterpillar was selected by a survey of the chief executives of 2,300 major U.S. corporations as one of the 10 best-managed companies in the United States. The selection was made in response to a poll conducted by "Dun's Review," a monthly magazine of business and industry.

Each of the 10 companies was chosen for what the voters deemed to be its most distinguishing characteristic. Caterpillar's selection was based on "the image of quality that has always characterized its products, and the major contribution this has made to its revenues and profits."

Among its other accomplishments, Caterpillar states that it was the first in the industry to have its truck engines certified as meeting applicable Federal smoke emission standards, and that these engines already meet standards adopted by California, effective January 1, 1973, relating to gaseous emissions from diesel truck engines.

The annual report also points out that Caterpillar's efforts to employ, train, and upgrade members of minority groups continued last year, and renewed emphasis was placed on the elimination of discrimination in all aspects of employment.

In addition, the report notes that a new record of safety in Caterpillar plants was set in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, in the context of our present concern over the state of the economy and our continuing problems with the balance of trade and especially our balance of payments, the report from

Caterpillar is both encouraging and refreshing. The ongoing successful operation of this company and the many others like it, large and small, provide solid evidence of the strength and viability of our private enterprise system and the basic soundness of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD a news item on a statement by Caterpillar board chairman William Blackie, calling for changes in international monetary policies.

The item follows:

THE CATERPILLAR CO. AND OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

A Caterpillar Tractor Co. executive today (February 1, 1971) called for changes in monetary policies among nations, including an orderly system for foreign exchange rate adjustments.

William Blackie, chairman of the board, said it is particularly important to correct the undervaluation of the Japanese yen in relationship to the U.S. dollar. Appropriate adjustment should have the effect of reducing the pressures for quotas, tariff increases or other forms of interference with international trade while also reducing some of the hostility which presently tends to impair U.S.-Japanese relations.

The adjustment could be made by revaluation of the yen or by devaluation of the dollar, he said. He pointed out, however, that devaluation of the dollar is not practical because it is the basis of many other international currency relationships.

Blackie said that actions taken by several major trading nations since 1967 have been of great importance to international commerce.

He cited the devaluation of the pound sterling by Great Britain in 1967; the establishment of a new value for the franc by France and the deutsche mark by West Germany in 1969; and Canada's present policy of allowing the exchange value of its dollar to "float."

"Among those countries which have made no adjustment in modern times, none could now do so to greater international advantage than Japan," Blackie said.

"Since parity for the yen was established at 360 to the U.S. dollar in May, 1958, Japan has become one of the world's most highly developed industrial and commercial nations—trading aggressively and freely wherever its goods can penetrate foreign markets. This it has usually been able to do on the basis of prices lower than those of competitive indigenous alternatives. And insofar as such lower prices may be the result of higher work productivity, superior management, or more effective industrial discipline, the Japanese should be entitled to earn the benefits.

"It can hardly be claimed, however, that they are also entitled to obtain extraordinary competitive advantage on the basis of out-moded foreign exchange rates," Blackie said.

"The time has come when the conditions of multilateral reciprocal trade established under the terms of the GATT should and can be complemented by a multilateral reciprocal system for establishing and adjusting monetary exchange values.

"Such a system should permit exchange rates to move in relation to each other timeously and, therefore, gradually—in a rational, interpretable manner. It should recognize that there is no such thing as 'stability' unless it is to be found in an orderly system of continuous revision. Too often in the past, needed adjustments have been too late and, therefore, too drastic—undertaken only under the compulsive threat of monetary or political crisis," he said.

Blackie pointed out that Caterpillar has not been waiting for actions by governments or others—at home or abroad—to foster its international business. "On the contrary, it

has over the years established and now has in being a strategic deployment of resources outside the United States."

He also said that "in each case where Caterpillar has established overseas production in a selected country, the volume of sales has increased within that country for both the particular Caterpillar products made in it and those exported to it from the U.S."

Blackie said international business cannot be considered only in terms of trade, but that consideration must be given also to foreign investment.

"Appropriate recognition of this would suggest greater caution in the continuance of the so-called 'temporary' controls now in effect for U.S. direct foreign investment. Whether they have been helpful or harmful is now beside the point. The time has come when they should be removed—if for no other reason—because the United States can no longer count with assurance on its ability to generate a surplus on its balance of trade. If there is to be a favorable balance of payments, there should, accordingly, be more adequate recognition of the need for and the long-term advantages of a substantial flow from the return on foreign investments."

THE CONSUMER AGRICULTURAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1971

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. Speaker, ever since my election to the Congress, and before, I have actively and personally worked to improve agriculture, particularly the working and living conditions of farmworkers.

Our Nation depends on agriculture—nutritionally and economically. Agriculture is our Nation's No. 1 industry.

In the 91st Congress I introduced comprehensive legislation to establish a National Farm Labor Relations Board. I have again introduced this proposal. During the past few months I have watched many farmworkers and their families suffer grievous injury; farmers and processors lose money; and poor, innocent consumers deprived of nutritious food at reasonable cost; because of the agriculture strikes and boycotts. This must stop.

Disruptions of the agriculture process, especially of harvests, are quite different from disruptions of a manufacturing process. Assembly lines can often stop and steel ingots and automobiles can be stored or inventoried for weeks without deterioration—as a matter of fact, with an increase in value. No man, group, or Government can stem the inexorable process of fruit and vegetable growth and maturation. A strawberry, for instance, must be picked, processed, and packaged within hours of maturity or spoilage begins and losses accelerate.

Agricultural losses are compounded when the processes are interrupted. Spoiled crops must be picked, or disked under, at additional costs, even though they are useless. Vegetables that spoil after harvest while stalled en route to market, for instance, must be disposed of, as garbage, usually at great cost and without any recoupment.

Farmworkers can least afford a harvesttime strike, because after the crops mature, there is no work until the next

harvest—which may be months away. Also, harvesttime provides special opportunities for extra work—overtime, additional jobs, longer shifts; when extra work is available, the work stoppages are extraordinarily disastrous.

Obviously an entirely different legal and administrative mechanism—other than the one presently used in settlement of industrial disputes—is necessary for the settlement of disputes in agriculture and the food processing industry. A unique need is certain—there can be no strike, slowdown, or lockout at harvesttime.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my proposal accomplishes this. In lieu of strikes and lockouts, I have proposed a Board of Negotiation to expedite and guarantee the fair settlement of all farm labor disputes. This independent board encourages each party to negotiate expeditiously and reasonably to settlement. When disputes arise, one party files a petition and appoints one arbitrator; the other party also names an arbitrator. These two then designate three neutral persons to a five-man Board of Negotiation. If the parties do not reach an agreement within 30 days, the Board publicly announces the best proposal of each party, that is, the proposal of each party which is more favorable to the other side. If no agreement is reached within 5 additional days the Board selects the more reasonable of the two proposals, which then becomes part of the labor contract and enforceable by law.

This mechanism will permit the parties to bargain freely; it will provide strong incentives for the parties to bargain promptly and reasonably. It is essential that labor contract negotiations be more public—the terms and proposals should be known to all involved, while maintaining safeguards for secret ballot elections.

My bill should not only be of great interest to my colleagues who represent agricultural districts, but it should also be of interest to those who represent urban and suburban areas who have a consumer constituency. The disruption of the harvest and orderly flow of agricultural products from the farm to the consumer is wasteful, costly, and injurious not only to the farmworker and the farmer, but to every consumer.

Because time is of the essence, I urge members of the House Education and Labor Committee to schedule early hearings on my proposal, not only in Washington, but in California where they will be able to hear firsthand testimony from those directly affected by farm labor disputes. Adoption of my bill can settle farm labor disputes in a manner more fitting for our civilized society. We must eliminate the present barbaric and outmoded strike techniques.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INTER-STATE SALES AND USE TAX ACT

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) has joined me in introducing a bill to provide a uniform system for the application of State and local sales and use taxes to transactions in interstate commerce. Its title is "The Interstate Sales and Use Tax Act."

This bill is introduced in order to focus attention directly on the basic issues involved in the application of State and local sales and use taxes to interstate business in a manner that will avoid the confusion of considering the application of other taxes that are, in fact, unrelated. I desire to provide an opportunity for the consideration and debate of these issues on their individual merits.

In the decade since Congress first directed that a study be made of interstate taxation there have been some very significant developments. First, it has become clear, beyond any reasonable doubt, that an attempt to resolve all interstate tax problems by the adoption of a single set of jurisdictional standards is unrealistic and does not recognize the intrinsic differences between sales and use taxes and corporate income taxes. The disregard of this principle has contributed very substantially to the controversy existing in the field of interstate taxation.

In this same decade there have been a number of significant developments in the application of sales and use taxes to interstate transactions that render irrelevant much of the previous testimony in support of Federal legislation in this field.

For example, the Supreme Court has dealt conclusively with catalog and mail order sales which were the subject of extended testimony and debate. On other issues the States have voluntarily acted to provide uniformity where it was previously lacking.

The one development, however, that stands out so boldly has been the widespread realization among national and local businessmen, economists, and experts in public finance, as well as State and local tax officials, that it is essential that we distinguish basic differences in jurisdictional rules applicable to sales and use taxes from those applicable to the corporation income tax. Since the first interstate taxation bill was introduced in 1965, there has been a steadily increasing recognition of the inequity and unsoundness of attempting to apply the principle of Public Law 86-272 to the collection of sales and use taxes. This conclusion has been for reasons well founded in both logic and efficacy.

The purpose of Public Law 86-272 is to reduce the tax compliance burden on interstate sellers by simplifying the allocation of income among States. This is achieved by precluding the apportionment of income for net income tax purposes by any State in which a multistate seller does no more than solicit orders for acceptance at and shipment from an out-of-State point. No matter what the merits of Public Law 86-272 for corporation income tax purposes, its application to sales and use taxes would have disastrous consequences.

If the principles of that law were applied to sales and use taxes, the multi-State seller would be free of tax obligations even though he maintains an unlimited number of salesmen in a State, so long as he had no place of business in that State and the orders taken were filled by shipments from outside the State. The tax loss to State and local governments, at rates of 5 percent or more in many States, would be substantial. Of even greater concern is the very significant competitive advantage that would be granted to out-of-State sellers over local retailers. This tax advantage would lead to further penetration of local markets by the vendors given such tax immunity.

A different situation exists in the application of Public Law 86-272 to income taxes. The tax loss to any State is measured by net income from sales. Discrimination against local business is therefore less significant.

Beneficiaries of the proposed immunity from collection of sales and use taxes will include many very large multi-state businesses. For example, a full-page advertisement appearing in the July 1969 issue of *Fortune* states that for the 15th consecutive year the advertiser is the world's largest direct seller of fashion jewelry and that every 12 seconds of every working day a home jewelry show of its products is held somewhere in the United States. With little or no adjustment of sales methods, sales by this company would be immune from sales or use tax collection in virtually every State if the principles of Public Law 86-272 are applied to sales and use taxes. It obviously would be impossible for any State to collect the use tax due from each of the customers of this company.

To further illustrate the fiscal and competitive consequences if Congress were to extend the principle of Public Law 86-272 to sales and use taxes, I submit an exhibit compiled from the records of the California State Board of Equalization. It shows the type of business activities engaged in by some of the companies that would be exonerated from responsibility for collection of sales and use taxes. These 22 companies annually make over \$37 million of sales through solicitation by sales representatives within California. Nationwide, their sales run into hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

I propose to provide the Congress, businessmen, consumers, and State tax officials alike, with the opportunity to consider a uniform system for the application of sales and use taxes in interstate commerce which is based on the premise that there are some problems in the sales and use tax field that are different from those found in the income tax field, and consequently they require different solutions.

The bill which I have introduced utilizes to the fullest the work already done by the committees of the Congress. In fact, it largely follows the framework of Congressman ROBINO's bill which was passed in the last session of Congress by this House, but with two major differences. The remedial provisions of my bill are directed exclusively to the solu-

tion of today's interstate sales and use tax problems, and it retains the time-tested sales and use tax jurisdiction based on sales solicitation within the State.

The presence of sales personnel within a State provides the most logical jurisdictional standard. Sales people make sales, with or without fixed business locations, in direct competition, to local merchants, and the courts have recognized their presence within a State provides a rational nexus between the benefits derived and the tax collection burden assumed by the seller.

My proposal, however, does recognize the problem of the proliferation of non-uniform local taxing jurisdictions as it limits the use tax collection responsibility of out-of-State sellers based on solicitation only within the State to uniform State administered local taxes. In order for nonuniform local tax laws to impose seller collection duties, the seller must have a business location in the jurisdiction, or must make regular deliveries into the jurisdiction other than by common carrier or U.S. mail. This requirement is similar to the provisions of previously submitted bills by Representative RODINO and Senator RIBICOFF. Thus, it is clearly possible to greatly reduce use tax collection burdens for interstate vendors while retaining the well established jurisdictional standards for State administered taxes.

Mr. Speaker, in developing this bill I am greatly indebted, and wish to give credit, to the Chamber of Commerce of the State of California, the California Manufacturer's Association, the California Retailer's Association, and the State Board of Equalization, whose study and expertise in large measures made this bill possible. In addition, Governor Reagan and his administration have given this measure their active support.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of the bill in the RECORD, together with the exhibit prepared by the California State Board of Equalization, and an explanatory statement containing a section-by-section analysis of this Interstate Sales and Use Tax Act:

SALES AND USE TAX JURISDICTIONAL LIMITATIONS IN PROPOSED FEDERAL INTERSTATE TAXATION ACTS

California based businesses would be at a competitive disadvantage with out-of-state sellers if the jurisdictional limitations provided in Public Law 86-272 were applied to the Sales and Use Tax Law.

Proposals for "Interstate Taxation Acts" previously submitted in both houses of Congress (Representative McCulloch), (Representative Rodino), (Senator Mathias), (Senator Ribicoff), provided tax shelters to interstate sellers, and would cause substantial loss of California income taxes and state and local sales and use taxes.

Among other things, each of the proposed bills imposed arbitrary and unreasonable jurisdictional standards on state and local government, jeopardized collection of local taxes under the California Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law, and created inequities in the apportionment of corporate income for California income tax purposes.

Common to all the bills is the jurisdictional limitation applicable to sales and use taxes. Specifically, the California Sales and Use Tax Law presently provides that an out-

of-state retailer shall collect the use tax if it has an office, warehouse, representative, agent, salesman, canvasser or solicitor in this state. Under the proposed bills, this requirement would not apply to interstate retailers unless they maintain a business location in this state or regularly make household deliveries in this state.

To illustrate the widespread tax and competitive impact of this restriction, we have selected the following typical businesses from the many that make California sales without maintaining a fixed place of business or inventory within the state. If the jurisdictional limits of Public Law 86-272, or those set forth in previously proposed "Interstate Taxation Acts," were applied to the Sales and Use Tax Law, most of these businesses would be exempt from tax collection requirements with no change in their operations. The remainder would qualify for exemption with a minimal change in their method of delivery.

1. This firm sells ready-to-wear dresses. Sales personnel within California obtain "hostesses" to arrange a "social party." A "stylist" attends the party and exhibits sample garments. Orders are submitted by the "stylist" to, and are filled from, a point outside the state by a combined shipment to the "hostess." State and local sales and use taxes in California for the fiscal year 1967-1968 totalled \$403,500. This firm would no longer be subject to sales tax, nor required to collect the use tax. This translates into sales in excess of \$8 million in direct competition with California retailers.

2. A shoe manufacturer makes sales in California through commission salesmen direct to consumer customers. California sales for the fiscal year ended 6-30-68 amounted to \$350,000 with tax paid in excess of \$17,000.

3. A shoe manufacturing firm sells through sales representatives on a house-to-house basis. This firm paid tax of more than \$48,000 on sales of \$960,000.

4. A company sells household utensils, pots, pans, etc., through independent representatives to consumer customers on a house-to-house basis. Sales last year exceeded a quarter million dollars, with a tax payment in excess of \$12,500.

5. This business is conducted by two related corporations. One sells jewelry, the other sells cosmetics, through solicitors operating within California. Their annual state and local sales and use taxes aggregate \$175,000. Under the proposed federal restriction, \$3,500,000 of sales with local solicitation would not subject the companies to the California Sales and Use Tax Laws.

6. A large greeting card firm has independent sales solicitors taking orders from consumer customers in California. Last year's volume of sales in California was almost a half million dollars, with tax paid of \$24,900.

7. A firm sells educational books through commission salesmen on a door-to-door basis. Sales made were in excess of \$525,000, tax paid of \$25,300.

8. Another firm sells Bibles, for all denominations, on a door-to-door basis through commissioned salesmen. Sales for last year totalled more than \$460,000, and tax paid exceeded \$23,000.

9. A firm engaged in the sale of books, magazines, and record albums, has agents located in California who operate from their homes. These agents solicit orders which are filled, and shipped from a point outside the state direct to the purchaser. It would be discharged from further liability on \$7,500,000 of annual sales on which it now pays \$375,000 in taxes. An affiliated corporation of this firm does maintain offices in California. It would be an easy matter to direct all publications of a nontaxable nature through the corporation maintaining an office in the state, and all taxable publications, and other items

of a taxable nature, through the corporation with no office in the state. The enactment of this legislation would provide the opportunity for tax avoidance.

10. A firm with independent sales representatives sells dry goods direct to consumer customers. This firm's sales last year fell just short of \$500,000, and they paid tax of \$24,350.

11. A correspondence school makes sales of educational material and school supplies directly to the student through independent sales representatives. Annual sales in California totalled \$732,000, with tax payable of \$36,600.

12. A corporation makes direct sales of general merchandise to credit card holders of large national firms. Individual sales amounts are small, however, the volume is quite large with last year's sales exceeding \$450,000, and payment of tax in the amount of \$22,700.

13. This firm has 20 photographic salesmen in California who take and sell pictures to students and schools. Annual sales exceed \$800,000, with a tax liability of \$40,650.

14. This manufacturer is engaged in the sale of desks and public seating equipment to many vendees within the state. Sales are made by resident salesmen. Tax paid last year was in excess of \$37,000.

15. This firm supplies prescription lenses, frames, and accessories to optometrists and oculists. All sales are made through resident salesmen. The sales to California purchasers in the last fiscal year amounted to \$1,252,000, with a tax liability of \$62,600.

Four additional optical firms making sales in the same manner as described above made sales in the amount of \$1,600,000, with a total tax paid of \$79,000.

16. A manufacturer and seller of yearbooks makes sales through representatives without offices to students and schools. The tax paid amounts to \$110,000.

17. Another publisher of yearbooks makes sales of these and other specialty publications in the same manner as indicated in number sixteen. Their sales are also to students and schools. The tax revenue from this account is \$120,000 per year.

18. Another company has independent sales agents soliciting orders for their products which are advertising specialties, executive gifts, metal signs, etc. This firm paid tax of \$27,050 on sales of \$540,000.

19. This taxpayer operates in California through resident salesmen making sales of uniforms to various employers and organizations throughout the state. All sales are made through taxpayer's sales representatives. California taxable sales during the last fiscal year exceeded one quarter of a million dollars.

20. A manufacturer and seller of rubber processing machinery and garbage disposers make sales as a result of solicitation by sales representatives, with no office maintained in this state. Sales for last year totalled \$1,600,000, and tax paid of \$80,000.

21. A supplier of industrial chemicals and disinfectants made sales through resident salesmen in excess of \$2,000,000 last year, and paid tax in the amount of \$110,000.

22. This firm is a manufacturer of industrial mixers. Most of its sales are to bakeries and other food processing industries. Orders are solicited by an independent sales representative. Sales for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968, exceeded \$500,000, with total tax paid in excess of \$25,000.

Sales made by the first twelve firms are direct to consumer customers who are not normally registered with the state for the purpose of reporting or paying sales or use taxes. The individual sales amounts would be so minimal as to preclude any pursuit of the consumer customer for payment of the tax. The absolute loss of revenue as a result of this legislation, from

these accounts would amount to almost \$1,200,000 annually.

At least a part of the sales of the last ten of the listed accounts are made to purchasers engaged in business in California. For this reason, some part of the tax now collected and paid to the state by these vendors would be paid directly to the state by purchasers otherwise required to file sales and use tax returns. The greater percentage, however, would be lost. The greater cost of collecting tax from purchasers would further limit the net tax yield from sales by these firms.

In addition to sellers which would be immediately excused from compliance with the California Sales and Use Tax Law, there are many others who could easily arrange to come within the protection of the Public Law 86-272. Some examples follow:

A large publishing firm presently maintains sales offices in California but does not carry stock of goods within the state. Orders are obtained by personal solicitation within California, and shipments are made from a point outside the state. Last year this publisher paid over \$400,000 in state and local sales and use taxes in California. The mere closing of the sales offices would exempt the publisher from this liability.

A firm making sales of incentive programs and related materials maintains one sales office in California. Taxable sales reported by this organization last year amounted to \$4,400,000, with a payment of \$220,000 in tax. The closing or relocation of this single sales office would eliminate the need for this firm to pay any tax.

A mail order shoe retailer has agents in California soliciting orders which are filled from a point outside the state. Sales are in excess of \$800,000 per year. An office maintained in Los Angeles could easily be closed and relieve this seller of further tax liability.

The passage of legislation containing jurisdictional limits defined in Public Law 86-272 would provide the out-of-state retailer with a distinct competitive advantage over the California retailer. The limiting jurisdictional factors, which would permit unlimited direct sales solicitation within the state without tax liability, would encourage many out-of-state sellers who presently are not making sales in California, to engage in such sales activity due to the lucrative market represented by California consumer customers.

H.R. —

A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a uniform system for the application of sales and use taxes to interstate commerce

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Interstate Sales and Use Tax Act".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I—JURISDICTION TO TAX

Sec. 101. Uniform sales and use tax jurisdictional standard.

TITLE II—UNIFORM RULES FOR APPLICATION OF TAX

Sec. 201. Reduction of multiple taxation.

Sec. 202. Exemption for household goods, including motor vehicles, in the case of persons who establish residence.

Sec. 203. Treatment of transportation charges with respect to interstate sales.

Sec. 204. Liability of sellers on exempt sales.

Sec. 205. Local sales and use taxes.

TITLE III—DEFINITIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Sales tax.

Sec. 302. Use tax.

Sec. 303. Sale; sales price; purchase price.

Sec. 304. Interstate sale.

Sec. 305. Destination.

Sec. 306. Business location.

Sec. 307. Location of employee.

Sec. 308. State.

Sec. 309. State law.

PART B. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 321. Prohibition against geographical discrimination.

Sec. 322. Prohibition against out-of-State audit charges.

Sec. 323. Permissible taxes.

Sec. 324. Reciprocal collection agreements.

Sec. 325. Liability with respect to unassessed taxes.

Sec. 326. Effective dates.

TITLE I—JURISDICTION TO TAX

SEC. 101. UNIFORM SALES AND USE TAX JURISDICTIONAL STANDARD.

No State or political subdivision thereof shall have power to impose a sales tax or to require a person to collect a sales or use tax with respect to an interstate sale of tangible personal property for delivery in the State unless the person—

(1) has a business location in the State, or
(2) regularly solicits orders for the sale of tangible personal property by salesmen, solicitors, or representatives in the State, unless his activity in the State consists solely of solicitation by direct mail or advertising via newspapers, radio, or television, or

(3) regularly engages in the delivery of property in the State other than by common carrier or United States mail.

A State or political subdivision shall have power, subject to the provisions of Sections 201, 205 and 324 of this Act, to impose a sales tax, or, to require seller collection of a sales or use tax with respect to an interstate sale of tangible personal property, if it is not denied power to do so under the preceding sentence.

TITLE II—UNIFORM RULES FOR APPLICATION OF TAX

SEC. 201. REDUCTION OF MULTIPLE TAXATION.

(a) LOCATION OF SALES.—A State or political subdivision thereof may impose a sales tax or require a seller to collect a sales or use tax with respect to an interstate sale of tangible personal property only if the destination of the sale is—

(1) in that State, or
(2) in a contiguous State or political subdivision of a contiguous State for which the tax is required to be collected under reciprocal collection agreements as authorized under Section 324 of this Act.

(b) CREDIT FOR PRIOR TAXES.—The amount of any use tax imposed with respect to tangible personal property shall be reduced by the amount of any sales or use tax previously incurred and paid by a person with respect to the property on account of liability to another State or political subdivision thereof.

(c) REFUND.—A person who pays a use tax imposed with respect to tangible personal property shall be entitled to a refund from the State or political subdivision thereof imposing the tax, up to the amount of the tax so paid, for any sales or use tax subsequently paid with respect to the same property on account of prior liability to another State or political subdivision thereof.

(d) LIMITATION ON CREDIT FOR PRIOR TAXES.—A credit or refund otherwise permitted under subsections (b) and (c) shall not be allowed with respect to taxes which are measured by periodic payments made under a lease to the extent that the taxes imposed by the other State or political subdivision thereof were also measured by periodic payments made under a lease for a period prior to the possession, storage, use, or other consumption of the property in the

State or political subdivision thereof imposing the tax.

(e) VEHICLES AND MOTOR FUELS.—

(1) VEHICLES.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall affect the power of a State or political subdivision thereof to impose or require the collection of a sales or use tax with respect to vehicles that are registered in the State.

(2) FUELS.—Nothing in this section shall affect the power of a State or political subdivision thereof to impose or require the collection of a sales or use tax with respect to motor fuels consumed in the State.

SEC. 202. EXEMPTIONS FOR HOUSEHOLD GOODS, MOTOR VEHICLES, IN THE CASE OF PERSONS WHO ESTABLISH RESIDENCE.

No State or political subdivision thereof may impose a sales tax, use tax, or other non-recurring tax measured by cost or value with respect to household goods, including motor vehicles, brought into the State by a person who establishes residence in that State if the goods were acquired and used by that person ninety days or more before use of the property in the State in which he establishes such residence.

SEC. 203. TREATMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CHARGES WITH RESPECT TO INTERSTATE SALES.

Where the freight charges or other charges for transporting tangible personal property from the seller or supplier directly to the purchaser incidental to an interstate sale are separately stated in writing by the seller to the purchaser, to the extent that such charges do not exceed a reasonable charge for transportation by facilities of the seller or the charge for the transportation by the carrier when the transportation is by other than the seller's facilities, no State or political subdivision may include such charges in the measure of a sales or use tax imposed with respect to the sale or use of the property.

SEC. 204. LIABILITY OF SELLERS ON EXEMPT SALES.

No seller shall be liable for the collection or payment of a sales or use tax with respect to an interstate sale of tangible personal property if the purchaser of such property furnishes or has furnished to the seller a certificate or other written form of evidence indicating the basis for exemption, or the reason the seller is not required to pay or collect the tax. Any such certificate or writing shall given the name and address of the purchaser, his registration number, if any, and shall be signed by the purchaser or his representative.

SEC. 205. LOCAL SALES AND USE TAXES.

(a) LIMITATION ON SELLER COLLECTION.—No seller shall be required by a State or political subdivision thereof

(1) to collect a sales or use tax of a political subdivision with respect to interstate sales, or

(2) to classify interstate sales for sales or use tax purposes according to geographic areas of the State in any manner except with respect to those interstate sales with destinations in political subdivisions in which the seller has a business location, or regularly makes delivery other than by common carrier or United States mail.

(b) LOCAL TAXES TREATED AS STATE TAXES.—Notwithstanding the limitations in subsection (a), to the extent that State and any local sales and use taxes are imposed in all geographic areas of a State upon like transactions at the same combined State and local rate, are administered by the State, and are otherwise applied uniformly so that the seller is not required to classify interstate sales according to geographic areas of the State in any manner whatsoever, such sales or use taxes, whether imposed by the State or by political subdivisions, shall be treated as State taxes for the purposes of this Act.

TITLE III—DEFINITIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. SALES TAX.

A "sales tax" is any tax imposed with respect to retail sales, and measured by the sales price of tangible personal property or services with respect thereto, which is required by State law to be stated separately from the sales price by the seller, or which is customarily stated separately from the sales price.

SEC. 302. USE TAX.

A "use tax" is any nonrecurring tax complementary to a sales tax measured by the purchase price or value of tangible personal property or services sold, which is imposed on or with respect to the exercise or enjoyment of any right or power over tangible personal property incident to the ownership or possession of that property or the leasing of that property from another, including any consumption, keeping, retention, or other use of tangible personal property.

SEC. 303. SALE; SALES PRICE; PURCHASE PRICE.

The terms "sale", "sales price", and "purchase price" shall be deemed to include leases and rental payments under leases.

SEC. 304. INTERSTATE SALE.

An "interstate sale" is a sale in which the tangible personal property sold is shipped or delivered to the purchaser in a State from a point outside that State.

SEC. 305. DESTINATION.

The destination of a sale is in the State or political subdivision in which possession of the property is physically transferred to the purchaser or to which the property is shipped to the purchaser regardless of the f.o.b. point or other conditions of the sale.

SEC. 306. BUSINESS LOCATION.

(a) **GENERAL RULE.**—A person shall be considered to have a business location within a State or within a political subdivision only if that person—

(1) owns or leases real property within the State, or within the political subdivision,

(2) has one or more employees located in the State, or in the political subdivision,

(3) regularly maintains a stock of tangible personal property in the State, or in the political subdivision, for sale in the ordinary course of its business, or

(4) regularly leases out tangible personal property for use in the State, or in the political subdivision.

For the purpose of paragraph (3), property which is on consignment in the hands of a consignee, and which is offered for sale by the consignee on his own account, shall not be considered as stock maintained by the consignor. If a person has a business location in a State, or in the political subdivision, solely by reason of paragraph (4), he shall be considered to have a business location in the State, or in the political subdivision, only with respect to such leased property.

SEC. 307. LOCATION OF EMPLOYEE.

An employee shall be considered to be located in a State or in a political subdivision if—

(1) his service is performed entirely within that State, or within that political subdivision, or

(2) his service is performed both within and without that State, or that political subdivision, but in the performance of his service he regularly commences his activities at, and returns to, a place within the State or within the political subdivision.

SEC. 308. STATE.

The term "State" means the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 309. STATE LAW.

References in this Act to "State law", "the laws of the State", and the like shall be

deemed to include a State constitution, and to include the statutes and other legislative acts, judicial decision, and administrative regulations and rulings of a State and of any political subdivision.

PART B—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 321. PROHIBITION AGAINST GEOGRAPHICAL DISCRIMINATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—No provision of State law shall make any person liable for a greater amount of sales or use tax with respect to tangible personal property by virtue of the location of any occurrence in a State outside the taxing State, than the amount of the tax for which such person would otherwise be liable if such occurrence were within the State. For purposes of this subsection, the term "occurrence" includes incorporation, qualification to do business, and the making of a tax payment, and includes an activity of the taxpayer or of a person (including an agency of a State or local government) receiving payments from or making payments to the taxpayer.

(b) **COMPUTATION OF TAX LIABILITY UNDER DISCRIMINATORY LAWS.**—When any State law is in conflict with subsection (a), tax liability may be discharged in the manner which would be provided under State law if the occurrence in question were within the taxing State.

SEC. 322. PROHIBITION AGAINST OUT-OF-STATE AUDIT CHARGES.

No charge may be imposed by a State or political subdivision thereof to cover any part of the cost of conducting outside that State and audit for a tax to which this Act applies.

SEC. 323. PERMISSIBLE TAXES.

The fact that a tax to which this Act applies is imposed by a State or political subdivision thereof in the form of an excise, privilege, or license tax shall not prevent the imposition of the tax on a person engaged exclusively in interstate commerce within the State; but such a tax may be enforced against a person engaged exclusively in interstate commerce within the State solely as a revenue measure and not by ouster from the State or by criminal or other penalty for engaging in commerce within the State without permission from the State.

SEC. 324. RECIPROCAL COLLECTION AGREEMENTS.

When authorized by State law, reciprocal agreements may be made between two contiguous States for the purpose of requiring a seller with a business location in one of the States to collect applicable state use tax (including any tax treated as a State tax under Subsection (b) of Section 205 of this Act) for, and to remit that tax to, the other State into which the seller makes sales of tangible personal property, even though he is otherwise not subject to the jurisdiction of such other State under Section 101 of this Act.

SEC. 325. LIABILITY WITH RESPECT TO UNASSESSED TAXES.

No State or political subdivision thereof shall have the power, after the date of the enactment of this Act, to assess against any person for any period ending on or before such date a sales or use tax with respect to tangible personal property, if during such period that person was not registered in the State for the purpose of collecting tax, had no business location in the State, did not regularly solicit orders for the sale of tangible personal property by salesmen, solicitors, or other representatives in the State or did not regularly engage in the delivery of property in the State other than by common carrier or United States mail.

SEC. 326. EFFECTIVE DATES.

Sections 101, 321, 322, and 325 of this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act. Section 205 shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter commencing five years after the enactment of this Act. The remaining provisions of this Act

shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar quarter commencing after the enactment of this Act.

PROPOSED "INTERSTATE SALES AND USE TAX ACT" ANALYSIS

The bill provides a uniform system for the application of the sales and use taxes of the several states and their political subdivisions with respect to sales of tangible personal property in interstate commerce. It closely resembles S. 3368 and H.R. 19580, introduced in the 91st Congress, but contains some clarification in the language used in those bills. To the extent considered compatible with the objectives to be achieved, much of the wording and many of the provisions are derived from H.R. 7906 of the 91st Congress.

Title. The title "Interstate Sales and Use Tax Act" reflects the limited scope of the bill to deal only with these taxes.

Title I, Jurisdiction to Tax. In this title are contained the basic jurisdictional standards applicable to imposition and collection of sales and use taxes on interstate sales.

Sec. 101, Uniform Sales and Use Tax Jurisdictional Standard. Along with Secs. 306 (Business Location) and 307 (Location of Employee), this section prescribes the basic jurisdictional standards for imposition of sales and use taxes to sales in interstate commerce.

The jurisdictional standards of this bill differ from those of H.R. 7906 in that they would subject a seller to the jurisdiction of any state and of any local subdivision having a uniform state-administered local tax when the seller regularly solicits orders for the sale of tangible personal property by salesmen, solicitors or representatives in the state. Its other jurisdictional standards are somewhat similar to those of H.R. 7906 and require a business location in the state through the ownership or leasing of real property, maintaining a stock of tangible personal property for sale, or through the location of an employee. The regular delivery of property in the state other than by common carrier or United States mail will also be sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction. Regularly leasing out tangible personal property for use in the state will support jurisdiction with respect to the leased property.

Under this bill a seller would not be subject to the jurisdiction of the state if his activity in the state consists solely of solicitation by direct mail or advertising via newspaper, radio or television.

Title II, Uniform Rules for Application of Tax. The uniform rules found in this title either further limit the jurisdiction of the states or specifically prescribe standards for application of state and local sales and use taxes.

Sec. 201(a), Location of Sales. This section is similar to Sec. 301(a) of H.R. 7906, except that under subsection (2) the taxes which may be required to be collected for other states are limited to those of contiguous states through reciprocal collection agreements authorized under Sec. 324.

Secs. 201(b), (c) and (d). These subsections prevent multiple taxation by insuring that full credit or refund be given to a taxpayer who is subjected to taxation by more than one state with respect to the same property moving between states in an interstate transaction.

Sec. 201(e), Vehicle and Motor Fuels. This section is derived from Sec. 301(e) of H.R. 7906, but applies to vehicles such as truck trailers as well as to motor vehicles which are registered. There appears to be no logical distinction for sales and use tax purposes that would require limiting the application of the section solely to motor vehicles.

Sec. 202, Exemptions for Household Goods, etc. As in H.R. 7906 (Sec. 302) a state of new residence of a person is prevented by this

section for asserting a sales or use tax respecting household goods brought into the state by the new resident. Motor vehicles are included as household goods and in this respect the bill differs from S. 3368 which excluded motor vehicles from the category of household goods. The main difference from H.R. 7906 is the use of a 90-day period rather than a 30-day period of prior acquisition of the property in order to conform more closely with existing state practices. This bill also requires that the property be used in order to be exempt, and thus would prevent avoidance of tax where new property is ordered and shipped to the state of new residence without prior use by the purchaser.

Sec. 203, Treatment of Transportation Charges, etc. Derived from Sec. 303 of H.R. 7906, this section excludes interstate freight charges from the measure of tax on an interstate sale if they meet the conditions set forth in the section. The charges which may be excluded are reasonable charges for transporting property by facilities of the seller or actual charges for transportation by the carrier and the charges must be separately stated in writing by the seller to the purchaser.

Sec. 204, Liability of Sellers on Exempt Sales. This is a modified version of Sec. 304 of H.R. 7906. The vendor is exonerated from further tax collection or payment liability once he accepts a certificate or other written evidence from the buyer which meets the requirements of the section. It is intended that any reason for exemption which is authorized by the law of the state of destination will be sufficient if the purchaser furnishes the certificate in writing properly identifying himself and stating the allowable reason for exemption.

Sec. 205, Local Sales and Use Taxes. This section is derived from Sec. 305 of H.R. 7906, but is more specific. Out-of-state sellers could not be required by local taxing jurisdictions or the state to collect non-uniform local taxes solely on the basis of a nexus deriving from solicitation in the local jurisdiction. In order for non-uniform local tax laws to impose seller collection duties, the seller must have a business location in the destination jurisdiction or must make regular deliveries into the jurisdiction other than by common carrier or United States mail. Subsection (b) would, however, allow any statewide layer of uniform state-administered local taxes to be treated as state taxes for the purposes of the Act. This section would not go into effect for five years in order to allow the states to correct their non-uniform patterns of local sales and use taxes.

Title III, Definitions and Miscellaneous Provisions. This title contains basic definitions and several miscellaneous provisions.

Sec. 301, Sales Tax. This definition is essentially the same as that of Sec. 603 of H.R. 7906, with some technical drafting changes.

Sec. 302, Use Tax. This definition is somewhat different from Sec. 604 of H.R. 7906 in that it specifies that a use tax be complementary to a sales tax and allows a use tax to be measured by purchase price or value. This section intentionally excludes from the definition of use tax those taxes which are complementary to certain excise taxes, such as those on cigarettes that are measured by the number of units and are not complementary to a traditional type of sales tax.

Sec. 303, Sales; Sales Price; Purchase Price. The definition is the same as Sec. 607 of H.R. 7906, with the phrase "purchase price" added.

Sec. 304, Interstate Sale. This is similar to the definition as was contained in Sec. 304 of S. 3368, but deletes "or the designee" contained in that bill. It simplifies and changes the definition in H.R. 7906 so as to include only sales which involve inter-

state movement of tangible personal property.

Sec. 305, Destination. This definition is the same as S. 3368, except that it deletes references to a designee which was thought to be unclear in the context. The section is basically modeled after Sec. 610 of H.R. 7906 but is more specific.

Sec. 306, Business Location. This section is the same as Sec. 307 of S. 3368, except that references to political subdivisions are included in order to make the definition of business location available for the sales and use taxes of political subdivisions.

Sec. 307, Location of Employee. This section is similar to Sec. 308 of S. 3368 and is based on Sec. 613 of H.R. 7906, but modified to conform to the scope of this bill and to allow the definition to be used with respect to political subdivisions of a state.

Secs. 308 and 309, State and State Law. These definitions are the same as Secs. 615 and 616 of H.R. 7906.

Sec. 321, Prohibition Against Geographical Discrimination. This section is based upon Sec. 622 of H.R. 7906, but deletes the reference to gross receipts taxes in order to conform with the scope of this bill.

Sec. 322, Prohibition Against Out-of-State Audit Charges. The section is based upon Sec. 624 of H.R. 7906, but is modified to relate only to sales and use taxes.

Sec. 323, Permissible Taxes. This section is the same as Sec. 621 of H.R. 7906, except that in the third line the word "excise" is substituted for "franchise."

Sec. 324, Reciprocal Collection Agreements. This is a new section which would authorize contiguous states to enter into reciprocal agreements to require a seller to collect applicable use tax for the sister state into which a seller makes sales of tangible personal property. This section makes specific the rather cryptic provisions formerly contained in Sec. 301(a)(2) of H.R. 7906 and Sec. 201(a)(2) of S. 3368.

Sec. 325, Liability With Respect to Unassessed Taxes. The section is based on Sec. 625 of H.R. 7906, but is modified to eliminate references to income taxes, etc., and to accord with revised jurisdictional standards.

Sec. 326, Effective Dates. This section is similar to Sec. 325 of S. 3368, but allows Sec. 205, prescribing limitations on local sales and use taxes, to take effect five years after the enactment of the Act in order to allow time for Legislatures of the several states to make changes in presently existing non-uniform local sales and use tax laws. The section also assures that jurisdictional limitations on imposition of tax and provisions barring prior assessments shall be effective upon enactment.

CONTEMPLATED FOLLY

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, we continue to contemplate some wondrous things in this Federal Government. Members are aware of the action in which the Federal Government purchased the Congressional Hotel from the Government campus at a good price, purchasing it for use as an office building and then leasing it back to the original owner at a price favorable to the hotel corporation. However, now we talk about another venture of this kind which just seems incredible. There is a strong desire to tear down the old Willard Hotel, which is a hotel. Now we have serious consideration given to a proposal to make a hotel out of the old post office building at a

cost of \$6 million or more so that we will have a place for people to stay in when they come to the big birthday party a few years hence. I think Members should be alerted to the folly that is being contemplated.

DANGEROUS COURSE OF WILLY BRANDT

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the recent and continuing harassment of motorists en route to and from West Berlin points up once again the utter folly of the spineless policy toward Russia being pursued by Chancellor Willy Brandt.

I find it hard these days to recognize the former mayor of West Berlin who was once among the most fearless and outspoken of anti-Communists.

In the last year, however, this former lion has turned into a lamb, openly kowtowing to Moscow and its puppet satellites. He has signed what amounts to surrender papers with Russia and Poland and is bent on doing the same with Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria.

Ironically, Herr Brandt has apparently never heard of an Englishman named Chamberlain who tried to pacify Hitler in much the same manner.

He is now, pitifully, trying to pacify his critics with a proposed "deal" with the Russians "guaranteeing" free access to West Berlin as well as other "concessions" toward that city.

I say it is a pitiful sight because, as Herr Brandt should know, a Russian guarantee is worth just about as much as the paper upon which it is written. It is to be fervently hoped that the people of West Germany will persuade their Chancellor of the folly of his present course before it brings Communist enslavement to them all.

WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS

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

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of national farm leaders from my State. Among them is Mr. Fred V. Heinkel, president of Mid-Continent Farmers Association. In the February issue of that organization's magazine, *Today's Farmer*, Mr. Heinkel expressed some penetrating thoughts relative to operation of wheat and feed grains programs under the Agricultural Act of 1970. These remarks should not escape the attention of the Members, particularly those representing wheat and feed grain areas, and, therefore, I insert his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

NEW WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS PROGRAMS:
WILL THEY DO THE JOB?
(By F. V. Heinkel)

As details of the 1971 feed grains and wheat programs are unveiled by USDA, I

share with many of you a growing concern with regard to what's ahead.

A real and dangerous weakness of these programs, as I see them, is in the "watered down" approach to supply management. There are no acreage allotments. Cross-compliance is no longer required. If a wheat or feed grains farmer maintains his soil conserving base and meets the set-aside requirement, he can plant his entire remaining crop acreage to corn, or to wheat or to grain sorghums—and his entire crop production will be eligible for government loan.

Under the new farm law, as a safeguard against continued over-production or under-production, the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to regulate individual crops. But he has chosen not to exercise that authority in this year's programs.

As a result, it would be possible this year for farmers in Missouri to double last year's corn acreage—and still have every bushel eligible for government loan. Such an increase is unlikely, of course, because farmers probably will not make such a drastic shift in cropping programs. But it is possible. And, as we've learned in previous years, even a slight over-planting and over-production can depress prices to the point at which government loan becomes the best available "market."

Under this year's programs, loan price for corn has been pegged at \$1.08 per bushel, wheat at \$1.25 per bushel and grain sorghums at \$1.73 per cwt. Without allotments and cross-compliance, will farmers over-plant? Will government bins again become the "market" for those commodities?

I have no crystal ball. I cannot see for certain what lies ahead. But I do have a pretty good memory, I think.

I remember the 1920's—when there were no planting restrictions and no price supports. In those years, debt-ridden farmers plowed and planted every available acre in futile efforts to increase their incomes. The result was bankruptcy for many.

Then I recall how the acreage control and price support programs of the 1930's enabled farmers to improve their incomes and regain a degree of financial stability.

I am reminded that through supply management and production incentives built into the programs of the early 1940's, farmers were assisted and encouraged in providing the food and fiber needed to win World War II.

In the 1950's, you'll recall, our farm programs were administered without enthusiasm. Prices were supported by government loans, but acreage limitations were inadequate. As a result, surpluses piled up to unmanageable levels. And there was widespread disillusionment with government farm programs.

Then came the Agricultural Act of 1961, as amended and extended, and the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, which was extended through last year. Keyed to supply management, programs developed under those laws enabled us to eliminate surpluses and gear production to market demand. At the same time, farm income was improved. Those programs were not perfect. They could have been improved. But they worked!

Times and circumstances change. Programs must be adapted to the changes. But if there's one thing we should have learned during the last half-century, it is this: *Effective supply management is essential* to the success of farm programs, to the improvement of farm income and to the welfare of this nation. Farmers need assistance in gearing their production to market demands. Without effective supply management, burdensome surpluses and disastrously low prices are likely.

For me, there's small consolation in the USDA promise that payments to farmers this year will total about the same as last year.

With no payment for acreage diversion, many farmers will find that the government

payments which they can collect this year will be substantially less than they earned last year.

The USDA promise, I am told, was based on the assumption that a higher percentage of farmers will participate in the 1971 programs. With eased planting restrictions and in the absence of cross-compliance requirements, more big farmers and multi-farm operators—especially in the big corn states of Iowa and Illinois—are expected to sign up in order to collect price support payments and be eligible for crop loans.

A program for big farmers and big grain handlers? That's how it appears to be shaping up. Except for the payment limitation of \$55,000—which affects only a handful of farmers—the new programs provide more benefits for big farmers than any programs of recent years. At the same time, they neglect some of the special needs of smaller farm operators.

For example: The total diversion feature, so important in recent years to some smaller farm operators and some semi-retired farmers, has been eliminated. Under the old programs, you'll recall, a smaller farm operator who chose to plant no wheat or feed grains could divert his total base acreage. Now, in order to maintain his base and collect price support payment, a farmer must plant part of his acreage to wheat or feed grains. This means that some smaller farmers may be forced back into production of those commodities.

Of real concern to many farmers was the eligibility requirement for set-aside acreage, as announced in December by USDA. To be eligible for set-aside, land must have been harvested for crops other than wild hay within the last three years, USDA said. In other words, most land which had been diverted for the last three years would not be eligible for set-aside.

For many farmers, the requirement—which was a USDA ruling, not a part of the law—would have disrupted cropping plans and increased costs by making it necessary to plow up land already seeded to grass and establish grass seedings on land intended for crops this year.

The set-aside eligibility requirement was protested, promptly and emphatically, by MFA. A delegation, including D. T. Weekley, MFA board member from Blackwater, and L. C. Carpenter, MFA vice-president for public affairs, went to Washington to explain the farmers' point of view to USDA and ASCS officials.

Recognizing the hardship which would result, the Secretary of Agriculture last month rescinded the unnecessary set-aside eligibility requirement for this year's program.

Sign-up for the 1971 farm programs is scheduled to begin March 1. I urge you to go to your ASCS office. Find out for certain how the new programs will affect your operation. Get every detail.

Although less than we hoped for, the new programs are all that's available for now. If you can participate, I encourage you to do so.

If you don't like the new programs, I suggest that you let your Congressman know how you feel—Loud and Clear.

The farm law was created by the U.S. Congress. It can be amended by that Congress. And administrative rulings can be changed. There's another election coming up next year.

TO RESTORE STABILITY TO NATIONAL ECONOMY

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, I proposed what I believed to be

an effective method to restore stability to the national economy. My bill, H.R. 2502, which I am reintroducing today with several cosponsors, establishes an Emergency Guidance Board to set and administer a system of voluntary price and wage guidelines for certain concentrated industries and large labor organizations.

My proposed program is designed to bring quick, short-term relief during a time when an expansionary monetary policy is being pursued to increase demand, as it is increasingly by the Federal Reserve Board. Upon introducing my bill, I noted that the administration has started haltingly on this course in setting up a wage board in the construction industry.

The system of voluntary guidelines administered by the Emergency Guidance Board is designed to put a lid on inflationary increases in prices and wages and would be equally applied to all industries in a context that would not interfere with the free market system.

An article entitled "Teeth for the Jawbone," written by Mr. Henry C. Wallich in the February 15 issue of Newsweek presents an excellent discussion of this matter, underscoring the need for a program similar to my proposed Emergency Guidance Board, and I am inserting the article at the conclusion of my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues. The article by Mr. Wallich follows:

TEETH FOR THE JAWBONE

(By Henry C. Wallich)

Some two and a half years ago, in this space, I ventured a generalization about our experience in stopping inflation. Half a recession, so it seemed to me, did not do it. A recession and a half was adequate, but perhaps more than required.

History since that time has not disavowed the proposition. Whatever the rating that specialists may give to the late, unlamented economic unpleasantness, surely it qualifies for at least a half recession. It has not stopped inflation. Some people argue that if only we keep money and the budget tight enough long enough, inflation will end. Very probably so. But that means accepting still higher levels of unemployment and a serious recession. The advice to hang on echoes the tale of the man who set out to demonstrate that his donkey could learn to live without food. He had almost proved his point when unfortunately the beast died. Having demonstrated the first part of my law—half a recession is not enough—we are not minded to explore the second—whether something short of a recession and a half will do the job. Thus a new approach is needed.

The name of the new approach is in incomes policy. On this there is now increasing—though by no means universal—agreement. So far, however, incomes policy is still a term in search of a meaning. The term itself is a polite circumlocution for some kind of interference in the free economy. What is to be interfered with are wages and prices. That means the incomes of labor and capital—hence incomes policy.

My own preference continues to be for a form of incomes policy that preserves free markets. The profits surtax on companies granting excessive wage increases, which I have suggested repeatedly in this column, meets this standard. It meets also the very important standard of fairness. Wages are restrained, but the company pays. A burden falls on both sides. Of the criticisms that I have received—readers have been quite forthcoming in that respect—that which best stands up to serious analysis is the difficulty

of administration. But I have said enough on this topic, and now turn to examine other forms of incomes policy.

EQUAL TREATMENT

If free markets cannot be fully preserved, intervention should at least be fair and equitable. That means that labor and business should be treated alike, and that all major unions and major companies should be treated alike. To pick on one sinner to expiate the wage-price transgressions of all will do little good to the many and great damage to the few.

Naturally many people view with satisfaction the President sallying forth to do battle with a steel company, as President Kennedy did in 1962, and as President Nixon did a few weeks ago. Both Presidents acted under great provocation, and indeed a 12 per cent steel price increase could do serious damage. In some situations there may be little alternative. But this cannot be the whole of a new "game plan."

Today many unions and companies are practicing wage-price aggression because they fear that unless they do, they will suffer by the aggression of others. Unions and companies that practice restraint run great risks. The quest for stability and steady growth has given way to the battle for survival. The way to quiet the aggressors is to protect them against the aggression of others.

If we go toward intervention in wages and prices, we should have, along with occasional Presidential jawboning, a broadly based institution to do the job. Full-scale wage and price control is out. Let it stand, as a warning specter, at the end of the road leading to economic failure. Right now, a wage-price board is needed with powers to monitor, but not to approve or deny, a wide range of wage and price increases.

This board would have to establish standards of reasonableness for wage and price movements. These should take into account the existing momentum of inflation but seek to subdue it with all deliberate speed. The board should have a staff and powers to obtain information sufficient to test any actual wage and price movements, and it should publicize and seek public support for its findings. These procedures would have to be supplemented by action on other fronts—to stimulate competition, to deal with the special situation of the construction industry, to restrain the government's own multifarious price-raising propensities. But the overriding law, for the board as well as for all supplementary efforts, would always be simple: to maintain as effectively as possible the operation of free markets.

CURB ILLEGAL INTERNATIONAL DRUG TRAFFIC

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years, drug addiction from heroin was confined to hardened criminals in the big city ghettos of the United States. Today, however, this addiction is common among young people living, not only in the cities, but also in the suburbs and rural areas. No part of society, no neighborhood or family, is immune from the disease and tragedy caused by drug abuse.

My own State of Connecticut has 4,000 to 8,000 heroin addicts, the second largest number in New England, while New York City is reported to number at least 100,000. The drug problem is out of control; the number of addicts increases

daily, and the number of crimes due to addiction increases proportionately.

Survival for an addict is expensive and hazardous. He needs about \$40 a day for drugs which the average user obtains by committing various criminal acts—usually assault and theft, sometimes murder. The drug addict is desperate and dangerous; obtaining his fix may impel him to violent action. In New York City, addicts steal more than \$1.5 billion every year. Not only are people in New York and elsewhere being robbed, attacked, and killed because of the drug problem, but the cities are losing their vitality, partially because of this disease. City dwellers, frightened by what might happen to themselves or their children, are moving away. The "smell of death," as Stewart Alsop recently called it, is becoming intolerable. Drug pollution is choking the country.

The 91st Congress passed legislation that would provide for education and treatment of drug addicts, and these steps are important; but unless the production of heroin can be curbed, unless we can confront the problem at its source, addiction will continue to pollute our cities, and our countryside as well. Almost 100 percent of the hard drugs being consumed in the United States today is produced abroad, with 80 percent coming from crops grown in Turkey and processed in France. Although Turkish farmers have been cultivating opium poppies for hundreds of years, the Turkish Government has not been able to control its illegal drug traffic. Smugglers in Turkey pay farmers \$7 to \$11 a pound for raw opium, but when it is sold to American addicts as heroin, the price per pound is more than \$40,000.

Last week I introduced a bill that expresses congressional support for strengthening the power of the United Nations to curb illegal production and illegal international traffic in narcotics and dangerous drugs.

Today, I am introducing legislation that would amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so that the President would be authorized to suspend, in whole or in part, foreign aid to any country which failed to cooperate with the United States in reducing illegal international drug traffic. Under this proposal, the President would have the power to impose economic sanctions on those countries which would not control their illegal production and export of narcotics. Certainly the United States should not provide aid to those countries which condone illegal profits made in so harmful and tragic a fashion. On the other hand, a country willing to help eliminate the supply of narcotics should be supported by the United States, and in fact the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs has teams in France assisting the French Government which is developing its own domestic narcotics problem. My bill authorizes the President to call upon all appropriate agencies of our Federal Government to assist cooperating foreign governments in their efforts to prevent the unlawful entry of narcotic drugs into the United States.

In light of the growing drug problem in Connecticut and throughout the

United States, in the cities, and elsewhere, I urge favorable consideration of this proposal. By reducing the supply of narcotics illegally entering the United States, the Congress can make a much needed contribution toward controlling the growing menace of drug addiction and related crime.

BOTTLED DRINKING WATER LEGISLATION

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation authorizing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish and enforce a program of health standards for bottled drinking water.

Because of today's emphasis on pollution and the current dissatisfaction with the taste of chlorinated water, the demand for bottled drinking water has sharply expanded in the last few years. The Water Resources Division of the Department of Commerce has estimated from private industry sources that \$100 million worth of bottled water was sold in 1970. This figure is significantly up from \$60 million worth sold in 1960 and the \$63 million worth sold in 1964. The American Bottled Water Association, which represents 90 percent of the bottlers of still waters, reports that sales are growing at the rate of 15 to 20 percent a year. People dubious of the quality of their water supplies or unhappy with the taste of chlorine are demanding bottled water as a practical alternative.

Industry has responded to this demand. Many supermarkets now stock containers of water for their customers, and in some localities bottled water is delivered to the door each day in the same fashion as milk and orange juice. It is known that certain nationwide soft drink companies are considering entrance into this burgeoning market.

In the light of this substantial growth, it is surprising and disturbing that no specific and uniform standards exist to control the quality of bottled drinking water. Several States have stringent regulations, but most States have either very general standards or no standards at all. In addition, most States that do have regulations have no dependable mechanism for systematic inspection of bottled water.

Private industry has proved responsible in most instances in maintaining minimum health standards in its products. However, without specific, uniform guidelines, industry cannot be certain of its responsibilities, and consumers cannot be absolutely sure of the extent of their protection. This type of uncertainty must be eliminated. The legislation I am now introducing empowers the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to prescribe minimum health and safety standards for bottled drinking water if, after scientific investigation, he determines that such standards are necessary. These standards will apply to spring water, distilled, and flourished water, or any other bottled water product which

moves in interstate commerce and the Administrator finds in need of regulation. It will be illegal for any producer or distributor of bottled drinking water to transport in interstate commerce those products which fail to meet these minimum standards. Violators of this act will be subject to a restraining order and a civil penalty of up to \$1,000.

Because of the sudden rapid growth of the bottled water industry, I feel that now is the proper time for the Congress to establish adequate protective legislation. By providing uniform standards for the entire industry and insuring the safety of the growing number of bottled water consumers, this bill will create the needed protection.

HUD REPORT ON URBAN RENEWAL PROBLEMS NEEDED

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, we all know that relocation matters pertaining to urban renewal projects have been the most difficult problems that we face in this general area. It brought us more anguish and more unhappiness and more unpleasantness than any other thing that we have been faced with. Over a year ago the Congress passed an amendment which said that the Department of Housing and Urban Development was to conduct a survey on the effectiveness of all relocation matters with respect to urban renewal programs. I have exchanged correspondence with the Department of Housing and Urban Development during the last year because I had offered that particular amendment and it said that a review should be done by December. Then HUD changed the schedule and said that the review would be available by January. We are now approaching the mid-mark of February, and this review has still not been completed. I think the Congress is getting tired of waiting. We need to have this review showing the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of relocation matters with whatever recommendations that the Department of Housing and Urban Development might have. We should have a report on this review now. If the Congress does not get it, we should consider withholding funds in this area. We must solve the relocation problem in a better way, and I hope that this review is published immediately.

CREATION OF NATIONAL CANCER AUTHORITY

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill calling for the creation of a National Cancer Authority to direct and appropriate funds for cancer research. I have recommended that the Authority be granted \$100 million annually so that we can hopefully conquer cancer in this decade.

The need for this program is apparent.

Cancer is the second leading cause of all deaths in the United States. This year alone, the American Cancer Society projects 335,000 Americans will die of this dreaded disease. Of every six deaths from all causes in the United States, one is from cancer.

Most striking is the fact that the mortality rate for the largely preventable disease of lung cancer has increased in men more than 15 times in 40 years.

But progress is being made. With early detection and treatment a patient's chance for survival is better now than before.

The fact that progress has been made should lead us to believe that the search for cures is not hopeless, that our efforts in this behalf will not be futile, and that now is the time for us to commit ourselves to conquering cancer.

With new breakthroughs in the development of anticancer drugs and research into DNA and virus-induced cancer in animals, we seem to be drawing closer to the cures we need.

Thus far, over 100 viruses—20 of which have been discovered in the last 3 years—have been found to produce cancer in animals. Although not yet identified as the cause, some of these viruses are associated with cancer in humans and others are considered as suspects for causing cancer. If we can identify cancer-causing viruses, it would be possible to develop vaccines to protect us against them.

We seem to be in the threshold of discovery, but we actually know less about cancer than we do about the moon or the atom. We need a national commitment to provide the funds and the direction so we can step over that threshold in this decade.

THE STATE OF OUR SYSTEM OF JUSTICE IN THIS COUNTRY AND AROUND THE WORLD

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, as a lawyer and a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, I am concerned with the state of our system of justice in this country and around the world. Recent events have led me to examine the legal system of Communist-controlled countries insofar as it applies to citizens of these countries and those who have been subjected to these systems.

The House of Delegates of the American Bar Association has just adopted a resolution condemning the actions of the Czechoslovak Government which is engaged in a systematic demand of money from Czech and Slovak emigres throughout the free world.

Recently these free world residents have been receiving letters from the Czechoslovak Legal Advisory Center which tells them that they have had criminal proceedings filed against them for the crime of leaving the country without permission. The letters advise these individuals that they must pay substantial fees in advance to government law-

yers who will defend them and that the individual will most likely be sentenced and that the punishment cannot be suspended. The letter advises further that the legal fees may be collected from close relatives remaining in Czechoslovakia and that if the individual should return to Czechoslovakia immediately it might be possible to have a stay of the criminal proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, this has been described as a simple case of blackmail and it is of very great concern to those receiving such letters. This is an ominous threat to them, their relatives, and their property. The leadership of Adm. William C. Mott, U.S. Navy, retired, chairman of the ABA Standing Committee on Education About Communist and Its Contrast With Liberty Under Law and of Dr. Charles Baroch, scholar-in-residence for the standing committee, deserves applause and praise both for the interest and concern and for the professional manner in which the matter was presented to the ABA House of Delegates.

Senator ROMAN HRUSKA has been a leader also in voicing the fears of these people. I would respectfully direct the attention of my colleagues to pages 1559 through 1562 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 3, 1971, which contain remarks by Senator HRUSKA and various items of correspondence and news articles.

At this point, I include background information on the resolution of the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 9, 1971

Whereas, The Czechoslovak Government through its Legal Advisory Center (Advokátní Poradna) has advised all Czech and Slovak emigres who left the country as a result of the Warsaw Pact military intervention of 1968 that a criminal proceeding has been initiated in absentia against them for leaving or staying out of the country without permission; and

Whereas, The Czechoslovak Legal Advisory Center has demanded a down payment in hard currency of the country in which the emigres are now domiciled for defense by Czechoslovak lawyers of the alleged crime; and

Whereas, The Czechoslovak Legal Advisory Center has informed all emigres that should they fail to transfer the required down payment within fifteen days the Center would be entitled to and would demand payment from their nearest relatives in Czechoslovakia; and

Whereas, The American Bar Association is dedicated to the principle of justice under the law and believes that the failure of justice anywhere is a threat to its realization everywhere and the action of the Czechoslovak Government through its Legal Advisory Center and court system in the case of these emigres violates principles of human rights;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the American Bar Association:

(1) formally condemn the actions of the Czechoslovak Government and its Legal Advisory Center against the aforementioned emigres;

(2) call these injustices to the attention of members of the Bar, the American public and appropriate international bodies and agencies such as the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, the International Commission of Jurists, the International Bar Association, and other groups; and

(3) charge its Standing Committee on Education About Communism and Its Contrast With Liberty Under Law to follow the administration of justice in Communist-controlled countries in order to keep the Association and the American public at large informed concerning the nature of legality and justice in those countries and regularly report instances of injustice as they occur; and

Be it further resolved, That the Committee prepare a comprehensive report concerning recent events in Czechoslovakia which prompted this resolution, without expenditure of ABA funds.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE RESOLUTION

The facts which prompted the Committee to submit a Resolution for the consideration of the House of Delegates are incontrovertible and have been reported in the world press.

There are about 70,000 new Czechoslovak emigres in the free world (about 8,000 are in the United States, 12,000 in Canada, 2,000 in Australia, with the rest in Europe).

They left Czechoslovakia shortly before or after the Warsaw Pact armed intervention in August 1968, an action undertaken to restore the controlling rule of the Czechoslovak Communist Party as enforcement of the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine in that country.

Citizens of Czechoslovakia are denied the basic human right to leave the country or stay abroad without official permission. Such acts are crimes against the security of the state (the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic).

Consequently, the Czechoslovak citizens who preferred to leave their country rather than live under rigid Communist control violated paragraph 109, sections 1 and 2, of the Criminal Code 140/1961, and, according to reports in Czechoslovak newspapers, are now on trial by the hundreds in absentia.

All the so-called defendants received registered letters² at their residences abroad, advising them of criminal proceedings instituted against them in the CSSR. These letters differ according to the different purposes of this terror campaign.

First, one can discern an overall effort by the Czechoslovak Communist government to instill fear into the emigres for their own persons and for their relatives left behind. Their personal insecurity comes from lack of citizenship (not yet attained in most cases) and, consequently, from their doubts about protection by the authorities of their new country of residence.

The second discernible purpose behind the mass trials is to extort hard currency by asking the emigres to pay defense fees to government lawyers assigned to each case. Some letters contain a blackmail threat to collect the required sum from relatives, if the refugee refuses to pay. In view of the large number of pending cases the Czechoslovak government could collect millions of dollars worth of hard currency, badly needed in its shaky economy.

Finally, some letters indicate the desire to pressure refugees, the majority of whom come from the intelligentsia, to return home, by promising to drop the charges against them. This would indicate a technological and professional manpower shortage in Czechoslovakia, caused by the emigre brain drain.

These letters caused great alarm among the emigres everywhere, to the extent that they are reluctant even to admit receiving them for fear of reprisals against their relatives in Czechoslovakia. For that reason all names and details which could identify the recipients have been deleted from the enclosed copies. This alarm has been reflected

in appeals of many Czechoslovak emigre organizations to their respective adopted governments, asking a stop to this harassment of future citizens.³

Under these circumstances, the support of the American Bar Association in reaffirmation of human rights, as expressed in the Resolution, would be of immeasurable value to the refugees, who in their ambiguous legal situation can rely only on the free world's expression of solidarity.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE RESOLUTION DOCUMENTATION

(1) *New York Times* article by Tad Szulc (12/16/70).

(2) Three letters (representing those received in the USA, Canada and England—copies of the original letters with names and addresses of recipients are in the hands of the committee).

(3) Telegram to US Secretary of State and Attorney General from Czechoslovak emigre organization.

(4) Appeal to the Canadian government by a number of organizations together with a Vancouver press report.

(5) *New York Times* and *Washington Post* articles on Australian residents (12/13/70, 12/16/70).

LETTER.—TRANSLATION

You are advised that criminal proceedings have been instituted against you for the criminal act of leaving the Republic, according to paragraph 109, section 2 of the Criminal Code. Since these proceedings are conducted in your absence, the Czechoslovak law on criminal procedure requires that you have a defense lawyer. I was appointed as your defense lawyer, and you are obliged to defray the cost, which is estimated in the first instance of the proceedings at 1,350 crowns/approximately \$190.00, which includes the lawyer's fee and court expenses.

I am therefore requesting that you pay the sum mentioned within one month as a down payment for the defense. It should be credited in dollars according to the official exchange rate to the account of the Regional Lawyers Union at the Artisans Bank, Prague.

Finally, I should like to bring to your attention that the results as of now of the criminal proceedings seem to indicate that you will be sentenced and that your punishment cannot be suspended. The prison term for the criminal act mentioned above ranges from 6 months to 5 years and, in addition, your property will be confiscated.

You could possibly receive a suspended sentence, but only if you return to Czechoslovakia immediately or apply to the Regional Passport Office for extension of your permit to stay abroad. In the latter case it may be possible to request a stay of the criminal proceedings pending a decision with regard to your application for passport extension.

Greetings,

signature _____

PRAGUE STARTS BLACKMAILING 70,000 EXILES

LONDON/FCI.—British authorities are in possession of an interesting official document originating from Prague. It testifies to an unprecedented blackmail which may affect 70,000 voluntary exiles from Czechoslovakia, the majority of whom are now settled in Commonwealth countries, some 2-3,000 in Britain itself. It is a letter from the "Legal Advisory Centre" ("Advokátní poradna") established by the Prague regime and is addressed to post-August 1968 exiles. It demands an immediate down-payment of 700

³ See the enclosed telegram sent, December 30, 1970, to Secretary of State William P. Rogers and Attorney General John Mitchell by the Czechoslovak National Council of America.

Kcs. (\$40 at the official exchange rate, but worth treble to the State Bank in foreign currency) with the threat that if the money "is not deposited within 15 days the Legal organization has the right to demand it from near relatives in CS(S)R", i.e. in most cases aged parents. This letter has reached exiles in a number of countries and may soon affect most of the post-invasion exiles of whom there are about 70,000, although Prague officially admits to only 51,000 by omitting those who have not yet made a declaration that they have no intention of returning.

THE LETTER

I wish to inform you that based on the decision of an investigator made on . . . a criminal proceeding has been initiated against you based on para. 102-2 of the criminal law, because according to the aforementioned decision there is a reasonably founded conclusion that you have been illegally abroad since . . . with the intention of taking up permanent residence there.

According to the law Defence Counsel in this case is obligatory. Since you have not chosen a Defence Counsel, I have been nominated to represent you, for which reason I am sending you the above information. (FCI Note: This is usually the first time the addressee has heard about the proceedings. He has, therefore had no opportunity of naming a Defence Counsel, even if he had wished to do so).

"At the same time I wish to inform you" the letter goes on, "that according to the provisions of the criminal law cited, you can be tried in absentia and may be sentenced to prison for a term of 6 months to 5 years, to corrective measures and to confiscation of property. (FCI note: In most cases property, flats, cash deposited, etc., have already been confiscated by a special decree before any proceedings being instituted in individual cases).

"It is in your own interest to let me know if any circumstances exist which, as your lawyer, I could use for your defence in these proceedings. Especially, let me know whether you submitted an appeal asking for permission to prolong your stay abroad, or whether such an appeal is under consideration by the authorities." (FCI: Many exiles left legally but failed to return).

"Finally, I wish to inform you that the cost of the proceedings and of the defence have to be met by you. As far as the cost of the defence is concerned, it is my duty to ask you to pay, within 15 days, an appropriate down-payment, i.e. 700 Kcs. According to our currency regulations this down-payment must be paid in the currency of the state where you are now domiciled to the value of the official exchange rate. (FCI note: which is purely fictitious) and credited to the account of the Regional Lawyers Union at . . . with the Artisans Bank (Zivnostenska Banka). Should you fail to transfer the required sum within the period stipulated, the Legal Advisory Centre is entitled to obtain payment from your nearest relatives in CS(S)R.

I await your reply and remain with greetings,

(Stamp) LEGAL ADVISORY CENTRE at . . . Signed)

In many cases, in order to save old parents or other relatives the exile pays up. He does not realize that the final bill may be many times higher than the original demand for "down-payment". If later he refuses to pay the balance for concluding the proceedings—the result of which is a foregone conclusion—the money will be extorted from those he wished to save by making the first payment. Since similar measures were not applied (especially in their financial aspects) against the majority of the post-February 1948 putsch victims, observers believe that this scheme for obtaining foreign currency has been devised by the KGB and Soviet

¹ See the enclosed article by Tad Szulc in the *New York Times* of December 16, 1970, pp. 1; 10.

² See enclosed copies of translations.

legal advisors who have of late directed political "justice" in occupied Czechoslovakia.

To avoid further victimisation of a particular "offender" and of his relatives, it has been decided not to publish the name or the address of the "Legal Advisory Centre" and the nominated Defense Counsel concerned in this letter.

CS(S)R: World-Wide Campaign (London/FCI) According to Swiss and German press reports the number of exiles resident in Switzerland, who have received notification of criminal proceedings instituted against them, is considerable. Downpayments vary. In some cases it is 1000 Kcs. (almost £60 or \$144). Exile publications in Canada have advised readers not to reply to the letters, but to contact Canadian authorities and ask for protection against blackmail. A Czechoslovak exiles delegation appealed to Mr. Trudeau to intercede with Soviet authorities to liberalize the occupation regime in Czechoslovakia.

[Translation]

OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSELLING No. 5

You are advised that following the decision of the Inquest officer dated October 12, 1970, prosecution has been initiated against you for the criminal act of abandoning the Republic according to article 109/2 of the Criminal Code, because established facts do sufficiently justify the conclusion that you have been, since October 18, 1968, staying abroad illegitimately with the intention to take up permanent residence there.

The law makes defense in this case obligatory; as you have not yet chosen a counsel I was appointed to be your defense lawyer. Consequently, I am addressing to you the above information.

At the same time I wish to advise you that according to the quoted article of the Criminal Code you may be tried in absentia and sentenced to prison for a term of 6 months to 5 years or to corrective measures, or possibly to forfeiture of your property.

It is in your own interest to communicate to me, whether there are any facts that I could, as your counsel, point up for your defense in this process. In particular, let me know, whether you applied for an extension of your stay abroad or whether proceedings relating thereto are on the way.

Finally, you are advised that the costs of the proceedings and those of legal defense are your responsibility. As far as the defense costs are concerned, it is my duty to invite you to send within 15 days an adequate deposit, i.e. 700.- Czechoslovakian crowns. According to our foreign-currency regulations, of course, the deposit has to be forwarded in the currency of the country of your immediate residence, i.e. in Canadian dollars, at the official exchange rate, to the order of the City Guild of Barristers in Prague at the Artisans' Bank, Prague 1, Prikopy. If the deposit is not forwarded within the stated deadline, the organization of barristers is entitled to accept payments by your close relatives in Czechoslovakia.

Expecting your answer, I remain,

Your truly:

(Illegible signature).

TELEGRAM FROM THE CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA, CHICAGO, ILL.

TO SECRETARY OF STATE AND ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Public opinion in the United States, Canada, Australia and other free countries has been seriously disturbed by recent evidence of a new form of harassment of refugees from Czechoslovakia by agencies of the Prague government. Many refugees have received communications from Czechoslovak authorities informing them about pending trials initiated against them for having illegally left Czechoslovakia or for not returning from abroad. The Czechoslovak authorities urged

refugees to transmit sizeable sums of money to cover the fees of officially assigned defense lawyers.

The letters contain a veiled threat that in case of nonpayment the refugees' relatives in Czechoslovakia might be called upon to defray the defense expenses. This despicable form of blackmail is a logical consequence of the communist unwillingness to respect the fundamental human right of every individual permitting him to leave at will his own country and to settle in any country of his own choice.

Basically this is the same evil which is found in the cruel denial of permission to Jews to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America is deeply shocked by the apparent inability of the American government to convince the communist governments of the imperative need to implement more accurately the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Czechoslovak National Council urges the Department of Justice/State to find new and better ways of representing this need to the communist governments of East Central Europe.

James V. Krakora,

President.

Francis Schwarzenberg,

Vice-President.

Vlastislav Chalups,

Secretary.

EXPATRIATE LEADER APPEALS TO OTTAWA OVER "BLACKMAIL"

The leader of 1,200 Czechoslovakian expatriates in Vancouver has filed charges with Ottawa that many of them are being black-mailed by the Communist regime of their homeland.

Prague recently advised Czech refugees in the United States, Canada and Western Europe, who fled their country after the Soviet-led invasion in 1968, that they face criminal proceedings for "illegal presence" abroad.

Many expatriates have received letters telling them that they must make a "down payment" for legal defence or the "fees" will be collected from their nearest relatives in Czechoslovakia.

University of B.C. professor, Dr. V. J. Krajina, says many of these letters have been received by refugees settled in Vancouver.

Krajina, president of the Vancouver Chapter of the Czechoslovak National Association of Canada, has sent off a letter to External Affairs Minister Sharp pleading for help to combat a "case of mass extortion."

Krajina says that officers from the Czech government specify that payments ranging from \$50 to \$100 be credited to an official Czechoslovak bank.

"To my mind (this) belongs to the same category of blackmail that was applied at the kidnappings all over the world and more recently in Quebec," said Krajina. "But in this case it is applied directly by an agency which is under the control of the Communist state."

In his letter to Sharp, Krajina says the Communist regime of Czechoslovakia has two aims in invoking "mass extortion."

He says the first is to alleviate the economic problems of Czechoslovakia by extorting money from refugees.

The second aim is to create hatred between relatives—Czechs presently living in Czechoslovakia and those who fled.

"Both these Machiavellian aims are humanly most objectionable," says Krajina.

TORONTO AREA CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE OF CZECH AND SLOVAK DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATIONS

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

The below mentioned organizations of Canadians of Czech and Slovak origin in

Toronto area would like to bring to your attention the following matter:

Many refugees from Czechoslovakia, who came to our shores after the invasion of their country, are now facing in-absentia trials in Czechoslovakia, in which they are accused of "crimes", like living in Canada without Czechoslovak Government official permission. These trials, in the opinion of many, would be just a farce, if they were not accompanied by threats to the new immigrants and their relatives in Czechoslovakia.

Czechoslovak refugees in Canada are receiving letters from state-appointed "legal counsels" in Czechoslovakia and are being asked to pay a down-payment for what is called "defence in court". These letters invariably include a sentence that down-payment will be "accepted from close relatives in Czechoslovakia", which will be interpreted as "to demand payments" by anybody, who had lived under a Soviet type of dictatorship. It is therefore understandable that people in Canada receiving such letters from authorities in Czechoslovakia consider themselves to be victims of blackmail.

We are warning our fellow-countrymen, through our ethnic press, against this Communist scheme, and we are urging them to leave letters from state-appointed Czechoslovak lawyers unanswered. However, we fear that if anyone in Canada will submit to pressure from authorities in Czechoslovakia, he will do so not because he recognizes any legal obligation, but only because he wishes to spare his closest relatives from persecution.

We feel that the whole situation might be remedied more efficiently, if the Government of Canada could find a way of expressing its dissatisfaction with these procedures.

Two aspects of this affair would, in our opinion, justify Canadian Government action:

1. New immigrants in Canada are being bothered and their settlement rendered more difficult by moral as well as economic pressure;

2. If the scheme were allowed to go on unchecked, several million dollars might be drained out of the Canadian economy.

We sincerely hope that you will understand the cause of our concern. We would like to assure you that any support you might be able to give to our standpoint, will be of great significance to us. It may also restrain further moves by the Czechoslovak Government, as well as similar activity by other governments behind the Iron Curtain.

Club of newcomers of Czech and Slovak origin in Canada—represented by Steve Petr, Secretary, 5 Brookfield St., Toronto 145, Ont.

Czechoslovak Baptist Church—represented by Rev. J. Novák, 153 Medland St., Toronto 165, Ont.

Czechoslovak Refugees Canadian Fund and Information Service—represented by Karel Buzek, Vice-Chairman, 1 Adelaide St. East, Toronto 210, Ont.

Permanent Conference of Slovak Democratic Exiles in Canada—represented by Rudolf Frastacky, President, 338 Cortleigh Blvd., Toronto 305, Ont.

Royal Canadian Legion, Branch 601/Czechoslovak—represented by Petr Eben, President, 605 Rushton Rd., Toronto 173, Ont.

St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church—represented by Rev. Daniel Jurkovič, 54 Clinton St., Toronto 140, Ont.

St. Wendeslaus Roman Catholic Church—represented by Rev. Jaroslav Janda, 496 Gladstone Ave., Toronto 173, Ont.

Soccer Club "Sparta"—represented by V. Bělohávek, President, 118 Christie St., Toronto 174, Ont.

Sokol Gymnastic Association of Toronto—represented by Karel Jerábek, President, 3 Fiesta Lane, Toronto 560, Ont.

Union of Czechoslovak Protestants in Canada—represented by V. Menšík, President, 196 Oakmount Rd., Toronto 165, Ont.

Union of Czechoslovak Sportsmen Abroad, Toronto Branch—represented by O. Pokorny, President, Apt. 309, 1285 Lakeshore Rd. East, Fort Credit, Ont.

Welfare Association of former Czechoslovak Political Prisoners/Canada—represented by Mojmir Chromec, Secretary, Apt. 1203, 103 West Lodge Ave., Toronto 146, Ont.

In full agreement with the above statement is also M. Kominek, Publisher of Independent Czechoslovak weekly "Nase Hlasy", 77 Florence St., Toronto 145, Ont.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 13, 1970]

PRAGUE LAWYERS SEEK FEES FROM EMIGRANTS TO AUSTRALIA

SIDNEY, AUSTRALIA.—Efforts by lawyers in Czechoslovakia to collect fees from Czechoslovak emigrants to Australia have aroused the anger of the Government here.

Several Czechoslovak residents of Adelaide said that they had received letters from Prague demanding payment of \$150 to court-appointed lawyers assigned to defend them against charges of having left the country illegally after the Russian invasion into Czechoslovakia in 1968. The letters were turned over to the Australian police, who brought them to the attention of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Foreign Minister William McMahon said that his department had "expressed displeasure" to the Consul General of Czechoslovakia in Sydney, Jaromir Johannes.

About 1,400 Czechoslovaks came to Australia in 1969, according to Government figures.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 16, 1970]

AUSTRALIA PROTESTS CZECH "BLACKMAIL"

CANBERRA, AUSTRALIA.—Australia has expressed concern to Czechoslovakia over what it regards as blackmail letters sent to former Czechs now living here, a foreign office spokesman said today.

He said the letters inform recipients they will be prosecuted for leaving Czechoslovakia illegally and ask for sums of around \$150 for defense costs.

COMMUNIST ATTEMPTS TO BLACKMAIL CZECHS AND SLOVAKS LIVING IN AMERICA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the puppet Czechoslovakian Government has never recovered from its acute embarrassment suffered in the popular uprising of its people in 1968.

The Communist rulers continue to harass and blackmail the 50,000 expatriates of 1968 who continue from exile to fight the oppression gripping their beloved homeland.

For the Communists, no scheme is too petty, no trick too insidious for attempts at reprisal.

Two months ago, their latest scheme came to public attention. Almost juvenile in concept, it nevertheless represents a threat and source of torment to Czechs and Slovaks who left relatives and property behind when they departed.

The despicable trick came to light when Czechs and Slovaks in the United States, Canada, and other nations of the free world began to receive letters stating they were being tried in absentia for the "criminal act of leaving the Republic." The letters went on to say that if there was to be any hope of avoiding sentences of imprisonment and confiscation of their property, they would have to pay substantial defense fees in advance. If this is not done, then the government-appointed barristers in such cases would be entitled to accept payment by your close relatives.

It seems unlikely that many persons would be taken in by this clumsy attempt at blackmail. Yet it does not tax the imagination to recognize the mental anguish it causes among those who fear for their loved ones.

The scheme was first called to my attention by Mrs. Anna Faltus, secretary for the

Czechoslovak National Council of America with offices in Washington, D.C. The council is a nonprofit organization founded in 1918 to promote cooperation of all peoples for the preservation of democratic freedom. That council is to be commended for the active interest which it has taken on this subject.

Mrs. Faltus wrote:

"DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: I am taking the liberty of bringing to your attention the fact that the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia started to blackmail the Czech and Slovak exiles who fled the country after the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia.

"I am enclosing for your information copies of some articles and letters pertaining to the subject. Please note, that one letter is addressed to a member of our local Chapter.

"According to an article that appeared in the New York Times—copy of which is enclosed—the Australian Government protested this unprecedented action of the Czechoslovak Government while our State Department informed some of the exiles who asked for help that it cannot do anything.

"This action of the Czechoslovak Government is not only harassing people who were granted asylum in this country and who have a right to be protected, but would also mean—if it succeeded—providing the communist government with funds for financing actions against our country; it would also mean a drain on our economy which we can hardly afford.

"Respectfully yours,

"ANNA FALTUS, Secretary."

Here are two samples of the letters to which she refers:

"You are advised that criminal proceedings have been instituted against you for the criminal act of leaving the Republic, according to paragraph 109, section 2 of the Criminal Code. Since these proceedings are conducted in your absence, the Czechoslovak law on criminal procedure requires that you . . . have a defense lawyer. I was appointed as your defense lawyer, and you are obliged to defray the cost, which is estimated in the first instance of the proceedings at 1,350 crowns/approximately \$190.00, which includes the lawyer's fee and court expenses.

"I am therefore requesting that you pay the sum mentioned within one month as a down payment for the defense. It should be credited in dollars according to the official exchange rate to the account of the Regional Lawyers Union at the Artisans Bank, Prague.

"Finally, I should like to bring to your attention that the results as of now of the criminal proceedings seem to indicate that you will be sentenced and that your punishment cannot be suspended. The prison term for the criminal act mentioned above ranges from 6 months to 5 years and, in addition, your property will be confiscated.

"You could possibly receive a suspended sentence, but only if you return to Czechoslovakia immediately or apply to the Regional Passport Office for extension of your permit to stay abroad. In the latter case it may be possible to request a stay of the criminal proceedings pending a decision with regard to your application for passport extension.

"You are advised that following the decision of the Inquest officer dated October 12, 1970, prosecution has been initiated against you for the criminal act of abandoning the Republic according to article 109/2 of the Criminal Code, because established facts do sufficiently justify the conclusion that you have been, since October 18, 1968, staying abroad illegitimately with the intention to take up permanent residence there.

"The law makes defense in this case obligatory; as you have not yet chosen a counsel, I was appointed to be your defense lawyer. Consequently, I am addressing to you the above information.

"At the same time I wish to advise you

that according to the quoted article of the Criminal Code you may be tried in absentia and sentenced to prison for a term of 6 months to 5 years or to corrective measures, or possibly to forfeiture of your property.

"It is in your interest to communicate to me, whether there are any facts that I could, as your counsel, point up for your defense in this process. In particular, let me know, whether you applied for an extension of your stay abroad or whether proceedings relating thereto are on the way.

"Finally, you are advised that the costs of the proceedings and those of legal defense are your responsibility. As far as the defense costs are concerned, it is my duty to invite you to send within 15 days an adequate deposit, i.e. 700-Czechoslovakian crowns. According to our foreign-currency regulations, of course, the deposit has to be forwarded in the currency of the country of your immediate residence, i.e. in Canadian dollars, at the official exchange rate to the order of the City Guild of Barristers/Městské sdružení advokátů/Prague at the Artisans Bank Zivnostenská banka/, Prague 1, Prikopy. If the deposit is not forwarded within the stated deadline, the organization of barristers is entitled to accept payments by your close relatives in Czechoslovakia.

"Expecting your answer, I remain,

"Yours truly."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a number of news releases and translations of documents of the kind relating to the incidents to which I have referred.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 16, 1970]

PRAGUE DUNS REFUGEES ABROAD FOR LEGAL FEES ON DEFECTIONS

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, Dec. 15.—Many Czechoslovak refugees in the United States, Canada and Western Europe, who fled their country after the Soviet-led invasion in 1968, are being advised from Prague that they face criminal proceedings for "illegal" presence abroad.

Letters from "legal advisory centers" in Prague also inform them that they must make a "down payment" in foreign currency within five days to assure their "legal defense," or the fees will be collected from the refugees' "nearest relatives" in Czechoslovakia.

The payments range from about \$70 to \$100, and are to be credited to the Prague regional lawyer's union at an official Czechoslovak bank.

There are estimated to be 8,000 Czechoslovak refugees in the United States, 12,000 in Canada and 50,000 in other Western countries.

United States officials said that even if a relatively small number of the refugees agreed to the "down payments" and later the full trial costs, the money would represent a source of badly needed foreign exchange for the Czechoslovak Government.

State Department officials said they had been consulted by several persons who have received letters from Czechoslovakia. The officials said they could offer no assistance or advice since the matter was between a foreign Government and its nationals abroad.

Czechoslovak citizens here and elsewhere began receiving in October the notifications of action pending against them. On Nov. 13, the Prague evening newspaper Vecerni Praha reported that courts were dealing with "hundreds of cases" of illegal departures and illegal stays abroad.

The letters to the refugees inform them that under the provisions of Section 109 of the Czechoslovak penal code, "You can be tried in absentia and may be sentenced to prison for terms of six months to five years, to corrective measures and to confiscation of property."

Those aiding other Czechoslovak citizens to leave the country without permission are

subject to prison terms of from 3 to 10 years. A virtual ban on foreign travel was imposed early in 1969.

In most cases, the property of refugees, including apartments and vehicles, has already been confiscated through administrative procedures.

A letter from the "legal advisory centers," signed by individual lawyers, tells a refugee that "since you have not chosen a defense counsel, I have been nominated to represent you."

A letter asks a refugee "to let me know if any circumstances exist which, as your lawyer, I could use for your defense in these proceedings. Especially, let me know whether you submitted an appeal asking for permission to prolong your stay abroad, or whether such an appeal is under consideration by the authorities."

The letters do not say what the final cost of "legal defense" will be, but it is understood that it may go up to \$140. The exact number of refugees involved was not known.

Spokesmen for refugee groups here and in Canada said that in many cases the citizens abroad may be willing to pay for "legal defense" to avoid financial or other reprisals against relatives at home, in Canada, refugee groups have advised refugees not to reply to the letters, but to ask Canadian Government authorities to intercede with the Prague Government.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 13, 1970]
PRAGUE LAWYERS SEEK FEES FROM EMIGRANTS TO AUSTRALIA

SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA, Dec. 12.—Efforts by lawyers in Czechoslovakia to collect fees from Czechoslovak emigrants to Australia have aroused the anger of the Government here.

Several Czechoslovak residents of Adelaide said that they had received letter from Prague demanding payment of \$150 to court-appointed lawyers assigned to defend them against charges of having left the country illegally after the vaki in 1968. The letters were turned over to the Australian police, who brought them to the attention of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Foreign Minister William McMahon said that his department had "expressed displeasure" to the Counsel General of Czechoslovakia in Sydney, Jaromir Johannes.

About 1,400 Czechoslovaks came to Australia in 1969, according to Government figures.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 16, 1970]
AUSTRALIA PROTESTS CZECH "BLACKMAIL"

CANBERRA, AUSTRALIA, Dec. 15.—Australia has expressed concern to Czechoslovakia over what it regards as blackmail letters sent to former Czechs now living here, a foreign office spokesman said today.

He said the letters inform recipients they will be prosecuted for leaving Czechoslovakia illegally and ask for sums of around \$150 for defense costs.

EXPATRIATE LEADER APPEALS TO OTTAWA OVER BLACKMAIL

The leader of 1,200 Czechoslovakian expatriates in Vancouver has filed charges with Ottawa that many of them are being blackmailed by the Communist regime of their homeland.

Prague recently advised Czech refugees in the United States, Canada and Western Europe, who fled their country after the Soviet-led invasion in 1968, that they face criminal proceedings for "illegal presence" abroad.

Many expatriates have received letters telling them that they must make a "down payment" for legal defense or the "fees" will be collected from their nearest relatives in Czechoslovakia.

University of B.C. professor, Dr. V. J. Krajina, says many of these letters have been received by refugees settled in Vancouver.

"To my mind (this) belongs to the same category of blackmail that was applied at the kidnappings all over the world and more recently in Quebec," said Krajina. "But in this case it is applied directly by an agency which is under the control of the Communist state."

In his letter to Sharp, Krajina says the Communist regime of Czechoslovakia has two aims in invoking "mass extortion".

He says the first is to alleviate the economic problems of Czechoslovakia by extorting money from refugees.

The second aim is to create hatred between relatives—Czechs presently living in Czechoslovakia and those who fled.

"Both these Machiavellian aims are humanly most objectionable," says Krajina.

PRAGUE STARTS BLACKMAILING 70,000 EXILES: TRIALS FOR UNAUTHORIZED DEPARTURE TO BE PAID IN FOREIGN CURRENCIES BY REFUGEES OR RELATIVES—SOLICITORS' LETTERS DESPATCHED ALL OVER THE WORLD—KCB ADVISERS BEHIND FOREIGN CURRENCY DRIVE

(London/FCI) British authorities are in possession of an interesting official document originating from Prague. It testifies to an unprecedented blackmail which may affect 70,000 voluntary exiles from Czechoslovakia, the majority of whom are now settled in Commonwealth countries, some 2-3,000 in Britain itself. It is a letter from the "Legal Advisory Centre" ("Advokátní poradna") established by the Prague regime and is addressed to post-August 1968 exiles. It demands an immediate down-payment of 700 Kcs. (£40 at the official exchange rate, but worth treble to the State Bank in foreign currency) with the threat that if the money "is not deposited within 15 days the Legal organization has the right to demand it from near relatives in CS(S)R", i.e. in most cases aged parents. This letter has reached exiles in a number of countries and may soon affect most of the post-invasion exiles of whom there are about 70,000, although Prague officially admits to only 51,000 by omitting those who have not yet made a declaration that they have no intention of returning.

The Letter: "I wish to inform you that based on the decision of an investigator made on . . . a criminal proceeding has been initiated against you based on para. 102/2 of the criminal law, because according to the aforementioned decision there is a reasonably founded conclusion that you have been illegally abroad since . . . with the intention of taking up permanent residence there.

According to the law Defence Counsel in this case is obligatory. Since you have not chosen a Defence Counsel, I have been nominated to represent you, for which reason I am sending you the above information. (FCI Note: This is usually the first time the addressee has heard about the proceedings. He has, therefore had no opportunity of naming a Defence Counsel, even if he had wished to do so).

"At the same time I wish to inform you" the letter goes on, "that according to the provisions of the criminal law cited, you can be tried in absentia and may be sentenced to prison for a term of 6 months to 5 years, to corrective measures and to confiscation of property. (FCI note: In most cases property, flats, cash deposited, etc., have already been confiscated by a special decree before any proceedings being instituted in individual cases).

"It is in your own interest to let me know if any circumstances exist which, as your lawyer, I could use for your defence in these proceedings. Especially, let me know whether you submitted an appeal asking for permission to prolong your stay abroad, or whether such an appeal is under consideration by the

authorities." (FCI: Many exiles left legally but failed to return).

"Finally, I wish to inform you that the cost of the proceedings and of the defence have to be met by you. As far as the cost of the defence is concerned, it is my duty to ask you to pay, within 15 days, an appropriate down-payment, i.e. 700 Kcs. According to our currency regulations this down-payment must be paid in the currency of the state where you are now domiciled to the value of the official exchange rate. (FCI note: which is purely fictitious) and credited to the account of the Regional Lawyers Union at . . . with the Artisans Bank (Zivnostenska Banka). Should you fail to transfer the required sum within the period stipulated, the Legal Advisory Centre is entitled to obtain payment from your nearest relatives in CS(S)R.

I await your reply and remain with greetings
(Stamp) Legal Advisory Centre at . . .

Signed.

In many cases, in order to save old parents or other relatives the exile pays up. He does not realise that the final bill may be many times higher than the original demand for "down-payment". If later he refuses to pay the balance for concluding the proceedings—the result of which is a foregone conclusion—the money will be extorted from those he wished to save by making the first payment. Since similar measures were not applied (especially in their financial aspects) against the majority of the post-February 1948 putsch victims, observers believe that this scheme for obtaining foreign currency has been devised by the KGB and Soviet legal advisors who have of late directed political "justice" in occupied Czechoslovakia.

To avoid further victimisation of a particular "offender" and of his relatives, it has been decided not to publish the name or the address of the "Legal Advisory Centre" and the nominated Defence Counsel concerned in this letter. (221a/Do/SDC/To)

CS(S)R: World-Wide Campaign (London/FCI). According to Swiss and German press reports the number of exiles resident in Switzerland, who have received notification of criminal proceedings instituted against them, is considerable. Downpayments vary. In some cases it is 1000 Kcs. (almost £60 or \$144). Exile publications in Canada have advised readers not to reply to the letters, but to contact Canadian authorities and ask for protection against blackmail. A Czechoslovak exiles delegation appealed to Mr. Trudeau to intercede with Soviet authorities to liberalise the occupation regime in Czechoslovakia (221b/FA/NH).

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Dec. 21, 1970]

PRAGUE STOOPTS TO BLACKMAIL

This is the time of year that newspapers used to write stories about "the meanest man"—a thief who stole a crippled newsboy's Christmas savings or snatched a blind girl's seeing eye dog.

Well, our nomination for the honor in 1970 is a smirking genius in Communist Party headquarters in Prague. He is the brain behind blackmail letters now being received by Czechoslovak refugees from the 1968 Russian invasion of their homeland.

Under the manic logic of a communist society, one must be satisfied in a workers' paradise. So if you flee, even to avoid a Russian bayonet or a stretch in a prison camp, this leads to "illegal presence" abroad, a serious crime.

Czech refugees in the United States, Canada, Western Europe and Australia have received letters from alleged "lawyers" in Prague demanding up to \$150—in hard currency, of course—as fees for their "legal defense."

If the money isn't sent, the hapless refu-

gees are warned, it will be collected from their "nearest relatives." This is open blackmail, always a dirty crime. Usually, tho, it's the act of a criminal with a diseased mind. Making it government policy is more reprehensible.

There are perhaps 8,000 Czechoslovak refugees in this country, 12,000 in Canada and 50,000 in other non-Communist states. So the Prague extortion racket could raise a lot of foreign currency. This is badly needed by an economy staggered by the Soviet invasion, communist bungling and the Czech worker's unwillingness to exert himself for his oppressors, foreign and native.

Australia, which is a small nation but not one lacking in backbone, has expressed concern to Czechoslovakia over these blackmail letters.

By contrast, our State Department has told refugees that it can give no help or advice since the letters are between a foreign government and its nationals abroad.

This cautious, narrowly legalistic reply shows that some diplomats haven't learned anything from the scandalous case of the Lithuanian seaman, Simas Kuderka, a few weeks ago. In its answer we hear echoes of the advice to the Coast Guard—not to "encourage" the defector—which led to Kuderka's return to his Communist pursuers.

Consistency is, of course, a virtue, but not when the State Department tries to live up to President Kennedy's description of it as a "bowl of jelly."

The issue is really quite clear: when we give people refuge in this country, we can find ways to protect them against the exactions of foreign tyrants.

OF CZECH AND SLOVAK DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

For Your Information: The below mentioned organizations of Canadians of Czech and Slovak origin in Toronto area would like to bring to your attention the following matter:

Many refugees from Czechoslovakia, who came to our shores after the invasion of their country, are now facing in-absentia trials in Czechoslovakia, in which they are accused of "crimes", like living in Canada without Czechoslovak Government official permission. These trials, in the opinion of many, would be just a farce, if they were not accompanied by threats to the new immigrants and their relatives in Czechoslovakia.

Czechoslovak refugees in Canada are receiving letters from state-appointed "legal counsels" in Czechoslovakia and are being asked to pay a down-payment for what is called "defence in court". These letters invariably include a sentence that down-payment will be "accepted from close relatives in Czechoslovakia", which will be interpreted as "to demand payments" by anybody, who had lived under a Soviet type of dictatorship. It is therefore understandable that people in Canada receiving such letters from authorities in Czechoslovakia consider themselves to be victims of blackmail.

We are warning our fellow-countrymen, through our ethnic press, against this Communist scheme, and we are urging them to leave letters from state-appointed Czechoslovak lawyers unanswered. However, we fear that if anyone in Canada will submit to pressure from authorities in Czechoslovakia, he will do so not because he recognizes any legal obligation, but only because he wishes to spare his closest relative from persecution.

We feel that the whole situation might be remedied more efficiently, if the Government of Canada could find a way of expressing its dissatisfaction with these procedures.

Two aspects of this affair would, in our opinion, justify Canadian Government action:

1. New immigrants in Canada are being bothered and their settlement rendered more difficult by moral as well as economic pressure;

2. If the scheme were allowed to go on unchecked, several million dollars might be drained out of the Canadian economy.

We sincerely hope that you will understand the cause of our concern. We would like to assure you that any support, you might be able to give to our standpoint, will be of great significance to us. It may also restrain further moves by the Czechoslovak Government, as well as similar activity by other governments behind the Iron Curtain.

Club of newcomers of Czech and Slovak origin in Canada—represented by Steve Petr, Secretary, 5 Brookfield St., Toronto 145, Ont.
Czechoslovak Baptist Church—represented by Rev. J. Novak, 153 Medland St., Toronto 165, Ont.

Czechoslovak Refugees Canadian Fund and Information Service—represented by Karel Buzek, Vice-Chairman, 1 Adelaide St., East, Toronto 210, Ont.

Permanent Conference of Slovak Democratic Exiles in Canada—represented by Rudolf Frastacky, President, 338 Cortleigh Blvd., Toronto 305, Ont.

Royal Canadian Legion, Branch 601 (Czechoslovak)—represented by Petr Eben, President, 605 Rushton Rd., Toronto 173, Ont.

St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church—represented by Rev. Daniel Jurkovic, 54 Clinton St., Toronto 140, Ont.

St. Wencelas Roman Catholic Church—represented by Rev. Jaroslav Janda, 496 Gladstone Ave., Toronto 173, Ont.

Soccer Club "Sparta"—represented by V. Belohlavek, President, 118 Christie St., Toronto 174, Ont.

Sokol Gymnastic Association of Toronto—represented by Karel Jerabek, President, 3 Fiesta Lane, Toronto 560, Ont.

Union of Czechoslovak Protestants in Canada—represented by V. Mensik, President, 196 Oakmount Rd., Toronto 165, Ont.

Union of Czechoslovak Sportsmen Abroad, Toronto Branch—represented by O. Pokorny, President, Apt. 309, 1285 Lakeshore Rd. East, Port Credit, Ont.

Welfare Association of former Czechoslovak Political Prisoners/Canada—represented by Mojmir Chromec, Secretary, Apt. 1203, 103 West Lodge Ave., Toronto 146, Ont.

In full agreement with the above statement is also M. Kominek, Publisher of independent Czechoslovak weekly "Nase Hlasy", 77 Florence St., Toronto 145, Ont.

Mr. Hruska. Mr. President, the Czechoslovak National Council sent the following wire to Secretary of State William Rogers and Attorney General John Mitchell:

Public opinion in the United States, Canada, Australia and other free countries has been seriously disturbed by recent evidence of a new form of harassment of refugees from Czechoslovakia by agencies of the Prague government. Many refugees have received communications from Czechoslovak authorities informing them about pending trials initiated against them for having illegally left Czechoslovakia or for not returning from abroad. The Czechoslovak authorities urged refugees to transmit sizeable sums of money to cover the fees of officially assigned defense lawyers.

The letters contain a veiled threat that in case of nonpayment the refugees' relatives in Czechoslovakia might be called upon to defray the defense expenses. This despicable form of blackmail is a logical consequence of the communist unwillingness to respect the fundamental human rights of every individual permitting him to leave at will his own country and to settle in any country of his own choice.

Basically this is the same evil which is found in the cruel denial of permission to

Jews to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America is deeply shocked by the apparent inability of the American government to convince the communist governments of the imperative need to implement more accurately the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Czechoslovak National Council urges the Departments of Justice/State to find new and better ways of representing this need to the communist governments of East Central Europe.

JAMES V. KRAKORA,

President.

FRANCIS SCHWARZENBERG,

Vice President.

VLASTISLAV CHALUPA,

Secretary.

The following response was received from Mr. David Abshire, Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations at the State Department:

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: I have your letter of December 31 concerning the comments of Mrs. Anna Faltus on letters being sent by "Lawyers Councils" in Czechoslovakia to Czechoslovak nationals residing outside Czechoslovakia. Mrs. Faltus recently wrote the Department of State about this matter and attached materials similar to those enclosed in her letter to you. A copy of our reply to Mrs. Faltus on that occasion is enclosed for your information.

The Department has seen and carefully examined copies of several of the letters, signed by court-appointed attorneys on behalf of local "Lawyers Councils" in Czechoslovakia, which have been received by Czechoslovak nationals residing outside Czechoslovakia. The letters request payment of legal fees for defense of the addressees in prosecutions instituted against them in absentia, under Czechoslovak law, for leaving, or being absent from, Czechoslovakia without Governmental permission. The letters indicate that penalties under such Czechoslovak law may range from six months to five years deprivation of liberty and, in some instances, confiscation of property. Some letters request fees for services already rendered and describe the sentence imposed, while other letters request advance payment for services to be rendered. The fees requested have ranged from 470 to 1,000 crowns (the official rate is 7.18 crowns to the dollar). Two of the letters which have come to the Department's attention have stated that nonpayment of the fees will result in an assessment for the fee against the addressee's relatives remaining in Czechoslovakia.

While the United States Government, as a practical matter, cannot enjoin the enforcement of domestic laws in Czechoslovakia, it does have a strong interest in protecting all persons residing in the United States from communications from abroad which they regard as offensive and threatening. The Department has made known to the Czechoslovak Embassy its concern in this regard. I understand that Mr. John Leahy of my office has been in touch with your office on this particular point.

In response to inquiries by recipients of the Czechoslovak letters, the Department is drawing attention to Postal Service Regulation Section 154.11, under which any resident of the United States may prevent delivery of any mail to him from overseas simply by writing his local Postmaster, citing the regulation, and identifying specifically the names and addresses of the senders of mail that he does not wish to receive. For a period of two years thereafter all such mail will be treated as undeliverable by the United States postal authorities. Notably, this procedure may be invoked with respect to any correspondence or material sent from overseas, including Czechoslovak "census questionnaires," such as were reported in the press most recently, or other unsolicited communications. Re-

course to the procedure under this Postal Service Regulation is, of course, entirely at the discretion of the individual.

I hope the foregoing information will be helpful to you in replying to Mrs. Faltus.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. ABSHIRE,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

In the meantime, I recently received another letter from Mrs. Faltus, calling my attention to still another similar scheme, an attempt to collect money for child support. The text of this letter:

MY DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: I am again taking the liberty of informing you of another action of the communist authorities of Czechoslovakia against the Czech and Slovak exiles who fled Czechoslovakia after the Soviet invasion of the country in August 1968.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter which we received from Austria which brought to our attention another scheme of the Czechoslovak authorities to harass Czech and Slovak exiles in western countries. This time it concerns "child support" for children whom the father left in Czechoslovakia with his relatives while he is staying abroad "illegally". A special department for collecting child support money from abroad has been established by the District Court in Brno. It is headed by Dr. Uhde. This department is exacting child support money by way of courts in the particular country where the exile resides and is employed.

It has come to our attention that in some instances the Austrian authorities, for example, have already allowed such money to be collected and forwarded to the authorities in Czechoslovakia. While morally this claim to child support cannot be disputed, it would only be correct to demand reciprocity. There are instances where the children are abroad while the father stayed in Czechoslovakia. In cases where reciprocity was demanded, the Czechoslovak authorities stalled and delayed execution of the case to such an extent that the persons who were supposed to receive the money, lost hope of ever getting it. And, of course, no funds have been provided by the Czechoslovak authorities for this purpose. In other words, there are so many complications and so much red tape, that persons living abroad in the end give up their right to collect the money.

Our head office in Chicago is in the process of finding out whether there exists any agreement in this regard between the U.S. and the Czechoslovak governments. There is no reason why the Czechoslovak Government should be able to enrich its coffers with hard currency while not fulfilling its own obligation towards people living in the West.

Very respectfully yours,

ANNA FATUS, Secretary.

Those of us who are intimately concerned with this problem appreciate the concern of the State Department and its efforts to stop these insidious encroachments by the Czechoslovakian Government.

As in the case of our prisoners of war in Southeast Asia, however, governmental action is limited because it is impossible to have meaningful dealings with governments which operate without a base of honorable and humanitarian principles.

We must, therefore, seek other means of bringing these blackmail attempts to public attention. I will have more to say about other approaches in the near future.

Meantime, Mr. President, I urge the Members of this body to support any measures which may be taken to induce the Communist Czechoslovakian Government to cease its despicable practices.

THE CONVERSION RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACT OF 1971—A FIRST STEP TOWARD NEW TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS), chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Astronautics which will be handling the Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I have the privilege of reintroducing with the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) the Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971. The numerous cosponsors of this measure—68 as of this hour—are an indication of the growing national concern over the necessity to redeploy our highly skilled scientific and technical manpower to meet the challenges of our many national domestic problems.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, I am keenly aware of this need. Over the last decade, we have seen tremendous growth in our capability to apply science and technology to meet broad national goals in the areas of national defense, space exploration, and atomic energy research. At the same time, we have seen the emergence of grave domestic problems which will require an even more intensive use of our scientific and technological resources.

Today, both our economy and our scientific community are in a state of transition. On the one hand, we are trying to make an economic transition from inflation and a high defense budget to full employment and an increased output devoted to meet our civilian needs.

On the other, we must also effect a transition of our enormous scientific and technical enterprise to a more socially relevant sector. Both will be difficult. Both are situations for which we have been ill prepared. This is evidenced by the increasing rate of unemployment among scientists and engineers, it is implicit in the institutional inertia of our governmental structure, and it is only just now being fully recognized in most States of the Union.

Many of my colleagues have an intimate awareness of the magnitude of our current unemployment problem. Part of this problem the gentleman from Connecticut has already detailed. However, the truth of the matter is that we do not really have access to an accurate description of the situation. The quantity of data is great—the quality small.

For example, what types of people are unemployed? What are their ages and specific skills? What types of work have they been doing? Has it been theoretical or basic research, applied or developmental work, systems engineering or command and control? This is the important type of information which is lacking.

Some few facts, however, are clear. First, the trend away from defense and space funding which began in 1968 has proceeded at a very rapid pace. The steep decline in the growth rate in funding for research and development during the early 1960's, coupled with the completion of major space missions and military weapons systems have accentuated this trend.

Second, in little over 1 year, aerospace

and related employment levels have declined 15 percent from about 2.7 million to 2.3 million, impacting an estimated 450,000 employees.

Third, current projections indicate that further reductions during fiscal year 1971-72 will affect an additional 400,000 employees, of which about 65,000 will be scientists and engineers. The Lockheed Aircraft Corp. estimates that the average time required by its high-skilled employees to relocate in another job of any sort is from 6 to 9 months. Projecting the median of 7½ months against 65,000 unemployed we find a shocking loss of 195 million man-hours in this 1 year, in this one industry and in only this one category of employment.

It is estimated that the bulk of these reductions will be localized in Seattle, Los Angeles, Fort Worth/Dallas, Long Island, Cape Kennedy, and the Atlanta/Marietta areas.

In my own district, the Lockheed-Georgia Co., the State's largest single industry, employed approximately 30,000 people last year. Today, their employment stands at 22,000, and before current defense cutbacks run their course, is expected to drop to only 12,000.

Grim as this picture is, it is bright compared to the west coast situation. Only 2½ years ago the Seattle Boeing plant offered a rosy picture of 101,000 people employed. Today, their employment levels are down over 50 percent to 46,000. Layoffs are continuing at a monthly rate of 5,000 and by the end of this year total employment will have reached a low of 25,000.

There is no question but that those so affected are mainly scientists, engineers, and technicians. Where, in most industries, the highly skilled are the last to be relieved, in some of the major aerospace industries, they have been the first.

The reasons for this are obvious from a practical and business sense. From a moral, humane one they are unfortunate. First class engineers with 20 years' service and fast approaching company subsidized retirement, are turned loose and the company is saved the burden of fat pensions—an unfortunate situation made even worse by society's attitude toward the middle-aged technocrat. He is too old to profitably retrain. He is too young to be dependent on State aid, and he is too valuable to our technology pool, to let him just sit on the shelf. Additionally, his skills cannot be trotted out again on a whim. With lack of use, they atrophy, and cannot be easily regained.

Turning to the national picture, the unemployment problem for scientists and engineers is projected to be no less serious. For example, aerospace related layoffs as of June 30, 1969, were 20,000. As of the same date last year, the number had jumped to 65,000. Present projections for June 30, 1972, are for 130,000—over a sixfold increase from 1969.

At the same time, the 1980 Bureau of Labor Statistics employment projections indicate that, in the long run, the overall demand for scientific and engineering talent will exceed the current supply.

Already the current unemployment problem for scientists and engineers is affecting many young people who might otherwise consider careers in science. Discouraged by these gloomy employ-

ment projections and by the notion that "science just isn't relevant today," there is a trend in which more and more young people are turning away from the so-called hard sciences and toward the social sciences.

Another serious situation sees continued Federal cutbacks in support of higher education in the sciences. These actions may result in a real crisis for society 6 or 8 years hence when more highly trained scientists and engineers are needed to meet our national problems. As was noted in our NSF authorization report last spring:

The surest way of insuring a research gap in the future is to train inadequate numbers of scientists in the present.

These two trends indicate a grave danger for the future strength of this Nation, but at the same time, the facts behind them offer new opportunities—opportunities to redeploy existing scientific and technological resources to meet the challenges of our large social systems.

Our Nation's health system, for example, is inefficient and highly labor intensive, and will require major improvements. The housing industry is increasingly dependent upon technological innovation for price performance. A savings of only 1 percent in the cost per start of 2.5 million starts in 1975 would reduce financing needs by more than 500 million. Similarly, problems in the transportation industry, in the area of crime control and environmental management all will require broad technological innovation and the prized talents of our scientists and engineers.

Thus, the current reduction in demand for scientists and engineers from the defense related cutbacks creates a situation in which the required number of technical people may be easily attracted to other fields. This is the only bright side of an otherwise murky state of affairs.

Massive unemployment within the ranks of our technically expert personnel is intolerable. But, it is intolerable not simply because members of one group may suffer more hardships than other individuals in periods of less than full employment.

It is intolerable because we are not taking full advantage of the tremendous opportunity to redeploy our technological resources toward the solution of our domestic problems.

What must be done?

The Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971 provides us with an important beginning. Other actions will still be needed, and the very success of this conversion concept will be measured by the complementary or opposing actions of the future.

Briefly, I will focus upon four central themes embodied in this particular bill.

First, as I have suggested, we have to begin to more clearly define the problem at hand. This has not been done. It is simply a problem of unemployment? Is it a matter of resource allocation? Is the issue one of retraining? To be sure, it is all of these and still more. The bill represents, then, a major attempt to deal with the most pressing of these.

Second, is the question of retraining for

scientists and engineers so that they can effectively prepare themselves to meet our domestic challenges. One of the first laws of science is to build on what you already have. We must develop mechanisms that will promote the necessary coupling between a person's past experiences and his future professional tasks.

Third, we must recognize the tremendous contributions, social and behavioral, technologists can make to the solution of conversion from defense-related endeavors to civilian ones, and even beyond that to the very solution of difficult social problems themselves.

Fourth, we must begin to match more effectively our conversion needs and retraining efforts with specific localized domestic problem areas. For example, Michigan's massive pollution problems will surely require the contributions from scientists and engineers there. Similarly, the mass transit problems of southern California will require the many talents of our aerospace engineers in that part of the country, and in my own district, the threat of urban sprawl will draw heavily upon our technological pool.

The Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971 deals with all of these themes. But, I must add, it is also no panacea. The overall redirection of national priorities, already underway, will continue, and we must at the same time develop new market demands through the reallocation of our Federal resources. We must also develop new ways to remove some of the impediments in our labor and product markets. Only then will we have made a fair fledgling effort.

In conclusion, I feel compelled to say that this task falls to those of us in the U.S. Congress in the fact of total inaction on the part of the executive branch. It is my sincere hope that we will assert our congressional leadership in this area to the fullest.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I am honored that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, and 68 of our colleagues have joined with me today to reintroduce H.R. 34, the Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971. The growing support for this legislation is dramatic proof of the need for prompt action by the Federal Government to reverse the trend of increasing unemployment among this Nation's scientists, engineers, and technicians.

Last September, Mr. Speaker, I outlined for the Members of this House the disturbing ramifications of unemployment in the scientific and technological community. Today I wish to amplify some of these observations, for I am convinced that our failure to recognize and alleviate this crisis will adversely affect every American. This is an urgent matter; we can ignore it no longer.

A WASTE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

How strange it is that the most technologically advanced nation on the face of the earth is now confronted with the all-too-real possibility that much of its scientific and technological brainpower will be wasted because we lack the wisdom and motivation to properly use it.

We have been a wasteful Nation. Our soil, our forests, our minerals, our open spaces have been ravaged because we have refused to realize that these resources are not limitless. Must we now add to this tale of folly the squandering of our valuable human resources as well?

We cannot afford to waste them, Mr. Speaker, for we need them now as we have never needed them before. There are children to be educated. There are houses to be built. There are jobs to be created. There are rivers to be cleaned. There are diseases to be cured. These goals and others can be achieved only through the full utilization of this Nation's talents. President Kennedy recognized this need when he said:

Well-trained minds are among this Nation's most precious assets, among the scarcest of our resources. Attainment of our many national objectives and fulfillment of existing commitments critically depend on the quantity, and on the quality, of manpower in all professional fields, at all levels of training.

Unfortunately, the policies of the Federal Government have often failed to protect and preserve this valuable resource; in fact, shortsighted, haphazard, and unimaginative planning at the Federal level has undercut this Nation's scientific and technological community. The need for a national policy for high-level technical manpower was stressed last year by the Engineering Manpower Commission:

Observers may wonder how the engineering manpower picture can change so suddenly from one of chronic shortage to an apparent surplus of engineers. The answer, of course, is that the need for more engineers is basic and long range while the immediate job market is determined by all kinds of other factors. The absence of an underlying national policy with regard to high-level manpower is all too clearly revealed in the results of uncoordinated actions such as precipitous Federal budgetary cuts, shifts in monetary policy, changes in selective service regulations, and revised immigration laws. In none of these cases were the potential manpower implications studied in advance, and in all cases reliable statistics have become available, if at all, too late to permit timely corrective action. The Nation's supply of technologically educated manpower is too valuable a resource to be wasted in boom and bust cycles in which engineers are the unhappy victims of events and decisions beyond their influence or control.

The fact is that the Federal Government has a special responsibility in protecting our scientific resources because of its massive influence on deployment and utilization of scientists and engineers. The Committee on Utilization of Scientific and Engineering Manpower of the National Academy of Sciences underscored this point in 1964:

This influence imposes upon Government an entirely new order of responsibility to prevent maulutilization. Government must assess in advance the effects of its decisions on the deployment of large numbers of scientists and engineers, both in undertaking new projects and in discontinuing old ones.

The time has come, in our opinion, for the Government to assume this responsibility.

Others must share this burden, of course. Institutions and individuals must be ready and willing to adapt to meet

the changing needs of our society. What the National Academy's committee said on this subject in 1964 is still true today:

Individuals must have a deep commitment to innovation and self-renewal. Institutions must continually adapt their policies and procedures to new tasks. They also have an increasing responsibility for encouraging personnel, especially those in the professions, to renew, update and extend their skills throughout their careers, and for providing them opportunities to do so.

To create an atmosphere for such change is the goal of the Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971.

THE NEED FOR NEW TECHNOLOGY

The problem of unemployment in the scientific and technological community is, of course, only part of the overall manpower situation which so deeply concerns all of us. The plight of the engineer pumping gas or the physicist driving a taxicab is overshadowed by the fact that millions of other Americans cannot obtain jobs at all. I submit, however, that the thousands of unemployed scientists, engineers, and technicians have an effect on this Nation's total unemployment problem far greater than their numbers might suggest.

The fact is, of course, that scientists and engineers do not work in a vacuum. Their research and development efforts provide the impetus for employment in all areas of the economy. They provide the new goods and services which are needed in the American marketplace and throughout the world. Without them, there can be no progress, economic growth or employment stability. Because of this, our failure to fully utilize the skills of these men and women must ultimately result in increased unemployment throughout the Nation. For every highly skilled scientist and engineer put out of work, several unskilled workers will lose their jobs. The time has come for us to recognize the close relationship between unemployment in the laboratory and unemployment on the production line.

Our valuable scientific and technological community must be put to work on new technology, Mr. Speaker, technology which can help solve this Nation's pressing domestic problems. More importantly, this new technology can create the need for new jobs in every domestic field and at all economic levels. In short, it can bring about a new era in America—an era of economic stability, full employment and domestic progress. We have the resources to create this new technology; the time has come for us to use them.

The Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971 is not a panacea; it will not alone create millions of new jobs or solve our domestic problems. It will create, however, an atmosphere for change, a climate for conversion to new tasks and new goals. We believe that it is an important first step toward the systematic, prudent, realistic reordering of our economic priorities to meet the demands of a changing world.

TECHNOLOGY AND TRADE

Last year's extensive debate on foreign trade underscored an alarming fact—America is losing its position of

leadership in the international marketplace. A great deal was said last fall about our inability to compete with countries which use "cheap labor" to mass produce certain items. Not enough was said, however, about the degree to which this Nation has become dependent on so-called "high-technology" products to perpetuate its favorable balance of trade.

From 1964 to 1968, for instance, the favorable balance of U.S. trade declined significantly. What net balance we did enjoy was largely the result of our sale of high-technology products abroad. As an example in 1968 we imported \$33 billion worth of goods while exporting \$34

billion, giving us a favorable balance of \$1 billion. The favorable balance of trade for high-technology products, however, was \$9 billion. Without the export of these products, therefore, the United States would have lost \$8 billion in foreign trade in 1968 instead of gaining \$1 billion.

The story has been the same since 1962—the export of high-technology products has made the difference between a favorable and an unfavorable balance of trade. I wish to place in the RECORD at this point a table which shows the impact of high-technology products on our foreign trade between 1962 and 1968:

SELECTIVE WORLD TRADE DATA 1962-68

(Billions of dollars)

	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
All commodities:							
U.S. exports	21.4	23.1	26.2	27.2	30.0	31.2	34.2
U.S. imports	16.4	17.2	18.7	21.4	25.6	26.9	33.2
Balance	5.0	5.9	7.5	5.8	4.4	4.3	1.0
Technology-intensive product:							
U.S. exports	10.2	10.6	12.1	13.0	14.4	16.0	18.4
U.S. imports	2.5	2.6	3.1	3.9	6.0	7.0	9.4
Balance	7.7	8.0	9.0	9.1	8.4	9.0	9.0
Net balance for other than technology intensive products	(2.7)	(2.1)	(1.5)	(3.3)	(4.0)	(4.6)	(8.0)

Because of the obvious importance of high-technology products to our economy Mr. Speaker, we are deeply concerned about growing threats to our superiority in this area. The net balance of trade in such products with Western Europe and Japan is down. The United States has become an importer of sophisticated technological goods from Japan, when only a few years ago we had a favorable balance of trade in such products with that country. These are ominous signs, indeed.

Our only hope for retaining our favorable balance of trade lies in the continued production of goods and services that are ahead of the technological capabilities of other countries. Since these high-technology products cannot be produced by untrained, inexperienced personnel, it becomes apparent that our future standing in world trade will depend more and more upon the quality, availability, and utilization of our brainpower.

As the world's foremost trading nation, we cannot afford to dissipate our vital intellectual resources, yet, we are in imminent danger of doing precisely that. My colleagues and I are unwilling to permit this to happen; the Conversion Research and Education Act is a product of our concern.

THE TECHNOLOGY GAP IS CLOSING

For years, the American people have taken for granted this Nation's leadership in science and technology. Today, however, that leadership is being threatened by other technologically advanced nations; the technology gap is closing. Dr. James Killian, Jr., former president of MIT and former science adviser to President Eisenhower, underscored this threat in testimony before the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. He warned of the effects of

present Government policies on the scientific and technological community:

Taken together, these actions may curtail the amount and quality of basic research. They may diminish our capacity to educate scientists and engineers. They threaten to discourage young people from selecting science and engineering as fields of study. They threaten the breakup of experienced teams of talented scientists and the closing of facilities. They threaten to erode the preeminent position of the United States in science and technology. They provide a telling example of the need for new policies which can help to reduce uncoordinated federal decisions.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that our present uncoordinated approach to science policy at the Federal level is doing more to threaten this Nation's superiority in science and technology than is the progress of the other industrialized nations of the world. Are we to continue this dangerous trend by dismantling our vast research and development effort instead of finding new uses for it? Are we to lose our lead in science and technology because we lack the initiative and foresight to sustain it? My colleagues and I do not want to lose that lead; we believe that the Conversion Research and Education Act is a first step toward the creation of a realistic national science policy by the Federal Government.

THE CONVERSION RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACT OF 1971

The Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971 is based upon the principle that reductions in defense and space research and development must be met by corresponding increases in civilian, socially oriented research and development.

The bill authorizes \$450 million over a 3-year period for specific programs of education, research, and assistance to

small business firms, in order to aid in the conversion of defense research and development to civilian R. & D.

It authorizes the National Science Foundation to sponsor research on conversion and to develop and administer retraining programs for scientists, engineers, and technicians.

It authorizes the Department of Commerce, through the Economic Development Administration, to sponsor conversion retraining programs for management personnel presently engaged in defense-related research and development.

It authorizes the Small Business Administration to assist small business firms in achieving conversion by providing technical grants, loan guarantees and interest assistance payments.

It authorizes the National Science Foundation to provide grants to State and local governments to establish conversion planning and support programs at the State, local, and regional levels.

It authorizes the National Science Foundation to provide grants to local governments and nonprofit corporations for the establishment and development of community conversion corporations.

It creates an Advisory Commission of Scientists, Engineers, Industrialists, and Educators to help shape and guide these programs.

PEACE AND PROSPERITY

All of us agree, Mr. Speaker, that the safety and security of all Americans must be our first priority. We believe, however, that this Nation is rich enough, strong enough, and resourceful enough to maintain a first-class defense while meeting the pressing domestic needs of its citizens. This Nation has built a powerful military-industrial complex which has provided us with a defensive capability second to none. The time has come, however, for us to create an equally powerful social-industrial complex through which we can strengthen this Nation from within. In order to do so, we must utilize all our available talent and put a stop to the disastrous waste of precious resources which is seriously threatening our land.

We are convinced that this Nation can have both peace and prosperity. We are equally convinced that the Federal Government must begin to plan now for the attainment of that goal. The Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971 is an important first step in that direction. For the sake of our economy, for the sake of scientific and technological progress, and, above all, for the sake of the American people, we commend this proposal to our colleagues for their consideration and support.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include at this point in the Record an analysis of the bill and a conversion factsheet:

ANALYSIS OF H.R. 34

A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research, educational, and assistance programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities

H.R. 34 lays down a necessary new national policy for the utilization of our scientific and technical manpower resources. It also

provides for collection and analysis of pertinent information; basic and applied research relative to conversion of scientists and engineers to work on priority national problems; the financing of Community Conversion Corporations; education of scientists and engineers for conversion to such work; training of management personnel; and education grants to small business concerns. It establishes an Advisory Commission on Research and Development Conversion and authorizes a total appropriation of \$450 million for fiscal years 1972 through 1974.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

The bill declares a continuing national policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to take appropriate measures directed toward achieving the following goals:

(1) scientists, engineers, and technicians must have continuing opportunities for socially useful employment in positions commensurate with their professional, technical capabilities;

(2) the total Federal investment in science and technology must be raised to an adequate annual expenditure level, and then continue to grow annually at least proportionally to the growth in the gross national product;

(3) Federal obligations for civilian-oriented research and development must be increased so as to reach a level of parity with Federal obligations for defense research and development.

ANALYSIS AND PROGRAMS

Title I assigns three new functions to the National Science Foundation. It is to:

(1) analyze data regarding Federal expenditures for research and development activities, and the employment and availability of scientific, engineering, and technical manpower in order to appraise the carrying out of the policies of the legislation.

(2) develop and recommend to the President programs and activities which will contribute to carrying out the policies of H.R. 34.

(3) prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to Congress not later than March 1 of each year through 1976 a report of its activities and an appraisal of the extent to which the policies set out in the legislation have been implemented, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate.

CONSULTATION

The NSF Director is required to consult with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Advisory Commission on Research and Development established by this legislation.

RESEARCH

Title II authorizes a major new research program for the National Science Foundation. It authorizes use of grants or contracts with academic institutions, not-for-profit institutes, public agencies and private business firms, for basic and applied research designed to:

(1) study and appraise the social, economic and managerial aspects of conversion from defense-related research and development activities to civilian research and development.

(2) identify priority areas of civilian research and development activity likely to contribute to the resolution of the Nation's pressing domestic problems, including but not limited to, unemployment, poverty, race relations, social alienation, crime, environmental pollution, urban problems, energy sources and natural resources, nutrition, housing, transportation, education, and health care; and

(3) advance the scientific and technical state of the art in priority areas identified above.

Title II also authorizes the Foundation to make grants to State and local governments

and to regional governmental agencies for the establishment and development of conversion planning and support programs at the State, local, or regional level.

Dissemination of significant results of such research is authorized, especially the results of that research and development aimed at the resolution of the Nation's social problems.

COMMUNITY CONVERSIONS CORPORATIONS

To provide a local base for conversion efforts, the Foundation is further authorized to make grants or contract with local governments, or not-for-profit corporations to establish Community Conversion Corporations. These would engage solely in non-defense related research and development. In staffing their operations they would give preference to unemployed scientists, engineers, and technicians who had previously been employed in defense-related research and development.

EDUCATION FOR CONVERSION

Another important part of the conversion activity authorized in H.R. 34 is education. The Foundation is authorized to fund, through grants and contracts with academic institutions, not-for-profit institutes, and private business firms, the planning, developing, strengthening or carrying out of education programs designed to:

(1) retrain scientists, engineers, and technicians so that they can contribute constructively to civilian research and development by working in scientific and technical fields, or problem areas, other than the ones they had previously worked in or studied. The Foundation would designate specific fields or problem areas for such retraining.

(2) train or retrain personnel of Federal, State, and local government who will be responsible for, or participate in, determining the government market demand for civilian, socially oriented research and development.

(3) provide courses and curriculums to prepare students for careers in civilian, socially oriented research and development.

The cost of the first two educational programs would be paid to the conducting organization via minimum fees for each participant, paid under regulations set by the Foundation.

CONVERSION FELLOWSHIPS

Another means to the end of effective use of our scientific brainpower affected by changes in defense spending for research and development is the Conversion Fellowship program. The bill authorizes the Foundation to award conversion fellowships to scientists and engineers, and technicians to enable them to take part in the educational programs described above. The Foundations is to allocate such fellowships so as to:

(1) attract highly qualified applicants;

(2) provide an equitable distribution of such fellowships throughout the United States; and

(3) accord priority to applicants who are or anticipate being out of work as a direct result of reductions in defense related research and development.

The fellowships include allowances for family support, health insurance, job placement, and relocation expenses.

BUSINESS ORGANIZATION CONVERSION

Title III of H.R. 34 recognizes that business organizations as well as individual scientists and engineers need retraining. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to fund academic institutions, not-for-profit institutes and business firms for the purpose of developing, initiating, improving, or operating training programs for management personnel of business firms, to assist them in converting their research and development from defense related areas to civilian areas of work, especially those aimed at aid-

ing in the resolution of the Nation's domestic problems.

CONVERSION OF SMALL BUSINESS PERSONNEL

Title IV authorizes the Small Business Administration to make grants to small business concerns which have engaged in defense related research and development within the prior five years to pay up to 80 percent of the costs of enrolling their eligible personnel in any of the educational and conversion programs under Title II or III. The bill puts an annual ceiling of \$25,000 on such funds to any one small business.

Title IV also authorizes the Small Business Administration to guarantee any loan to a small business for a conversion project against loss as a result of the failure to repay the loan. When entering into a guarantee contract, the Administration, in addition to meeting several administrative conditions for such a loan, is also directed to give preference to small business concerns which have suffered severe financial difficulties from the fall of the Federal contracts for defense-related research and development; and to conversion projects aimed at aiding in the resolution of the Nation's pressing domestic problems.

To fund these loans, H.R. 34 establishes a revolving fund not to exceed \$50 million. Additionally, the Small Business Administration is authorized to make interest assistance payments to a lender for a conversion loan. The total of interest assistance grants which may be paid to lenders in any year shall not exceed \$15 million.

Small Business Administration loans may also be used to assist any small business in purchasing, leasing, or installing new facilities or equipment, or in altering existing facilities or equipment, where this is necessitated by conversion from defense related research and development to nondefense research and development and the Administration determines that such concern is likely to suffer substantial economic injury without this assistance. In making such loans, small businesses which are converting to activities aimed at resolving the Nation's pressing domestic problems are to get preference.

AN INFORMATION SERVICE

To inform small businesses of this assistance, the Administration is authorized to establish and operate a computerized Conversion Information Service. It will acquaint small business concerns with:

- (1) the conversion education programs and other forms of conversion assistance which are available; and
- (2) with market needs and opportunities for civilian research and development, especially those directed toward assisting in the resolution of the Nation's social problems.

AN ADVISORY COMMISSION

H.R. 34 establishes an Advisory Commission on Research and Development Conversion,

composed of fifteen members appointed by the President for terms of three years. The members are to be drawn in equal numbers from representatives of private industry with experience in nondefense related research and development; engineers; natural scientists; and educators. The Commission shall:

- (1) advise the Director and the Secretary of Commerce;
- (2) review and evaluate the effectiveness of Federal programs authorized by the legislation;
- (3) prepare and submit such interim reports as it deems advisable and an annual report;
- (4) publicize its finding and recommendations.

APPROPRIATIONS

H.R. 34 authorizes appropriations of \$100 million for fiscal year 1972, \$150 million for fiscal year 1973, and \$200 million for fiscal year 1974. The bill divides these authorizations among the several programs as shown in Table I.

TABLE I.—FUNDING OF PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED BY H.R. 34 THE CONVERSION EDUCATION AND RESEARCH ACT OF 1971

Program	[In millions of dollars]		
	Fiscal year 1972	Fiscal year 1973	Fiscal year 1974
Research.....	10	15	20
Community conversion corporations...	10	15	25
Education.....	15	20	25
Government employee participation.....	4	8	12
Conversion fellowships.....	45	65	80
Management training.....	5	10	15
Small business education.....	10	15	20
Conversion information service.....	1	2	3
	100	150	200

ECONOMIC CONVERSION FACTSHEET TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 34

I. DIMENSIONS OF THE PROBLEM OF POST-WAR ECONOMIC CONVERSION

The Economic Report of the President, transmitted to the Congress earlier this month stated, "De-escalation of the Vietnam war and changes in our general purpose force planning have led to a significant reduction in the resources used for national defense." By the third quarter of 1970 defense purchases had declined by 18 percent from their peak in the second quarter of 1968. Employment attributable to Department of Defense expenditures will have decreased nearly 1.8 million workers from its highest recent level in fiscal year 1968 to fiscal 1971. Most of the drop is in private employment attributable to defense expenditures—a decline of

Footnotes at end of article.

approximately 1.3 million workers over the period.²

Private employment generated by defense spending is diffused over a broad range of industries and occupations. However, the impact has been greatest in the manufacturing sector and most heavily concentrated in ordnance and aircraft. As the Economic Report pointed out, "A remarkably high proportion of workers in certain jobs calling for extremely specialized skills have been dependent on defense spending."³ The following excerpts from the Economic Report further illuminate the difficulties of conversion:

"Workers producing goods and services for defense are generally more skilled than the civilian labor force as a whole. Among white-collar workers a higher percentage of professional and managerial workers were employed in defense-generated jobs than in the entire economy. Among blue-collar workers, craftsmen and operatives were also more strongly represented in defense-generated employment. The larger relative increases in unemployment from the third quarter of 1969 to the third quarter of 1970 for more highly skilled white-collar and blue-collar workers were in part a consequence of the sharp reduction in defense employment, in which these workers were more heavily concentrated.

"Skilled workers in certain categories, such as engineers, were heavily dependent on defense spending for their employment. The estimated unemployment rate for engineers increased from 0.5 percent in the third quarter of 1968 to 2.4 percent in the third quarter of 1970. Nearly 60 percent of all the jobs for aeronautical engineers were generated by defense spending in 1968. Nearly 40 percent of all physicists were dependent on defense spending. A large number of airplane mechanics were employed in defense-related work, and over 50 percent of the skilled workers in this category relied on defense spending." (See: Table 1)⁴

TABLE 1.—Civilian employment attributable to defense expenditure for selected narrow occupational categories, fiscal year 1968.

(Occupational category and defense-generated employment)	[Percent of total employment in group]
Technical engineers.....	20
Aeronautical engineers.....	59
Electrical engineers.....	22
Mechanical engineers.....	20
Physicists.....	38
Machinists.....	19
Pattern and modelmakers.....	25
Sheetmetal workers.....	25
Airplane Mechanics.....	54

Source: U.S. House of Representatives ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT, House Document No. 92-28, page 46.

TABLE 2.—EMPLOYMENT OF ENGINEERS

Sector	Percent of total engineers employment	1970 hires, percent of 1969	Expected changes in engineer employment:				
			1969	1970	1971	1972	1975
Aerospace.....	6	62	100	91	75	71	73
Construction.....	10	137	100	109	120	132	166
Electrical and electronics.....	10	82	100	106	111	119	131
Metals and minerals.....	5	85	100	103	105	112	126
Mechanical and other.....	18	88	100	101	97	103	114
Chemical and petroleum.....	10	94	100	103	106	107	109
Engineering schools.....	13	97	100	106	112	120	127
R. & D. ¹	8	98	100	98	99	100	114
Federal Government.....	10	104	100	105	108	110	114
Utilities.....	4	119	100	104	107	111	129
State and local.....	6	127	100	104	109	112	110
Weighted average.....	100	99	100	103	105	110	122

¹ Estimates based upon 1969=100.

² Nonprofit and selected profit organizations primarily involved in R. & D.

The Federal Government has been a prime subsidizer of research and development. In 1967 it was estimated that approximately \$26 billion was spent on research and development of which over \$17 billion was funded by the Federal Government. In 1969, the last

year for which complete statistics have been compiled, funds for Research and Development in industry totaled \$18.4 billion. Industrial firms have accounted for about 70 percent of research and development in the Nation in recent years. During 1969, the Fed-

eral Government financed 47 percent of the industrial research and development total.⁵

The following table summarizes the expenditures for research and development by the Federal Government during recent years:

TABLE 3.—FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

Fiscal year	Department of Defense	NASA	AEC	HEW	NSF	Other	Total	Fiscal year	Department of Defense	NASA	AEC	HEW	NSF	Other	Total
1965.....	6,728	5,093	1,520	738	206	604	14,889	1970.....	7,424	3,699	1,346	1,235	293	1,100	15,098
1968.....	8,164	4,724	1,594	1,283	315	950	17,030	1971 estimate.....	7,543	3,319	1,307	1,359	330	1,474	15,332
1969.....	7,858	4,252	1,654	1,221	342	882	16,208	1972 estimate.....	7,734	3,109	1,251	1,477	403	1,692	15,666

Sources: U.S. Government, White House, Special Analysis; Budget of the U.S. Government, fiscal year 1971, p. 266. U.S. Government, White House, Special Analysis; Budget of the U.S. Government, fiscal year 1972, p. 271.

It should be noted, that the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission account for more than four-fifths of the federal expenditure for research and development. President Nixon's budget request for Fiscal Year 1972 is the first year that the ratio of Federal research and development has dipped below 80 percent of the total.⁶ The following chart summarized the percentage of research and development funding by the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and Atomic Energy Commission as a part of the total Federal outlay for that purpose.

TABLE 4.—SPENDING FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BY DOD, NASA, AND AEC

Fiscal year	Dollar value (in billions)	Total expenditure	Percentage
1965.....	13.2	14.7	89
1968.....	14.4	17.0	84
1969.....	13.7	16.2	84
1970.....	12.5	15.1	83
1971 estimate.....	12.1	15.3	80
1972 estimate.....	12.1	15.6	78

Source: Same as table II.

Over four-fifths of the 1969 industrial research and development was spent by companies in five industries: aircraft and missiles; electrical equipment and communication; machinery, chemicals and allied products; and motor vehicles and other transportation equipment.⁷ During 1969, although the Federal Government financed only 47 percent of the industrial research and development total, it financed nearly 80 percent of the research and development in two industries—aircraft and missiles and electrical equipment and communications.⁸ In January 1970, industrial firms employed the full-time equivalent of 377,100 research and development scientists and engineers. Of that total, 101,100 were employed in research and development in electrical equipment and communications and another 89,000 were employed in research and development in aircraft and missile industries. Over one-half of the available scientists and engineers engaged in research and development worked in these two industries.⁹

The State of Connecticut provides an excellent example of dependency on defense and space activities. The Fairfield University under a grant from the Connecticut Research Commission, recently published results of a joint study of the *Bridgeport Regional Economy in the Event of Reduction of Defense Allocations*. The study encompassed the Bridgeport Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, which consists of eight towns, two of which are located in the Third Congressional District. These two communities, Stratford and Milford, accounted for

93.13 percent of all defense contract activity in the region in 1968.

The Fairfield University research team found that in 1968, 29.6 percent of factory jobs in the Bridgeport area were defense-generated. Of the more than \$704 million in defense contracts, over 95 percent of the orders were concentrated in three industries—transportation equipment (aircraft), electrical equipment, and ordnance. Transportation equipment constituted more than 92 percent of the total contracts in the Bridgeport Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area and represented approximately 25 percent of the total prime contract awards for aircraft engines and related spare parts in the nation.¹⁰

The study divided employment related to defense contracts into three categories: Direct employment—jobs generated by defense contracts; Indirect employment—jobs generated by allocations of sub-contracts; and Induced employment—jobs generated in non-manufacturing as a result of the in-

crease in direct and indirect employment. It is important to note, direct employment sparks a direct employment relationship with the total economy, thus, a multiplier effect.

The Bridgeport study concluded that a reduction of one percent from the present level of prime contracts in the Bridgeport region could result in the loss of 310 jobs, ten percent in the loss of 3,100 jobs, and fifty percent in the loss of 15,500. If the defense spending in the Bridgeport region were to return to its 1965 levels of \$250-300 million a year, which is less than fifty percent of that spent, on the average, between 1965 and 1968, 15,500 men and women would lose their jobs. An estimate of the occupational characteristics of those who would be affected by the possible cutbacks shows that about ten percent of those who would suffer would be highly skilled professional workers. A ten percent cut could result in the loss of over 300 professional technical workers; a fifty percent cutback would affect over 1,700 skilled professionals.¹¹

TABLE 5.—ESTIMATED¹ OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE UNEMPLOYED DUE TO DEFENSE CUTBACKS, BRIDGEPORT SMSA

Defense Cutbacks	1968 Unemployed	10 percent	25 percent	50 percent	75 percent
Total unemployed.....	8,000	10,665	14,664	21,328	27,992
Male.....	3,800	5,589	8,272	12,744	17,216
Professional technical workers.....	120	333	652	1,184	1,716
Managers, officials, proprietors.....	90	260	514	934	1,362
Clerical and kindred.....	162	295	494	826	1,158
Sales workers.....	145	293	430	735	1,000
Craftsmen, foremen.....	648	1,078	1,723	2,798	3,903
Operatives.....	843	1,246	1,851	2,859	3,867
Service workers.....	910	1,019	1,182	1,454	1,725
Laborers.....	882	973	1,109	1,336	1,563
Not reported.....		126	315	630	945
Female.....	4,200	5,076	6,392	8,584	10,776
Professional technical writers.....	50	58	320	590	860
Managers, officials, proprietors.....	13	36	72	131	190
Clerical and kindred.....	850	1,126	1,540	2,230	2,920
Sales workers.....	160	216	301	442	583
Craftsmen.....	60	73	93	126	159
Operatives.....	900	1,112	1,431	1,962	2,493
Service workers.....	2,000	2,111	2,227	2,554	2,831
Laborers.....	127	134	144	161	178
Not reported.....		79	174	348	522

¹ Estimates based on 1960 distributions.

Source: Fairfield University, "Joint Study for the Analysis of the Bridgeport Regional Economy in the Event of Reduction of Defense Allocations," October 1969, p. 82.

The estimated unemployment level of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area under the assumption of a ten percent defense dollar cutback would be 6.1 percent of the labor force. A twenty percent defense dollar cutback would produce an 8.4 percent level of unemployment; a fifty percent defense cutback would result in 12 percent unemployment, and a seventy-five percent cutback would increase unemployment to 16.1 percent of the total available labor force. Comparing the estimated unemployment rates with those of the past, we find that unemployment resulting from a ten percent de-

fense cutback would be greater than the 1963 unemployment level of 8,000; twenty-five percent defense cutback would cause unemployment greater than the 1959-1960 figure of 12,000 unemployment; and a fifty percent defense cutback would foster an unemployment total of 21,328—almost 2,000 more than the 19,700 recorded during the 1958 recession. Remember, a fifty percent cutback in defense orders would return defense contract awards to the 1965 level. A seventy-five percent cutback—which would bring defense contract awards to their 1960 level—would result in 27,992 unemployed, the high-

Footnotes at end of article.

est unemployment rate since the Great Depression of the 1930's.¹²

FOOTNOTES

¹ U.S. House of Representatives, *Economic Report of the President*, H. Doc. No. 92-28, 92nd Cong., 1st Sess., p. 42.

² *Ibid.*, p. 42-43.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 45-46.

⁵ U.S. Government, National Science Foundation, "Industrial R&D Spending 1969", *Science Resources Studies Highlights*, NSF 70-47, January 22, 1971, p. 1.

⁶ U.S. Government, White House, *Special Analyses: Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 1972*, Special Analysis R.

⁷ U.S. Government, National Science Foundation, *loc. cit.*

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹⁰ Fairfield University, *Joint Study for the Analysis of the Bridgeport Regional Economy in the Event of Reduction of Defense Allocations*, October 1969.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*

II. AEROSPACE EMPLOYMENT

TABLE I.—EMPLOYMENT IN THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY, MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

Date and year	Aerospace employment ¹ (thousands)	Percent change from March 1970
March 1970	1,238	
June 1970	1,158	-6.5
December 1970	1,067	-13.8
March 1971	1,044	-15.7

¹ AIA Aerospace Data Services.

TABLE II.—EMPLOYMENT OF PRODUCTION WORKERS IN THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY, MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

Date and year	Employment of production workers ¹ (thousands)	Percent change from March 1970
March 1970	624	
June 1970	575	-7.9
December 1970	515	-17.5
March 1971	503	-19.4

¹ AIA Aerospace Data Services.

Source: Aerospace News.

TABLE IX.—DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL U.S. AEROSPACE EMPLOYMENT BY PRODUCT GROUP,¹ MARCH 1970-71

Product group	March 1970		June 1970		December 1970		March 1971	
	Employment (thousands)	Percent of total						
Total	1,238	100.0	1,158	100.0	1,067	100.0	1,044	100.0
Aircraft	551	44.5	510	44.0	469	44.0	460	44.0
Missiles and space	515	41.6	479	41.4	442	41.4	432	41.4
Other	172	13.9	169	14.6	156	14.6	152	14.6

¹ AIA Aerospace Data Services.

TABLE III.—EMPLOYMENT OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS IN THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY, MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

Date and year	Employment of scientists and engineers ¹	Percent change from March 1970
March 1970	205	
June 1970	198	-3.4
December 1970	179	-12.7
March 1971	175	-14.6

¹ AIA Aerospace Data Services.

TABLE IV.—EMPLOYMENT OF TECHNICIANS IN THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY, MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

Date and year	Employment of technicians ¹ (thousands)	Percent change from March 1970
March 1970	68	
June 1970	63	-7.6
December 1970	61	-10.3
March 1971	58	-14.7

¹ AIA Aerospace Data Services.

TABLE V.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT IN AEROSPACE INDUSTRY BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA IN THE UNITED STATES,¹ MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

Geographic area	March 1970	June 1970	December 1970	March 1971
Total United States	100	100	100	100
New England and Middle Atlantic	19.9	20.2	20.3	20.1
East North Central	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.1
West North Central	5.9	6.0	6.1	6.1
South Atlantic	10.1	10.0	9.9	9.9
South Central	6.4	6.7	6.5	6.3
Mountain	2.6	2.8	3.0	3.1
Pacific	40.9	39.8	40.0	40.4
Undistributed	10.0	10.2	10.1	10.0

¹ Derived from data supplied to the association in its semi-annual survey of employment. Geographic area boundaries follow those of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. To prevent disclosure of individual company data, no area with 4 or less establishments is shown separately.

TABLE VI.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT OF PRODUCTION WORKERS IN THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA IN THE UNITED STATES,¹ MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

Geographic area	March 1970	June 1970	December 1970	March 1971
Total United States	100	100	100	100
New England and Middle Atlantic	21.9	21.4	20.6	20.3
East North Central	5.8	6.0	4.3	4.3

¹ Derived from data supplied to the association in its semi-annual survey of employment. Geographic area boundaries follow those of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. To prevent disclosure of individual company data, no area with 4 or less establishments is shown separately.

² Elements may not add to totals because of rounding.

Geographic area	March 1970	June 1970	December 1970	March 1971
West North Central	6.7	6.6	7.2	7.3
South Atlantic	11.1	11.0	10.4	10.4
South Central	8.1	8.4	8.4	8.3
Mountain	2.3	2.5	2.7	2.7
Pacific	36.1	34.8	37.1	37.5
Undistributed	9.0	9.2	9.2	9.2

¹ Derived from data supplied to the Association in its semi-annual survey of employment. Geographic area boundaries follow those of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. To prevent disclosure of individual company data, no area with 4 or less establishments is shown separately.

² Elements may not add to totals because of rounding.

TABLE VII.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS IN THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA IN THE UNITED STATES,¹ MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

Geographic area	March 1970	June 1970	December 1970	March 1971
Total United States	100	100	100	100
New England and Middle Atlantic	14.0	13.9	14.4	13.8
East North Central	5.4	5.3	2.8	2.7
West North Central	5.7	6.0	6.4	6.3
South Atlantic	9.0	8.7	8.7	8.8
South Central	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7
Mountain	3.7	3.9	4.3	4.4
Pacific	47.4	47.2	48.7	49.3
Undistributed	10.2	10.4	10.2	10.1

¹ Derived from data supplied to the association in its semi-annual survey of employment. Geographic area boundaries follow those of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. To prevent disclosure of individual company data, no area with 4 or less establishments is shown separately.

² Elements may not add to totals because of rounding.

TABLE VIII.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT OF TECHNICIANS IN THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA IN THE UNITED STATES,¹ MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

Geographic area	March 1970	June 1970	December 1970	March 1971
Total United States	100	100	100	100
New England and Middle Atlantic	16.3	16.1	15.7	15.6
East North Central	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.2
West North Central	6.5	6.6	6.5	6.5
South Atlantic	13.0	13.2	13.7	13.1
South Central	9.0	9.4	9.0	9.1
Mountain	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.6
Pacific	37.2	36.3	36.7	37.2
Undistributed	11.3	11.5	11.4	11.6

¹ Derived from data supplied to the association in its semi-annual survey of employment. Geographic area boundaries follow those of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. To prevent disclosure of individual company data, no area with 4 or less establishments is shown separately.

² Elements may not add to totals because of rounding.

TABLE X.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF AIRCRAFT EMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES, BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA,¹ MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

Geographic area	March 1970	June 1970	December 1970	March 1971
Total, United States ²	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.6
New England and Middle Atlantic.....	25.7	25.9	26.4	26.6
East-West North Central.....	12.8	12.9	13.0	13.3
South Atlantic.....	10.1	9.8	8.4	7.1
South Central and Mountain.....	9.3	9.8	9.6	8.8
Pacific.....	32.0	30.8	31.7	33.1
Undistributed.....	10.3	10.7	10.9	11.1

¹ Derived from data supplied to the association in its semi-annual survey of employment. Geographic area boundaries follow those of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. To prevent disclosure of individual company data, no area with 4 or less establishments is shown separately.
² May not add because of rounding.

TABLE XI.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF MISSILE AND SPACE EMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA,¹ MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

Geographic area	March 1970	June 1970	December 1970	March 1971
Total United States ²	100	100	100	100
New England and Middle Atlantic.....	5.3	5.3	6.0	6.1
East-West North Central.....	3.4	3.7	3.9	3.8
South Atlantic.....	12.4	10.0	9.6	9.9
South Central and Mountain.....	8.0	8.5	9.3	9.3
Pacific.....	62.4	63.7	63.5	63.4
Undistributed.....	8.5	8.8	8.3	8.1

¹ Derived from data supplied to the association in its semi-annual survey of employment. Geographic area boundaries follow those of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. To prevent disclosure of individual company data, no area with 4 or less establishments is shown separately.
² Elements may not add to totals because of rounding.

TABLE XII.—COMMERCIAL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT EMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES,¹ MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

	Total transport employment	Percent change from March 1970	Scientists and engineers employment	Percent change from March 1970
March 1970.....	114,582	-----	16,416	-----
June 1970.....	102,212	-10.8	15,649	-4.7
December 1970.....	90,006	-21.4	14,248	-13.2
March 1971.....	90,094	-21.4	14,320	-12.8

¹ AIA Aerospace Data Services. Includes only establishments engaged as prime manufacturers of commercial transport aircraft. Lesser establishments, in a supportive or subcontracting relationship, excluded. Does not include propulsion system manufacturers.

TABLE XIII.—DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT OF PRODUCTION WORKERS IN THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY BY PRODUCT GROUP IN THE UNITED STATES,¹ MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

Product group	March 1970		June 1970		December 1970		March 1971	
	Employment (thousands)	Percent of total						
Total.....	624	100.0	575.0	100.0	515	100	503	100
Aircraft.....	309	49.5	280	48.7	252	49	247	49
Missiles and space.....	229	36.7	211	36.7	191	37	186	37
Other.....	86	13.8	84	14.6	72	14	70	14

¹ AIA Aerospace Data Services.

TABLE XIV.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT OF PRODUCTION WORKERS IN AIRCRAFT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA,¹ MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

Geographic area	March 1970	June 1970	December 1970	March 1971
Total United States ²	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
New England and Middle Atlantic.....	23.5	23.9	23.7	23.7
East-West North Central.....	13.8	14.0	14.3	14.6
South Atlantic.....	11.3	11.1	10.0	10.2
South Central and Mountain.....	21.4	21.9	20.5	20.5
Pacific.....	29.9	29.1	31.4	31.0

¹ Derived from data supplied to the association in its semi-annual survey of employment. Geographic area boundaries follow those of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. To prevent disclosure of individual company data, no area with 4 or less establishments is shown separately.
² Elements may not total because of rounding.

TABLE XV.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF AEROSPACE PRODUCTION WORKERS WORKING ON MISSILE AND SPACE IN THE UNITED STATES BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA,¹ MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

Geographic area	March 1970	June 1970	December 1970	March 1971
Total United States ²	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
New England and Middle Atlantic.....	6.4	6.7	6.6	6.7
East-West North Central.....	4.0	4.4	3.9	3.4
South Atlantic.....	8.1	8.5	8.8	8.6
South Central and Mountain.....	9.2	9.3	9.9	10.1
Pacific.....	63.8	62.7	63.2	62.8
Undistributed.....	8.5	8.5	7.6	7.7

¹ Derived from data supplied to the Association in its semi-annual survey of employment. Geographic area boundaries follow those of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. To prevent disclosure of individual company data, no area with 4 or less establishments is shown separately.
² Elements may not total because of rounding.

TABLE XVI.—DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS IN THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY BY PRODUCT GROUP IN THE UNITED STATES,¹ MARCH 1970—MARCH 1971

Product group	March 1970		June 1970		December 1970		March 1971	
	Employment (thousands)	Percent of total						
Total.....	205	100	198	100	179	100	175	100
Aircraft.....	107.8	52.6	104.3	52.7	94.7	52.9	92.1	52.6
Missiles and space.....	97.2	47.4	93.7	47.3	84.3	47.1	82.9	47.4

¹ AIA Aerospace Data Services.

TABLE XVII.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS IN AIRCRAFT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA¹ MARCH 1970-MARCH 1971

Geographic Area	March 1970	June 1970	December 1970	March 1971
Total United States ²	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
New England and Middle Atlantic	22.3	21.8	22.0	21.1
East-West North Central	18.4	18.8	18.7	18.7
South Atlantic	8.2	7.7	7.4	7.2
South Central and Mountain	15.5	16.6	16.2	16.3
Pacific	35.6	35.1	35.7	36.7

¹ Derived from data supplied to the Association in its semi-annual survey of employment. Geographic area boundaries follow those of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. To prevent disclosure of individual company data, no area with 4 or less establishments is shown separately.
² Elements may not total because of rounding.

TABLE XVIII.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF AEROSPACE SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS WORKING ON MISSILES AND SPACE IN THE UNITED STATES BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA¹ MARCH 1970-MARCH 1971

Geographic area	March 1970	June 1970	December 1970	March 1971
Total United States ²	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
New England and Middle Atlantic	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7
East-West North Central	3.6	3.7	3.9	3.6
South Atlantic	10.4	10.2	10.1	10.5
South Central and Mountain	8.5	8.6	9.0	9.0
Pacific	65.6	65.7	65.8	66.0
Undistributed	6.2	6.2	5.4	5.2

¹ Derived from data supplied to the Association in its semi-annual survey of employment. Geographic area boundaries follow those of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. To prevent disclosure of individual company data, no area with 4 or less establishments is shown separately.
² Elements may not total because of rounding.

TABLE XIX.—DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT OF TECHNICIANS IN THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY BY PRODUCT GROUP IN THE UNITED STATES¹ MARCH 1970-MARCH 1971

Product group	March 1970		June 1970		December 1970		March 1971	
	Employment (thousands)	Percent of total						
Total	68.0	100.0	63.0	100.0	61.0	100.0	58.0	100.0
Aircraft	35.5	52.2	32.1	50.9	30.7	50.3	29.1	50.1
Missiles and space	32.5	47.8	30.9	49.1	30.3	49.7	28.9	49.9

¹ AIA Aerospace Data Services.

TABLE XX.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT OF TECHNICIANS IN AIRCRAFT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA¹ MARCH 1970-MARCH 1971

Geographic area	March 1970	June 1970	December 1970	March 1971
Total United States ²	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
New England and Middle Atlantic	22.0	21.8	21.7	21.5
East-West North Central	15.1	15.5	15.5	15.2
South Atlantic	8.4	8.2	8.8	8.6
South Central and Mountain	25.4	26.5	26.2	26.9
Pacific	29.1	28.0	28.5	27.8

¹ Derived from data supplied to the Association in its semi-annual survey of employment. Geographic area boundaries follow those of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. To prevent disclosure of individual company data, no area with 4 or less establishments is shown separately.
² Elements may not total because of rounding.

TABLE XXI.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF AEROSPACE TECHNICIANS WORKING ON MISSILES AND SPACE IN THE UNITED STATES BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA¹ MARCH 1970-MARCH 1971

Geographic area	March 1970	June 1970	December 1970	March 1971
Total United States ²	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
New England and Middle Atlantic	10.6	10.9	10.4	10.6
East-West North Central	2.8	2.9	3.1	2.7
South Atlantic	18.6	18.9	19.7	17.8
South Central and Mountain	9.6	9.7	9.5	9.7
Pacific	49.9	49.5	49.6	51.1
Undistributed	8.4	8.1	7.7	8.1

¹ Derived from data supplied to the Association in its semi-annual survey of employment. Geographic area boundaries follow those of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. To prevent disclosure of individual company data, no area with 4 or less establishments is shown separately.
² Elements may not total because of rounding.

TABLE XXII.—HELICOPTER EMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES¹ MARCH 1970-MARCH 1971

	Total helicopter employment	Percent change from March 1970	Scientists and engineers employment	Percent change from March 1970
March 1970	36,004		3,370	
June 1970	32,567	-9.5	3,093	-8.2
December 1970	29,018	-19.4	2,872	-14.8
March 1971	26,661	-25.9	2,822	-16.3

¹ AIA Aerospace Data Services.

COMPANIES INCLUDED IN AIA SURVEY OF AEROSPACE EMPLOYMENT

- Abex Corporation.
- Aerodex, Inc.
- Aerojet-General Corporation.
- Aeronca, Inc.
- Aeronutronic Division, Philco-Ford Corporation.
- Avco Corporation.¹
- Bell Aerospace Company, Division of Textron, Inc.
- Bell Helicopter Company, Division of Textron, Inc.
- Bendix Corporation (The).¹
- Boeing Company (The).
- Chandler Evans, Inc.—Control Systems Division of Colt Industries, Inc.
- Cutriss-Wright Corporation.
- Fairchild Hiller Corporation.
- Garrett Corporation (The).
- Gates Learjet Corporation.
- General Dynamics Corporation.
- General Electric Company.
- General Motors Corporation, Allison division.
- B. F. Goodrich Company (The).¹
- Goodyear Aerospace Corporation.
- Grumman Aerospace Corporation.
- Gyrodyne Company of America, Inc.
- Hercules Incorporated.
- Honeywell, Inc.¹
- Hughes Aircraft Company.
- International Business Machines Corporation (IBM Corporation).¹

- International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation (ITT Corporation).¹
- Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corporation.
- Kaman Aerospace Corporation.
- Kollsman Instrument Corporation.
- Lear Siegler, Inc.
- Lockheed Aircraft Corporation.
- LTV Aerospace Corporation.
- The Marquardt Company.
- Martin Marietta Corporation.¹
- McDonnell Douglas Corporation.
- North American Rockwell Corporation.
- Northrop Corporation.
- Pneumo Dynamics Corporation.
- RCA Defense Electronic Products.¹
- Rohr Corporation.¹
- Singer-General Precision, Inc.
- Solar, Division of International Harvester Company.
- Sundstrand Aviation, Division of Sundstrand Corporation.
- Thiokol Chemical Corporation.¹
- TRW, Inc.¹
- Twin Industries Corporation.¹
- United Aircraft Corporation.¹
- Universal Oil Products Company.
- Westinghouse Electric Corporation.¹

¹ Only aerospace employment of these firms reported.

(NOTE.—Product group distributions of employment were generally accomplished as follows: Each plant in the survey was requested to identify its primary activity—aircraft, missiles and spacecraft, or non-aerospace, and this information was used to categorize employment by product activity. In regard to Tables IX and XIII, distributions are based upon methodology employed in AIA Statistical Series 8, monthly report on Aerospace Employment.)

III. SOME QUESTIONS OFTEN ASKED ABOUT H.R. 34
Question. How many people will this bill help?

Answer. This is a difficult question because of the many "multiplier effects" of any conversion program. Nonetheless, a conservative estimate is that the bill will assist directly about 20,000 people.

This figure is arrived at by (1) analyzing each section of the bill and separating out the money that goes to individuals from that which goes to corporations, businesses, etc. (2) Taking those amounts destined to go for individuals and separating out those expenses such as relocation costs, etc., that must be discounted. The final figure, conservative as it is, is about \$14,000 per person.

Surely the bill will not affect 50-70,000 people. However, neither is it in the 3,000 or 5,000 category. Best estimate: 10,000 to 30,000 range.

Question. *What kind of support would the Small Business Administration provide under this bill?*

Answer: SBA has four major additional functions under this bill:

- (1) Grants for retraining;
- (2) Loans guarantees for conversion projects;
- (3) Loans for actual conversion; and
- (4) Establishment of a Conversion Information System.

1. Retraining Grants: SBA can make grants to small businesses which have been engaged in defense-related R&D (within the prior 5 yrs) to pay up to 80% of the costs of enrolling their eligible personnel in retraining programs. (Limit on grants=\$25,000 to any one small business firm)

2. Loan Guarantees: SBA is authorized to guarantee any loan to a small business for a conversion project against loss as a result of the failure to repay the loan. This bill also establishes a revolving fund not to exceed \$50 Million to fund these loans.

3. Conversion Loans: SBA loans may be made to assist small businesses in purchasing, leasing, or installing new facilities or equipment, or altering existing facilities or equipment that is necessitated for conversion.

4. Conversion Information System: SBA is authorized to establish and operate a computerized Conversion Information System to acquaint small businesses on (1) conversion education programs and (2) market needs and opportunities.

Question. *What is the function of the Economic Development Administration under this bill?*

Answer. EDA is authorized to make grants or enter into contracts with academic institutions, not-for-profit institutes and organizations, and business firms for the purpose of developing, initiating, improving, or operating training programs for management personnel of business firms to assist in conversion.

A total of \$30 million is provided for this management training function.

Question. *What are "Community Conversion Corporations?"*

Answer. These are designed to provide a local base for conversion efforts. The NSF is authorized to make grants or contracts (\$10 the first year, \$15 the second, \$25 the third) with local governments, or not-for-profit corporations to establish these Community Conversion Corporations.

They would:

Engage solely in non-defense-related R&D;
Give preference in employment to unemployed scientists, engineers & technicians who had previously been employed in defense-related work;

Serve to channel funds for civilian R&D into the affected Communities; and

To provide immediate on-the-job retraining for these unemployed scientists—engineers.

Question. *How are state and local governments involved in the "Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971?"*

Answer. In the area of regional, state, and local participation, this year's bill differs from the previous bill we introduced in the 91st Congress. H.R. 34 authorizes the National Science Foundation to make grants

to state and local governments and regional government agencies for the establishment and development of conversion planning and support programs at the state, local, or regional level. There are two major reasons for the addition of this section. First, the magnitude of the economic conversion problem is so great that all levels of government must cooperate if we are to succeed. A half-hearted effort on the part of the Federal government without state, local, and regional support cannot bring about a solution. Second, the state and local governments and regional agencies are in the excellent position of being familiar on a first-hand basis with detailed situations peculiar to their areas. Because of this familiarity, they are indispensable to the Federal government in the planning and support efforts necessary for success of the economic conversion program.

Question. *Given the generally slack economy, how can you justify singling out highly trained people such as scientists and engineers for help? Aren't they the ones who have always been able to compete effectively in the job market? How will this help the blue-collar worker?*

Answer. I think we will all agree that this legislation is only a first step, but a very necessary and logical one with which to begin. The full utilization of highly educated and skilled workers is essential if we are to attempt to solve the mammoth problems of the nation, including the problem of the economy. History has shown us that advances in science and technology result in an economic surge—in other words, new technology means new jobs. Recent defense cutbacks without a corresponding rise in civilian research and development have created a vacuum that only reemployment of our scientists, engineers, and skilled technicians can fill. When these people find meaningful employment, the indirect effect on the rest of the job force will be infinite. No one here is arguing against the necessity of a comprehensive science, manpower, economic and education policy. Hopefully the Administration will respond to this pressing need. However, this response has not been forthcoming, and the Congress has been forced to take the initiative. The realities of the committee structure and Congressional organization require that we take a more limited, piecemeal approach. I feel that the "Conversion Research and Education Act" is a worthwhile step in the right direction, and I urge the Administration to join us in an expanded effort.

(NOTE.—In the Fairfield University Bridgeport Study on the Bridgeport Regional Economy in the Event of Reduction of Defense Allocations we found that at a 10% cutback there was a ratio of some three laborers unemployed for every scientist laid off.)

CONCLUSION

De-escalation of the Vietnam war and changes in our general purpose force planning have led to a significant reduction in the resources used for national defense. As a Member of Congress who has been working toward and looking forward to a reduction of dependence on the military by the economy in general, this has been heartening. But this is only half the picture. It is only half the job of re-ordering our national priorities. Provision must be made to take up the slack left by reductions in aerospace and defense-related employment. A crucial point of leverage is in the fields of science, engineering, research and development.

By the third quarter of 1970 (according to the President's own Economic Report) defense purchases had declined by \$11.4 billion (measured in 1958 prices), or 18 percent, from its recent peak in the second quarter of 1968. Substitute federal activity must be found with the proper multiplier effect (in economic terms) to arrest the slow, but sure, downward spiral in the economy.

The problem of economic conversion might justly be called the problem of creating a new government market for the skills and resources cultivated in a time of extreme defense-oriented need. As we reduce our commitment in Southeast Asia and reduce expenditures for a number of defense contracts and defense-related research and development, initiatives must be taken to foster federal funding in other areas, health, housing, education, environmental research, transportation and other realms of public need. This initiative has not been forthcoming from the Executive Branch. The Congress is having to take the initiative now, in the face of the gradual disintegration of the scientific and technical community and rising general unemployment.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join in cosponsoring with my good friend and distinguished colleague, Mr. ROBERT N. GIAIMO, the Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971.

The people of the 6th District of Connecticut know only too well the tragic waste of talent which prevails in our area among skilled and non-skilled workers, as a result of unemployment due, in large measure, to a reduction in expenditures in defense-oriented and space industries. In the three largest cities in the district, New Britain, Bristol, and Torrington, the unemployment rates have reached alarming and unprecedented heights. Unemployed persons in Bristol alone represent 19.8 percent of the total working force. It is 10.8 percent in New Britain and 13.2 percent in Torrington. During my first few weeks in Congress I have worked to seek Federal relief for these high unemployment areas through eligibility for a degree of preference in Federal procurement contracts, through designation of these areas by the Economic Development Administration, through cosponsorship of the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971, to provide Federal grants-in-aid to assist communities with high unemployment, through support of the comprehensive manpower training bill, and through cosponsorship and support for this present legislation.

It is my strong belief, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot long allow many of the most talented minds of the Nation to remain idle as we at the same time face the most critical problems of a post-industrial society—solutions to which require technical, scientific, and engineering skills. Also, we are doing a grave disservice to our scientific community if we fail to anticipate further reductions in defense and space research development.

As this Nation further disengages from the tragic war in Southeast Asia and as our priorities shift from moon exploration to domestic needs, we must utilize the great national resource of skills which our scientists, technicians, and engineers possess to tackle the pressing problems of our people. However, we hear a great deal about converting our resources to peacetime use and yet so little has been done to implement such a plan.

Only last Wednesday at a meeting in

Bristol of the Unemployment Task Force of the Connecticut General Assembly the observation was made that inadequacies of State-operated technical training programs have contributed to the present unemployment crisis in Connecticut. Such training programs for unskilled workers and for skilled workers who need to be retrained—if this need had been anticipated—would have alterably relieved the present flood of the unemployed. The Conversion Research and Development Act of 1971 is particularly imaginative in this regard as it would provide a mechanism for channeling funds to reeducate and retrain persons employed in defense related industries. Thus, the act would set in motion the actual process of adjustment which must accompany the redirection of national priorities.

Mr. Speaker, this is a much needed bill. It is necessary to give new life to our despairing economy. High-technology products in our economy are requirements and depend primarily upon the sustained research and development efforts of skilled scientists, engineers, and technicians engaged in commerce and industry. However, the present course of inaction on proposals for major job conversion has resulted in major defense-dependent firms laying off hundreds of men and women and many small businesses in fields related to defense production having to shut down altogether. Connecticut's economy depends on defense-oriented technological activity more than most any State in the Nation. And hardly a week goes by that some major Connecticut firm is not laying off workers or going out of business. Obviously, such an environment severely threatens any hope of economic stability.

The tragedy to the Nation which accompanies massive unemployment of persons with such gifted minds is that we so desperately need their ingenuity to apply all the dedication, initiative, and resources at our command to provide adequate housing, health care, education, food and transportation, crime protection, unpolluted water and air for all our citizens and for future generations of Americans. Yet, helplessly it seems we watch the unemployment rolls increase among resourceful citizens who are unable to find work and unable to assist their troubled Nation.

We cannot afford to be so ignorant as a society idly watching the dismantling of our technological community. National purpose and commonsense demands more of us.

To be sure, Mr. Speaker, the greatest discouragement is felt by the unemployed themselves. Men and women who, until recently, felt secure in their professions are now literally walking the streets in search of elusive employment. According to the State Department of Labor, Connecticut has reached its highest unemployment since the 1958 recession year. In mid-January 116,700 persons were looking for jobs compared to 50,200 in January of 1969. The 1971 figure represents 8.4 percent of the total Connecticut labor force. Two contributing

factors cited are the business slowdown and reduced Government spending.

However, these are quite cold statistics to those engineers who attended a workshop session on February 2 in West Hartford to discuss approaches of best presenting their case to prospective, and oversubscribed employers. Workshops such as this one are being conducted by the Department of Labor in 30 cities across the country. The engineers are taught "how to sell yourself" and are urged to avoid the sad tale of the Fairfield County man who kept commuting to New York 3 months after he had been laid off—because he did not want his family to know.

This then is the senseless predicament we find ourselves in. Our failure has been not matching skills to real needs. Converting war technology to peacetime technology is one of the promises of our time. There is so much we have to do. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I have a great sense of hope that we will find the way to do what we must through this exciting proposal—the Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the Conversion Research and Education Act under discussion today is rooted in the age-old problem of unemployment. Many among us are just beginning to react to this problem, as the unemployment rate climbs above 6 percent and begins to hit the middle class. For my district of Brooklyn, where the jobless rate is now running at about 30 percent unemployment is a way of life. There is, however, an easy solution to the question of unemployment among scientists, engineers, and technicians trained for defense-related work.

We in Congress have the opportunity now to examine not only our concern with unemployment, but also our own evaluations of the priorities of the problems facing our Nation today. Cutbacks in military spending have left jobless many highly trained and skilled people whose talents could be used in domestic service. Programs designed to combat pollution, overpopulation, the transportation crisis, inadequate housing, health care and education need trained researchers and administrators, as well as money, to be effective. Congressman GIAMMO stated in a speech here September 16, 1970:

We know that it will take dedication, initiative, and all the resources at our command to provide adequate housing, health care, education, employment, food and transportation for all our citizens.

We have these resources and they are immediately available. There are many scientists and engineers trained in many fields whose talents could be utilized to help solve our critical domestic problems.

The reorientation of these people is so easy that I find it absurd to discuss as a problem. There is no question that it can be done. The question is, are we willing to do it? Are we willing to take this positive step toward decreasing unemployment, toward creating alternatives to military work. We have the capability. What is needed now is the will to do it.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to

commend the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Georgia for their leadership in the effort to focus the attention of the Congress on some of the critical issues of economic conversion.

As a Representative from suburban Maryland, I have seen at close range the impact of cutbacks in military and aerospace spending on business firms and scientific, technical, and managerial personnel in this area. For the men and women involved, it is no picnic to be out of a good job and to find that you are "over-qualified" for what is available. All Americans should be concerned about the breakup of scientific teams and the enforced idleness of technical talent when it is as vital as ever to our national well-being.

The Defense and Aerospace industries, directly or indirectly, employ 10 percent of our total work force and 60 percent of our engineers. It does not take a Jeanne Dixon to foresee that sharp cutbacks in Federal spending in these fields will mean substantial unemployment. Nearly 2 years ago, I sponsored legislation to create a National Economic Conversion Commission to conduct studies and encourage conversion planning by industry, Government, labor, and professional associations.

Despite broad bipartisan support, this legislation languished in committee, while employment in the defense-related sector of the economy declined by more than 700,000 people. It has been updated to provide a trust fund to help finance conversion programs and to pay retraining and relocation expenses to displaced employees.

I have also sponsored the legislation being reintroduced today, to fund retraining programs for highly skilled personnel, under the auspices of the National Science Foundation. The Foundation would be charged with identifying civilian problems which will require scientific expertise, and will provide educational grants and programs for technical, scientific and managerial talent who wish to move into new fields.

Obviously, this proposal presumes that the United States intends to maintain a strong scientific capability, as we must. Expenditures will be redirected, but must be maintained at levels corresponding to the need for skilled people in pollution control, and other fields such as transportation, development of energy sources, and marine research, to name a few.

I cannot stress strongly enough the need for a national commitment to scientific research and development. The President's 1972 budget reflects this commitment in recommending substantial increases in federally supported research. The budget for the National Science Foundation, for example, would be increased from \$506 million to \$622 million.

This commitment is essential if we are to create new and needed markets for research and development firms and scientific personnel. Last November, the Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, on which I serve, held hearings on the application of aerospace

and defense industry technology to environmental problems. Many different opinions were expressed on the capabilities of aerospace firms to enter into commercial production to meet civilian needs. There was little disagreement, however, on the need to direct more Federal funding into the research market. In the area of water pollution control, for example, Federal outlays are great and growing, but most of the money is going into construction of sewage treatment plants.

This program is vital, but does not require the kind of highly sophisticated hardware that aerospace firms might develop and produce.

In talking with scientists and business firms in Maryland's 8th District, I have learned about a number of bold and imaginative proposals for research in areas such as recycling solid waste and utilization of the waste heat from powerplants. Vitro Laboratories, located in Silver Spring, has developed a proposal for a solid waste management system. The proposal would establish a national framework to handle the collection, transportation, and recycling of waste. A public utility is envisioned, and would be directed toward making a profit.

The Hittman Corp. of Columbia, Md., has done significant work in nuclear and sanitary engineering, resources management, energy conversion, and other areas. Hittman has substantial experience in developing techniques for planning of nuclear plants, including methods of power plants cooling and pollution control.

One of Hittman's proposals would utilize by-product heat from powerplants to reduce pollutants in cooling water drawn from our rivers. The water would be held up in an aerated lagoon, used for cooling powerplant condensers, and recycled to the lagoon.

I have cited these ideas as examples of the advanced brand of thinking we will need to clean up the environment. We will need the same spaceage technology in finding systematic solutions to other public problems as well.

I share the concern of my colleagues here today that our Nation cannot afford to be without the talents of many scientific, technical, and managerial personnel who are today without employment. I support legislation to assist them in making the change to new scientific endeavors. And I think we must all work to assure that this Government creates and sustains a new market for research and development where adequate funds are available and bold new thinking is welcome.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 34.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STRATTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VIETNAM DISENGAGEMENT ACT OF 1971

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, at a press conference this morning it was announced that more than 50 Members of the House would be introducing today a bill entitled, "The Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971."

I am doing so on my own behalf and on behalf of the others.

The principal cosponsors of this legislation in the House are: Messrs. ANDERSON of Tennessee, McCLOSKEY, of California, and RIEGLE, of Michigan.

We are pleased to have the following Members as cosponsors:

Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BOLAND, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. DIGGS.

Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. RYAN.

Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. YATES, and Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the same as S. 376, which was introduced on January 27 in the other body by Senator McGOVERN and Senator HATFIELD with 19 other cosponsors, and it represents, in effect, the 1971 version of the Hatfield-McGovern amendment, which was extensively debated last year and extensively discussed around the country.

Essentially, what this bill does is to call for an end to offensive operations in Vietnam by May 1, and for total withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Vietnam by the end of this year.

I would like to comment briefly on some of the points that are made in section 2 of the bill under which Congress would make certain declarations and findings. It is there stated that—

Under the Constitution of the United States the President and the Congress share responsibility for establishing, defining the authority for and concluding foreign military commitments.

It seems to me it would be hard for anyone to quarrel with that conclusion. I said only yesterday I felt there was a growing tendency for the Congress in this matter of war and peace to be bypassed by Presidential authority, and I think the Congress should take steps to reassert its authority. The fact that wars today do not seem to be declared any more should not remove from the Congress the authority that it was given in

the Constitution to approve declarations of war, and that if wars are to be carried on in an undeclared fashion, then Congress should exercise its authority to decide whether or not they are appropriate.

Section 2 of the bill further states that—

The repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution raises new uncertainties about the source of authority for American involvement in Vietnam.

That resolution was repealed last year, as Members will recall, and since it was so often referred to as the basis of the authority for the President to act in Indochina, it is indeed strange, to say the least, that the hostilities have continued and, indeed, are extended without that legislative authorization. Uncertain as it was, and indefinite as it was, that authority in the Gulf of Tonkin resolution has now been repealed.

Section 2 further states that—

Both the domestic and foreign policy interests of the United States require an expeditious end to the war in Vietnam.

Again it seems hard to quarrel with this conclusion. I am sure that every American citizen wants to see an end to the war in Vietnam. We differ only in our approach and the method by which that end is to be achieved. We all know how damaging war has been to many of our interests, particularly to our domestic interests, where our resources to cope with the problems of our cities have been so severely reduced by the impact of the Vietnam war.

Section 2 further states that—

The conflict can best be resolved through a political settlement among the parties concerned.

It used to be that this was a constantly stated provision or principle. I must say that in recent months the administration has seemed to show less and less interest in this possibility and has seemed to rely more and more on military activities and military operations to bring about an end to the war. But those of us who are cosponsoring this bill feel, as we have in the past, that a political settlement is the only way the conflict can be resolved.

The further statement of section 2 is—

In the light of all considerations, the solution which offers the greatest safety, the highest measure of honor, the best likelihood for the return of United States prisoners, and the most meaningful opportunity for a political settlement would be the establishment of a date certain for the orderly withdrawal of all United States armed forces from Vietnam.

That is the essence of our position, and that is the essence of this bill.

According to a Gallup poll, 73 percent of the American people have come to the same conclusion that we have, to set a date for total American withdrawal, and that the date should be set by the end of this year.

I would like to comment particularly on the reference in that statement that this course offers the best likelihood for the return of U.S. prisoners of war. We are all concerned about the treatment of American prisoners in North

Vietnam, and we resent and protest the fact that they are not being treated according to the Geneva Convention. Many efforts have been made—and appropriately so—to bring international pressure on the Government of North Vietnam to accord the prisoners such treatment, but there is also, as Senator EDMUND MUSKIE pointed out the other day in Hartford, Conn., the underlying question of how we are going to get these prisoners released. The present course the administration is following, the so-called policy of Vietnamization, offers a prospect only of continuing and endless hostilities, and that means no prospect for the return of those prisoners.

If a date were set for total American withdrawal, there is no question whatever that the release of the prisoners could be promptly negotiated and there could be negotiated at the same time enforceable assurances that the withdrawal of American troops could be accomplished safely and without attack by Hanoi or the Vietcong.

The bill we are introducing today does not make specific mention of Cambodia or Laos. Perhaps it is unfortunate that it does not refer to the totality of Indochina, because Indochina has now become the total battlefield, but the bill does not do that, because we are introducing precisely the language of the bill introduced in S. 376. This is because the heart of the problem, the root of the trouble in Indochina, is still the wretched Vietnam war. If we can decide once and for all to get all American troops out of Vietnam, there will be no problem about the other areas.

This does not mean that we as cosponsors are not deeply troubled about the extension of the war to include air operations of various kinds and artillery operations in Laos and air operations in Cambodia. Many of us have introduced bills and resolutions to extend the existing congressional prohibitions of ground troops in these areas to air support and other types of military operations in Laos and Cambodia, and those resolutions should be considered as companion resolutions to the bill we are introducing today. It is our hope that all of these resolutions will be considered at an early date by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and those of us who are cosponsors of the bill and members of that committee are urging our distinguished chairman, Dr. MORGAN, to arrange for such hearings.

At this point I insert into the RECORD the remarks made at our press conference this morning by Senator MCGOVERN. We were honored to have him there. He is the principal sponsor, as I have said, of the corresponding bill in the other body.

The remarks of Senator MCGOVERN follow:

REMARKS BY SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN

I am pleased to join this press conference to announce the introduction of the Vietnam Disengagement Act in the House of Representatives. This is the companion bill to S. 376, which Senator Hatfield and I and nineteen other sponsors introduced in the Senate on January twenty-seventh.

The invasion of Laos makes clear that President Nixon succeeded in transforming a

one-front war into a three-front war. He inherited a war in Vietnam; now he pursues that same war in all of Indochina.

For once I find myself in complete agreement with Vice President Ky of South Vietnam, in his recognition that Vietnamese forces can become bogged down in Laos as they are in Cambodia, and that the operation is likely to prolong the war instead of bringing an earlier peace.

The invasion of Laos, like last summer's invasion of Cambodia, is portrayed as another step on our way out of Vietnam.

It is more likely a reminder that the Administration clings to the mistaken belief that we can yet achieve a military decision in Vietnam, where our military involvement already stands as the most serious blunder in our national history.

There is but one way now to bring the Administration to its senses, and that is for the Congress to pass the McGovern-Hatfield bill and its House counterpart, now approved by some 73 percent of the American people, to bring our armed forces home before December 31st of this year.

This is the one means to secure the release of our prisoners, the safe withdrawal of our forces and an end to the devastation now spreading across Indochina.

Note: S. 376, The Vietnam Disengagement Act (McGovern-Hatfield) was introduced in the Senate on January 27, 1971. It is currently sponsored by Senators McGovern, Hatfield, Cranston, Hughes, Bayh, Church, Eagleton, Gravel, Harris, Hart, Hartke, Inouye, Javits, Kennedy, Mondale, Moss, Nelson, Proxmire, Ribicoff, Tunney, Williams.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to include at this point the text of the Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971:

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

Sec. 2. Congress finds and declares that under the Constitution of the United States the President and the Congress share responsibility for establishing, defining the authority for and concluding foreign military commitments; that the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution raises new uncertainties about the source of authority for American involvement in Vietnam; that both the domestic and foreign policy interests of the United States require an expeditious end to the war in Vietnam; that the conflict can best be resolved through a political settlement among the parties concerned; that in the light of all considerations, the solution which offers the greatest safety, the highest measure of honor, the best likelihood for the return of United States prisoners and the most meaningful opportunity for a political settlement would be the establishment of a date certain for the orderly withdrawal of all United States armed forces from Vietnam.

Sec. 3. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 620. (a) In accordance with public statements of policy by the President, no funds authorized to be appropriated under this or any other Act may be obligated or expended to maintain a troop level of more than two hundred and eighty-four thousand armed forces of the United States in Vietnam after May 1, 1971.

(b) After May 1, 1971, funds authorized or appropriated under this or any other Act may be expended in connection with activities of American armed forces in and over Vietnam only to accomplish the following objectives:

(1) To bring about the orderly termination of military operations there and the safe and systematic withdrawal of remaining American armed forces by December 31, 1971;

(2) To insure the release of prisoners of war;

(3) To arrange asylum or other means to assure the safety of South Vietnamese who might be physically endangered by withdrawal of American forces; and

(4) To provide assistance to the Republic of Vietnam consistent with the foregoing objectives."

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague and good friend from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) and with the other cosponsors of the Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971. Let us hope that there is no need for the date of this legislation to be changed, nor for the 93d Congress to take up the cause initiated last year and continued this year.

The invasion of Laos, the escalation of the air war over Indochina, the continued deceptions practiced by the Nixon administration with regard to its policies in Vietnam make enactment of this bill an urgent necessity. It clearly is the only realistic alternative to the administration's Vietnamization policy which purports to end the war by widening it to save American lives by jeopardizing them still further, to assure freedom and self-determination for the people of South Vietnam by supporting, with our military and economic might, a repressive and dictatorial regime.

The invasion of Cambodia last year brought to a head what I consider to be a grave constitutional crisis. It is a crisis yet to be resolved, for the administration continues to wage a war during what it terms "peacetime," violates its own professed guidelines for military operations in Indochina, refuses even to tell Congress, the press, and the public what it is spending on the war, and conducts a secret ground war in Laos under the cover of the Central Intelligence Agency. To this day, the administration refuses to tell the truth about reports that U.S.-supported Thai troops are involved in Laotian military operations and I warn my colleagues and the President that it is becoming more possible every day for the war to spread to Thailand as it has to Laos and Cambodia. And if it does, what would the position of the United States be then, considering our obligations under the SEATO treaty?

The administration has refused to draw a line in Indochina. Its commitment to the Thieu-Ky regime seems bottomless. And so Congress must draw the line—clearly and now.

The need for passage of the Vietnam Disengagement Act is every bit as urgent today as it was last year when it was known as the amendment to end the war. By setting a definite timetable for withdrawal it gives us the means to achieve authentic negotiations that will bring our prisoners of war back to their homes and families and terminate our involvement in a war that has wreaked destruction on several countries and so tragically disrupted our own national priorities. I share the President's belief that this Congress can help end this war. The legislation we are introducing today is the best way Congress can meet its obligations.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, yesterday two members of the administration—

Secretary of Defense Laird and Secretary of State Rogers—testified before committees of Congress on American activities in Laos. After reading accounts of the testimony in this morning's papers I, for one, am more confused than ever.

Presumably, administration officials were sent to the Hill to reassure us that our recent air activities beyond the Laotian border are not what they seem to be—a full-scale invasion of Laos. In an effort to hide what is happening, they call this an "incursion" rather than an invasion. They tell us that, contrary to all reasonable expectation, this action will curtail the war rather than expand it. And, in what must be the most cynical distortion of all, they suggest that somehow, in some way, killing people from the air is a cleaner, better kind of war than killing them from the ground. Yet, it is a perverse morality that would have us think that dropping bombs on women and children whom you do not see is somehow superior to killing them face to face. It is true that a bombardier, from his position high in the sky, is protected from seeing the burning flesh, the blood and twisted bodies, whereas the foot soldier is not, but for the victims death is death.

Yet, these latest in a series of lies and distortions are not the first we have heard, nor will they be the last. Even while the administration tries desperately to befuddle us into silence over its frolic and detour in Laos, old lies are coming to light. Months ago the administration told us that U.S. combat troops would be out of Vietnam by summer. But today we learn that 40,000–45,000 combat troops will still be in Vietnam after May 1, and another 142,000 will serve as combat support, on call for further fighting when the generals think it necessary.

What the Nixon administration now seems to be forgetting is that it is the citizens of this country who are paying for the war, in lives and in dollars, and that the citizens have overwhelmingly repudiated it. As I have noted already, the most recent Gallup poll shows that 73 percent of the American people favor total withdrawal. Yet, the Nixon administration takes us deeper into the war, rather than out of it, and hopes to anesthetize us into inaction by systematically and intentionally concealing the truth.

In the face of this monstrous display of illegal executive power, I again call on all Members of the House and Senate to join the many efforts to bring this war to an end. Whatever it takes—whether it be House and Senate resolutions, restrictions on appropriations, or measures such as the Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971, which cuts off all funds unless U.S. troops are withdrawn by December 31, 1971 and which I am proud to cosponsor today—every Member of Congress must act decisively to bring our soldiers home—to end our immoral and illegal interference in other countries—and to bring this American tragedy in Southeast Asia to an end before another year passes.

We must insist that the President set a specific date for the immediate withdrawal of all American troops from Vietnam.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I first want to compliment my colleagues in the House, Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. RIEGLE, and Senator McGOVERN, for their courageous leadership on this most critical issue.

Under Mr. Nixon's program of Vietnamization, we have seen this vicious war spread into Cambodia and Laos. The argument that by widening the war we will bring about a more speedy end does not hold water. If Vietnamization has not yet succeeded, it will not succeed. We must face the fact that Asia's future will be determined by Asians.

We can devastate and depopulate Vietnam and Cambodia and Laos but we cannot win anything worth winning there. The only sane course is to get out as soon as possible, a course on which 73 percent of the American people are agreed.

As this resolution would do, we must limit military spending in Vietnam to defense of our troops and we must set a date by which time all American combat forces will be withdrawn. There is no other way we can be assured that the war will not be widened further and that the United States will not become partner in future adventures of the kind now taking place in Laos.

Again, I want to express my gratitude to my colleagues for taking the leadership on this issue. It will be a great day for Americans as well as Asians if we succeed in this effort.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971 introduced by my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. BINGHAM). I only wish there were reason to believe that this time it will be different. On at least a dozen occasions over the past 2 years I have shared the frustration of men like the gentleman from New York as the Congress, and particularly the House of Representatives, has consistently refused to accept its constitutional right and responsibility to control the warmaking activities of the U.S. Army in Southeast Asia. Vietnam is no longer merely Mr. Nixon's war. It is now our war as well. We have passed up too many chances to stop it.

The most shameful part of our dismal record on the war is that we have not acted out of principle but rather out of expediency and even indifference. The problem is not that a majority of the Members of this body are for the war, but that they are not against it. If I am committed to ending the war, and you are committed to escalating toward a clear military victory, at least we can define our differences and deal with them. What is frustrating and perhaps immoral is to not care enough to stand up strongly on either side—to avoid the issue and pass the unpleasant buck by asserting that the President's hands must not be tied, or that we should first give Vietnamization a chance to work.

Mr. Speaker, there are only two real sides to the issue of the war. To stay in or to get out. The rest is obfuscation. You do not get out by going further in. Calling expansion of the war into Cambodia and Laos part of our planned withdrawal does not change that truth. Prof.

Hans J. Morganthau, of the University of Chicago, has written a terrifying article, recently printed in the New Republic of February 20, 1971. Professor Morganthau demonstrated that ultimately, when all the public relations stunts—like Vietnamization—designed to bring military victory have failed, we will have to face the hard choice we continue at present to avoid: Either we pull out all stops and attain a total military "victory" by demolishing Southeast Asia with tactical nuclear weapons, or we liquidate our bankrupt policy and withdraw completely, just as the French did from Algiers. I am including Professor Morganthau's article for the benefit of my colleagues.

By continuing to avoid the responsibility of facing this unpleasant choice of alternatives, Congress has earned a share of the responsibility for the loss of the spirit of America.

The time has come to choose sides. No one can stand on the sidelines. If you are not against, then you are for. There is no neutral ground. I support the Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971. On behalf of the people of America and of Southeast Asia, I respectfully ask my colleagues in the Congress, "Where do you stand?"

The article follows:

THE NUCLEAR OPTION—WHAT PRICE VICTORY?

(By Hans J. Morganthau)

Recent events in Cambodia and Laos have clarified three important aspects of our involvement in Indochina: the nature of Nixon's Indochina policy, the inability and unwillingness of Congress to change more than the modalities of that policy, and the nature of the victory we are likely to win.

Before the 1968 election, many—myself included—thought that Nixon, clever politician that he is, would make it his first order of business to liquidate the Vietnam war. He could easily have done it, telling the world that the United States had honored its commitment to the freedom of South Vietnam and that it was up to the South Vietnamese to decide what to do with that freedom, and telling the American people that he was putting an end to Johnson's war as Eisenhower has put an end to Truman's war in Korea. It is now become obvious that Nixon's policy of "winding down" the war is not the same as ending it. Faced with the choice between the Algerian solution—admitting a mistake and liquidating it speedily and without qualification—and fighting on to victory—victory meaning the perpetuation of an anticommunist government in Saigon—Nixon has chosen the latter alternative. However, he cannot pursue victory with the costly and ineffective conventional means Johnson used for the same purpose; for the American people and Congress have made it clear that they will no longer support such a war. The Cooper-Church amendment, prohibiting the use of American ground troops and advisers in Cambodia, expresses that popular and congressional mood.

That mood, however, does not necessarily favor the Algerian solution. What this mood is against is the continuation of a war fought with American ground troops at a casualty rate out of all proportion to the gains made and to be expected. It is against this kind of a war that public and congressional opinion has turned, but it has not turned against a war fought more effectively and more sparingly of American lives. It is this kind of a war Nixon is waging and proposes to wage till victory. He proposes not to end the war but to change its nature. As an Air Force officer said to Alvin Shuster of *The New York Times*: "We will be around a long time to come. You won't see any dead-

lines on the withdrawal of air power from this place."

It is characteristic of a counterinsurgency war, that is, of a war fought against a whole people or at least a large segment of it, that its primary aim is not the conquest of territory but the destruction of the will to fight of the insurgent population by killing insurgents. If that will proves to be virtually indestructible then the physical destruction of the insurgent population itself becomes the primary aim. Hence "search and destroy" as the strategy of the Indochina war and the body count as the measure of victory. Yet in practice "search and destroy" on the ground has revealed two drawbacks and, in consequence, has undergone a significant transformation.

The search for the enemy has frequently been in vain and has therefore frustrated and demoralized the searching troops, as has the impossibility of distinguishing between the combatant insurgents and the hostile or indifferent civilian population. Furthermore, "search and destroy" has been turned effectively by the insurgents against their enemies through ambush and booby traps. Thus inevitably what was intended as a discriminating "search and destroy" operation was transformed into indiscriminate destruction of the actual or potential enemies, that is, of the whole population actually or presumably friendly to, and controlled by, the enemy. Yet while "search and destroy" requires operations on the ground, indiscriminate destruction is much more effectively and economically carried on from the air. As a Laotian general put it to Henry Kamm, according to *The New York Times* of February 6: "Maybe in three years, or maybe earlier, there will be only women in Laos."

Thus the prohibitions of the Cooper-Church amendment compelled the Administration to change the main locale of its operations from the ground to the air, a change which the results of the ground war suggested anyhow and which it has put into practice in good measure on its own initiative in Vietnam and Laos. Thus the Cooper-Church amendment compels the Administration to do completely in Cambodia what it has already done partially in Vietnam and Laos and what it would have done anyhow to a considerable extent.

While the Cooper-Church amendment ratifies and legitimizes a change in the tactics of the war which the failure of the ground war had already suggested to the Administration, it intends to impose one real limitation upon the Administration's freedom of action: any use whatsoever of ground troops and advisers in Cambodia. This limitation, unqualified and absolute, runs counter to the Administration's resolution to leave Indochina undefeated and victorious. In the measure that the Cambodian and South Vietnamese forces are unable to hold their own, they must be supported by the United States. The margin of victory which these forces cannot supply must be supplied by the United States.

If air interdiction is all that is needed, the Administration will remain within the limits of the Cooper-Church amendment. If more is needed, such as close combat support from the air, the ferrying of troops by helicopter, and the supervision of the use of American weapons, the Administration will stretch the Cooper-Church limitations to the breaking point. For instance, a helicopter crew which is shot at after having landed with its troops or cargo is not likely to hide behind a copy of the Cooper-Church amendment but will shoot back, and a "military equipment delivery team," in or out of uniform, cannot help but advise the recipients in the use of the delivered hardware and may have to accompany them into combat in order to make the advice effective. If American personnel on such a mission should be unable to hold their own against an enemy attack, ground troops would of course be sent in to rescue them. Thus one thing on the ground

would lead to another, and the Cooper-Church amendment would join a number of other congressional enactments trying in vain to limit executive discretion in the conduct of foreign and military policy.

These possible and even likely developments, however, do not preclude a repetition of the Vietnam experience, culminating in a massive American engagement on the ground. The Administration is committed to disengagement on the ground, and reescalation of the war on that level, even if the Administration had learned nothing from the fiasco in Vietnam, would threaten political disaster in 1972 and would be militarily hazardous on account of the beginning disintegration of the American Army in Vietnam. What we must guard against is not a repetition of the Vietnam experience in Laos and Cambodia. The Administration is committed to winning the war from the air, and it is this commitment that casts an ominous shadow not only over Southeast Asia but over the United States and Western Civilization itself.

A genuine war of national liberation, such as the people of Vietnam have been fighting for 25 years, can be won by the foreign power only if the latter is able to kill so many enemies that the survivors have no longer the will and, more particularly, the means to fight on. What we have done in Vietnam on the ground and from the air has failed to win the war, and what we are doing in Laos and Cambodia from the air and what the South Vietnamese are doing on the ground is not likely to win it either, at least in the short or tolerably long run. Of course, if we were to bombard the Indochinese landscape from the air systematically year-in and year-out, we would utterly destroy the land and the people and thereby have won the war. But the Administration cannot afford to wait that long and it has in its armory a weapon that can expedite dramatically the process of destruction and, hence, victory.

It stands to reason that what conventional warfare on the ground and from the air is achieving gradually and with painful and risky slowness, a few judiciously placed "tactical" nuclear weapons—and note that the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs are now categorized as "tactical"—could accomplish overnight. It would be surprising if this obvious and simple fact had escaped the attention of the makers of our Indochinese policy. Indeed, it is an historic fact that Nixon as Vice President recommended in 1954 the use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam, and there are indications that more recently the use of such weapons was seriously considered. More importantly, the logic of the Administration's position points ineluctably in this direction. The Administration is committed to leaving Indochina only after it has won a victory. It has not won that victory with the conventional means thus far employed. It is not likely to win it within a tolerable period of time through the continuing employment of conventional means. Vietnamization, in particular, even if it turns out to be successful, will not, and is not intended to, change the—unsuccessful—strategy of the war; it will only change the color of the casualties, and has already done so in considerable measure.

Both the extension of the ground war into Cambodia and Laos and the enormous intensification of the air war testify to the failure of the conventional strategy. Since we cannot win the war by employing conventional means in Vietnam, we are trying to win it by employing the same means in all of Indochina. But if this quantitative and special extension of an unsuccessful strategy will still prove to be unsuccessful, what then? Three options are open to the United States: One is resort to "tactical" nuclear weapons, a course of action toward which, as we have seen, the Administration is being

moved by the logic of its position. Another one is the provocation of China into a war which would unite the people behind the Administration and whose anticipated victories would obliterate the memory of the failure in Vietnam. That course of action has its advocates at the present only at the fringes of the Administration, and it can therefore be ruled out as a short-term alternative. The third option open to us is unconditional disengagement.

This has always been the only rational denouement, however unobtainable in view of the insistence by a succession of administrations upon victory. Resistance to the Algerian solution remains strong in the White House and at the very top of the military hierarchy. Yet very close to that top, the doubts about the war which have always been more intense and widespread than the public assumed, have now been strengthened by the fear lest the indefinite continuation of the war destroy the Armed Forces themselves as an effective instrument of national policy. Race, drugs, and "fraggings" (attacks on officers with fragmentation bombs) have seriously weakened control of the officers over their men, and quite a number of officers are now reluctant to give unpopular orders because they are afraid they either might not be obeyed or might call forth a violent reaction. Thus the Armed Forces and, more particularly, the Army, interested in their own survival as an effective fighting force, are in the process of becoming an active element favoring the speedy conclusion of the war.

That new element is capable of supporting either unconditional disengagement or the use of nuclear weapons. If military doubts and fears should crystallize into outright opposition to the war, such opposition might well turn into the decisive argument in favor either of the nuclear "final solution" of the Indochina problem or of the Algerian solution of unqualified disengagement. For the time being, however, the issue remains hanging in the balance; for the Administration will not be compelled to choose between these two painful alternatives as long as failure has not disabused it of the hope that, by using more intensely the same means that proved to be of no avail in Vietnam, it can gain in Laos and Cambodia the victory that has eluded it in Vietnam. If and when that hope, too, has been dashed, the Administration will no longer be able to evade that painful choice. In his press conference of January 29 the Secretary of State observed that "we don't foreclose any possibility." In a broader sense than he intended, this sums up our prospects in Indochina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend and revise their own remarks on the subject of the Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971.

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

There was no objection.

FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McKEVITT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, last year fire killed approximately 12,200 Americans and destroyed property worth \$2.7 billion. Both of these figures, representing record highs, are of a magnitude comparable to losses from crime. Yet,

little is being done to fully implement the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968.

The Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 authorized the Secretary of Commerce to provide, conduct, support, and coordinate a national fire research and safety program. A fire research and safety center was to be established to carry on this program at the National Bureau of Standards. However, due to inaction on the part of Congress, this worthwhile program has never really gotten off the ground.

Enacted in March 1968, the act passed the Congress too late to be included in the regular appropriation request of the Bureau of Standards for fiscal 1969. An effort to provide supplemental appropriations failed, and although the Bureau of Standards requested funds for the program again in 1970, the appropriation that was finally approved provided only \$550,000 for all of the Bureau's program increases. Therefore, the Bureau was unable to initiate any portion of the Fire Research and Safety Act in 1970.

Finally, for fiscal 1971 a breakthrough in implementing the act was made when the President requested an increase in funding in the amount of \$1.11 million specifically for the initiation of the tasks authorized by the Fire Research and Safety Act. The Congress appropriated \$1 million for the Bureau's fire safety programs. This allowed the Bureau to utilize \$840,000 to launch title I of the Fire Research and Safety Act. Of this money, \$140,000 represents reprogrammed funds from other National Bureau of Standards programs; \$300,000 of the \$1 million appropriated by the Congress was used to convert and expand an existing fire research program.

Mr. Speaker, title I is grossly underfunded. The grants and provisions of this title are extensive. If the intent of the 90th Congress is to be carried out to the fullest, more money will have to be appropriated to implement title I of the act. As for the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, which constitutes title II of the bill, no funds have yet been made available to enable the Commission to convene.

To add to the troubles of this fire safety program, last year Congress failed to extend the authorization of the act itself. The Fire Research and Safety Act authorization expired on June 30, 1970. Technically speaking, this means that there is no enabling legislation to warrant spending the \$840,000 that has been made available to the program in 1971. With this in mind, I would urge the Members of the House to move swiftly to correct this sad legacy of inaction.

I am introducing legislation today which would extend the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 through June 30, 1973. In order to enable the program to function as it was intended to, my bill authorizes \$3 million to be appropriated for the period ending June 30, 1972, and \$3 million for the period beginning July 1, 1972, and ending June 30, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, we must not fail the people of this Nation by denying them the benefits of a program which would provide a national and comprehensive fire research and safety program. The goal

of the act is to reduce national fire losses. I firmly believe that with adequate funding the Fire Research and Safety Act contains the elements to achieve this goal. Title I of the law provides for a national fire research and safety program and recommends the creation of a National Fire Research and Safety Center. These things were needed in 1968 and they are still needed in 1971. We owe it to the American people to see that the necessary funds are provided to bring about greater protection against death, injury, and damage to property resulting from fire.

Following is the text of my bill, H.R. 3977:

H.R. 3977

A bill to extend the fire research and safety program until June 30, 1973

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 104 of the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 is amended by adding at the end thereof of the following new sentence: "In addition, there are authorized to be appropriated for such purposes the sum of \$3,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1972, and the sum of \$3,000,000 for the period beginning July 1, 1972, and ending June 30, 1973."

A BILL TO PRESERVE HUMAN HEALTH AND WELFARE: THE MARINE PROTECTION ACT OF 1971

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Council on Environmental Quality has reported to the President and the Congress that unregulated dumping of material in the oceans and other waters endangers human health, welfare, and the marine environment, ecological systems, and economic potentialities. It called for a Federal policy of regulating the dumping of all types of material in the relevant waters and also of vigorously limiting the dumping of material which could have an unfavorable effect.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to regulate the dumping of material in the oceans, coastal, and other waters, and I invite cosponsors.

This is a complex bill aimed at correcting a deplorable situation, and because of this complexity, a detailed section-by-section analysis of this legislation will follow my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to read this analysis and join me in cosponsoring this legislation which I will reintroduce next week for all who wish to join me.

The section-by-section analysis follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED MARINE PROTECTION ACT OF 1971

The title of the proposed act is designated as the "Marine Protection Act of 1971."

Section 2, drawing on the report of the Council on Environmental Quality made public by the President October 7, 1970, makes a finding by the Congress that unregulated dumping of material in the oceans, coastal, and other waters endangers human health, welfare, and amenities, and the marine environment, ecological systems, and economic potentialities. It declares a federal

policy of regulating dumping of all types of material in the relevant waters and of vigorously limiting the dumping of material which could have an unfavorable effect.

Section 3 defines certain terms used in the proposal. Subsection 3(a) defines the responsible official for implementation of the legislation as the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Subsection 3(b) provides that the proposal applies to the oceans, to gulfs, bays, and other similar salt waters, other coastal areas where the tide ebbs and flows, and to the Great Lakes.

Subsection 3(c) defines material, the transportation for dumping and dumping of which are regulated by the proposal, very broadly as "matter of any kind or description", and then, for illustrative purposes, but without limiting the comprehensive scope of this initial definition, lists specific materials which are included in the general definition. Oil and sewage from vessels, discharges of which are covered by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, are excluded from the scope of this Act.

Subsection 3(e) defines "person" in such a way that all Federal, State, and foreign governmental organizations, employees, and agents, along with private persons or entities, are included within the prohibition on transportation for dumping or dumping contained in Section 4. Federal organizations, employees, and agents, however, are excepted from the definition of "person" insofar as section 6, providing for penalties, is concerned. Thus, Federal organizations, employees, and agents must comply with the permit and standard-setting provisions of the Act, i.e., they would be required to obtain approval from the Administrator of EPA for the transportation for dumping or the dumping of materials in the relevant waters, but they are not liable for or subject to the penalty provisions.

Subsection 3(f) defines dumping for purposes of the Act as "a disposition of material". Provisos make two important exceptions to this general rule of applicability. The first proviso excepts from the Act's coverage disposition of effluents from any outfall structure or routine discharges of effluents incidental to the propulsion of vessels. Municipal sewage outfalls or industrial waste outfalls come within this proviso. Discharges of effluents other than sewage from outfalls come within the purview of standards set pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and also will be subject to the proposed permit program under the Refuse Act (33 U.S.C. § 407). Municipal sewage outfalls also come under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act's standards and also are affected by that Act's assistance programs.

The second proviso could be called the "lobster-pot" proviso. It excepts intentional placement of devices in the relevant waters or on the submerged lands beneath those waters. Several federal departments and agencies place testing, monitoring, sensing, or surveillance devices on the ocean floor. Under this proviso, the placement of such items or their transportation for placement is not within the coverage of the proposal. Private activities similarly not within the proposal would include placing into the ocean and other pertinent waters lobster traps, off-shore drilling platforms, pipelines, or cables. The latter portion of the proviso ensures that any excepted placement of devices does not include placement of material to produce an effect attributable only to the physical presence of the material in the ocean or other relevant waters. Thus, if car bodies or other similar material were placed in the ocean to serve as a shelter for fish, the effect from placing the car bodies would be attributable only to the physical presence of the car bodies in the ocean, and the placement would constitute a dumping for which a permit would be required under the Act.

Special note should also be made of the

fact that "dumping" as defined in subsection 3(f) would not include an activity which has as its primary purpose a result other than "a disposition of material" but which involves the incidental depositing of some debris or other material in the relevant waters. For example, material from missiles and debris from gun projectiles and bombs ultimately come to rest in the protected waters. Such activities are not covered by this Act.

Except where the Administrator has issued a permit for such activity, subsection 4(a) of the proposal prohibits transportation of material from the United States for the purpose of dumping it in the oceans, coastal, and other waters. Similarly, except where a permit has been granted, section 4(b) prohibits dumping of material in that part of such waters which is within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or in the Contiguous Zone of the United States when the dumping affects the territorial sea or territory of the United States.

Section 5 places authority to grant transportation and dumping permits in the Administrator of EPA, provides standards for his use in acting on permit applications, and governs the nature of permits which may be issued.

Section 5(a) allows issuance of a permit where the applicant presents information which indicates that the transportation or dumping or both will not unreasonably degrade or unreasonably endanger human health, welfare, or amenities, or the marine environment, ecological systems, or economic potentialities. The Administrator is directed to establish and apply criteria for reviewing and evaluating permit applications. In establishing or revising the criteria, the Administrator is required to consider the likely impact of the proposed dumping along with alternative locations and methods of disposal, including those based on land, the probable impact of using such alternatives on considerations affecting the public interest, and the probable impact of issuing or denying permits on such considerations. In establishing or revising criteria, the Administrator is directed to consult with the heads of concerned departments and agencies.

Subsection 5(b) authorizes the Administrator to establish and issue various categories of permits. If he deems such a step to be desirable, the Administrator could set different procedures for handling applications in the various categories. Subsection (b) (2) allows the Administrator to require applicants for permits to provide necessary information. The Administrator could require differing amounts and types of information according to category.

Subsections 5(c) and 5(d) set out the requirements which may be incorporated into permits issued under the authority of subsection 5(a). They also allow the Administrator, as he deems appropriate, to state further requirements and actions, such as charges for permits or reporting on actions taken under a permit.

Subsection 5(e) authorizes the Administrator to grant general permits for the transportation for dumping or dumping of quantities and types of materials which he determines will have a minimal effect on the ocean. This provides flexibility to give general permits for certain types of periodic or continuing activities where the amounts dumped are minimal.

Subsection 5(f) authorizes the Administrator to limit or deny the issuance of permits involving specified substances where he finds that the substances cannot be dumped consistently with the provisions of and criteria established under subsection 5(a). In such cases the Administrator may also alter or revoke partially or entirely the terms of existing permits.

Subsection 5(g) allows the Administrator to designate recommended sites for dumping

specified materials. This would give guidance to applicants and facilitate the Administrator's implementation of the control programs.

Subsection 5(h) establishes a very limited exemption from the prohibition on transportation for dumping or dumping where no permit has been granted. Such transportation or dumping is not prohibited where it is necessary in an emergency to safeguard human life. In such cases reports of the excepted emergency actions must be made to the Administrator.

Section 6 provides for penalties. Under subsection 6(a) the Administrator could assess a civil penalty recoverable in federal district court, of up to \$50,000 for each violation. Subsection 6(b) establishes, in addition, criminal sanctions for knowing and willful violations. The court could assess a fine of up to \$50,000 or order imprisonment for a period of up to one year, or both. For those cases where violations are of a continuing nature, and for the purpose of imposing civil penalties and criminal fines but not imprisonment, subsection 6(c) makes each day of such a violation a separate offense. Under the provisions of subsection 6(d), the Attorney General is authorized to seek equitable relief to redress violations. Subsection 6(e) subjects vessels used in violations to in rem liability for any civil penalty assessed or criminal fine imposed. Public vessels within the meaning of subsection 13(a) (3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and other public property of a similar nature would not be subject to the remedy authorized by this provision. Subsection 6(f) adds authority for the Administrator to revoke or suspend a permit issued under subsection 6(a) if the permit's provisions have been violated.

Section 7 deals with the relationship of this legislation to other laws. Generally, except as provided in subsections 7(b) and 7(c), it provides that after the Act's effective date, existing licenses, permits, or authorizations would be terminated to the extent they authorize activity covered by this proposal, and that further licenses, permits, or authorizations of a similar nature could not be issued.

Subsection 7(b) maintains present responsibility and authority contained in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and provides that the provisions of Sections 4 and 7(a) of this proposal do not apply to actions taken under that Act. However, the AEC must consult with the Administrator before issuing a permit to conduct any activity otherwise regulated by this proposal. Moreover, the AEC must comply with the radioactive-material standards set by the Administrator, and the Administrator is directed to consider the policy expressed in subsection 2(b) of this proposal along with the factors stated in subsections 5(a) (1) and 5(a) (2) in setting such standards for the waters covered by this proposal.

Subsection 7(c) relates to authorities contained in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, respecting dredging, filling, harbor works, and maintenance of navigability. The powers are exercised for the most part by the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers. Except for the limited supersession found in subsection 11(e), the Rivers and Harbors Act authorities are not negated or abrogated, nor are existing licenses or permits issued under the Act terminated. Rather, in situations where this Act and the Act of 1899 both apply to dumping of material in connection with a dredge, fill or other permit issued by the Corps of Engineers, issuance of the permit requires a certification by the Administrator of EPA that the activity is in conformity with this proposal and any regulations issued under it. The Administrator will not issue separate permits in such cases.

After this Act becomes effective, the De-

partment of the Army's permit program under the Refuse Act, which is administered in close cooperation with EPA on all water quality matters, will continue to regulate the disposition of any effluent covered by the Refuse Act from any outfall structure regardless of the waters into which this disposition occurs, in addition to regulating all depositing of material into other navigable waters of the United States not covered by subsection 4(b) of this Act.

Subsection 7(d) provides for consultation by the Administrator of EPA with the Secretary of the Army in cases where the Administrator finds that the proposed activity may affect navigation or create an artificial island on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Subsection 7(e) saves State or local laws from being preempted by this proposal.

Section 8 allows the Administrator to use, by agreement, resources of other federal agencies, on either a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis. In subsection 8(b) the Administrator is authorized to delegate responsibility for acting on permit applications to an officer of EPA or, by agreement, to the head of other federal departments or agencies, such as the Commandant of the Coast Guard. Subsection 8(c) directs that surveillance, and other appropriate enforcement activity be conducted by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

Section 9 gives the Administrator power to issue appropriate regulations in carrying out the responsibilities and authority conferred by the Act.

Section 10 directs the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator, to seek appropriate international action and cooperation to support the policy of this proposal.

Subsections 11(a) and 11(b) repeal the Supervisory Harbors Act of 1888, as amended (33 U.S.C. §§ 441-451b), and the provision of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 U.S.C. § 418) which preserved the Supervisory Harbors Act from supersession by the 1899 Act. The Supervisory Harbors Act provides a special authority to control transit in and from the harbors of New York, Baltimore, and Hampton Roads, Virginia. This authority has been used to regulate ocean dumping. The proposed Act would replace that authority. A portion of the Act of August 5, 1886 (33 U.S.C. § 407a), which pertains to deposits of debris from mines and stamp works, and which is covered by this bill or the Refuse Act, is also repealed. A provision contained in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1905 (33 U.S.C. § 419), which has been used to buttress the Corps of Engineers' authority to regulate ocean dumping, is superseded, insofar as it authorizes action that would be regulated by this proposal. Lastly, section 13 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 U.S.C. § 407), commonly known as the Refuse Act, is superseded, but only insofar as it applies to dumping of material in the waters covered by subsection 4(b) of this proposal.

Section 12 provides that this proposal shall take effect six months after its enactment and further saves from being affected by this proposal legal actions begun or rights of action accrued prior to the proposal's effective date.

Section 13 contains an authorization for appropriations to carry out the purposes and administration of the proposal.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL CATASTROPHIC ILLNESS PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of my highest priorities in the 92d Congress

will be to push for enactment of my bill, the National Catastrophic Illness Protection Act, which I introduced in the 91st Congress and reintroduced on January 21, 1971.

Catastrophic illness, as defined in my bill, would comprise those illnesses which require health-care expenses in excess of what normal basic medical or major medical insurance policies cover. Once a family finds itself faced with having to pay for health-care costs of an extensive nature, they are saddled with a financial burden that is staggering and beyond comprehension by those who have not found themselves in this position.

Since my introduction of this legislation, the catastrophic illness insurance concept has received much publicity and much interest. Today, I am pleased to reintroduce the National Catastrophic Illness Protection Act with additional cosponsors, bringing to a total of 17 the Members joining with me in supporting this approach to the problem. Those cosponsoring are: MARK ANDREWS, of North Dakota, NICK BEGICH, of Alaska, JAMES A. BYRNE, of Pennsylvania, TIM LEE CARTER, of Kentucky, JORGE L. CORDOVA, of Puerto Rico, CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, of New Jersey, SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York, JAMES F. HASTINGS, of New York, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, of California, ALBERT JOHNSON, of Pennsylvania, PETER N. KYROS, of Maine, ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, of Illinois, ROBERT A. ROE, of New Jersey, WILLIAM R. ROY, of Kansas, WILLIAM L. SCOTT, of Virginia, LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS, of Pennsylvania, and JIM WRIGHT, of Texas.

This bill has also been introduced in the Senate by Senators J. CALEB BOGGS, J. GLENN BEALL, JR., and JOHN G. TOWER. Congress will soon be giving consideration to the health care needs of our Nation and be required to develop a program which will respond to these needs while keeping in mind the limitations of the Federal budget. I urge that each Member take a close look at the concept contained in this bill, which is similar to that approved by Congress and being utilized to help victims of floods.

I include the following:

NATIONAL CATASTROPHIC ILLNESS PROTECTION ACT OF 1971

(Introduced by Representative LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, Republican of Maryland, January 21, 1971)

PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION OF LEGISLATION

The proposal National Catastrophic Illness Protection Act of 1971 is designed to encourage private health insurers, with the assistance of the Federal Government, to provide adequate health insurance protection for persons who cannot otherwise afford such protection, or whose medical and health expenses are such that extended health insurance protection is not available. According to the findings outlined by Congress in the proposal, "many individuals are still unable to secure adequate health insurance protection or to secure such protection at rates which they can afford" and "few of our citizens are protected" from the costs of "catastrophic illness."

To deal with these problems, the bill would create a Federal health reinsurance program designed to encourage the development by the private insurance industry of policies which would afford individuals extended protection. Working with the in-

dustry, the Government would reinsure policies on the terms and conditions calculated to provide maximum encouragement to insurance companies to participate in the program, either individually or through pools established for the purpose.

The legislation contains five parts designed to meet the program's objectives. Part A contains general provisions relating to the program, including the statement of Congressional findings and a section setting forth the definitions used in the proposal. Part B establishes the National Catastrophic Insurance Program by means of State-wide plans providing extended health insurance coverage through a program by which the Federal Government reinsures losses of insurers or pools of insurers offering extended health insurance policies. Part C contains the Federal reinsurance mechanism for protecting insurers against losses incurred by plans provided under Part B of the bill. Part D of the legislation establishes a separate reinsurance program to operate in those States where a State-wide plan is not developed in accordance with Part B of the bill. Part E of the proposal contains general provisions relating to claims and judicial review procedures and Federal financial obligations in connection with the reinsurance programs established under Parts B and D of the bill.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

PART A—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 2001. *Short Title.* Provides that the legislation may be known as the "National Catastrophic Illness Protection Act of 1971."

Section 2002. *Findings and Purpose.* Sets forth the findings of the Congress that there are still many individuals who cannot secure or cannot afford adequate health insurance protection and that very little insurance protection is available to help meet the costs of catastrophic illness or disease. Establishes as the policy of Congress the need for a National Catastrophic Illness Insurance program to encourage States and private insurers in the development of policies which will meet the problems set forth in the statement of findings.

Section 2003. *Definitions.* Defines certain terms used in the Act, such as "extended health insurance," "costs of medical care," "insurer," "pool" and "reinsured losses." Among the definitions are:

(1) extended health insurance: meaning insurance against all costs paid or incurred for medical care as defined in the Internal Revenue Act.

(2) costs of medical care: include expenses of medical care incurred by or on behalf of persons covered by an extended health insurance policy which are deductible in accordance with provisions in the IRS Code.

(3) insurers: include any insurance company or groups of companies under common ownership authorized to engage in the insurance business under laws of a State.

(4) pool: meaning association of insurance companies in a State formed or organized for the purpose of making extended health insurance more readily available.

(5) reinsured losses: meaning losses on reinsurance claims under this Act and all direct expenses incurred in connection with such claims, including processing, verifying, and paying such losses.

PART B—ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM; STATE PLANS

Section 2011. *Authority.* Authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to establish and carry out a National Catastrophic Illness Insurance Program.

Section 2012. *State Plans.* Provides that the program shall involve the creation of State-wide plans providing extended health insurance, and that the Federal Government will reinsure insurers and pools of insurers who offer such insurance. Each insurer (or pool

of insurers) will work with the State insurance authority in carrying out the State-wide plan. All plans would have to include:

(1) that extended health insurance be available to all eligible individuals, as defined in Section 2013, and at a cost which is reasonable as defined in Section 2014, subject only to deductibles authorized in Section 2015.

(2) that where an insurer does not agree to write a policy of extended insurance, or does so under various limiting conditions, the State authority is notified. The policy would then be placed with a pool or otherwise assigned to insurers by the "all-industry placement facility," provided for in Section 2016.

(3) that data be compiled and studied in connection with the operation of the State-wide plan.

(4) that certain reports be submitted to the State insurance authority by individual insurers.

(5) that any cancellation of a policy provide for reasonable notice to permit coverage under a new policy to be written under the plan.

(6) that public information about the plan be readily distributed.

Further, each plan would have to contain such terms, conditions, requirements and other provisions determined to be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program.

Section 2013. *Eligible Individuals.* In order to be eligible for policies issued under a State-wide plan, an individual would have to be a resident of the State and make appropriate application, or be a member of the household of such a person and his spouse, child, grandchild, parent or grandparent.

Section 2014. *Premium Setting.* Premium rates would be set on the basis of a study of the risks in question and accepted actuarial principles. These rates would be promulgated by the Secretary for use by States and insurers in charging for extended health insurance issued under plans approved under Section 2012 above. Rate differentials would be authorized on the basis of the number of persons covered in a family, or by other factors approved by the Secretary, including the different risks involved in various coverage arrangements. Where insurers established rates lower than those promulgated by the Secretary, any losses sustained by these insurers, or pools of insurers would be compensated by "premium equalizers" provided for in Section 2044 of the bill.

Section 2015. *Deductibles.* Provides that, before payments are made under an extended insurance policy, a deductible must be satisfied through an equal amount of medical expenses paid or incurred by such individual. The amount of such deductible is determined by relating the extent of medical expenses to adjusted income and is equal to one-half of the amount by which a person's or family's adjusted income exceeds \$1,000 but does not exceed \$2,000; plus all of the amount by which such adjusted income exceeds \$2,000. (A person with an adjusted income of \$10,000 would have a deductible of \$8,500.)

For the purposes of this section, the term "adjusted income" means the "gross income of an individual or family for tax purposes less the aggregate amount of personal tax exemptions allowed the individual or family."

For satisfying the deductible, costs paid and incurred with respect to an illness which began in the previous year and continued uninterrupted until such costs were paid or incurred, shall be considered to have been paid or incurred in such previous year.

The deductible would be reduced by the amount of any payments for the costs of care covered by the Medicare and Medicaid programs, or by any other public or private health insurance policy covering such care.

Section 2016. *All Industry Placement Facility.* A Statewide plan must provide for an

all-industry placement facility which would have the responsibility of distributing equitably the risks involved in the issuance of extended health insurance and which would seek to place insurance up to the full insurable value of the risk to be insured.

Section 2017—*Industry Cooperation*. Provides that certain statements pledging participation and cooperation with the State insurance authority would be required of insurers seeking reinsurance under the program. In addition, no insurer shall direct any agent or broker not to solicit business through such a plan, nor penalize agents or brokers in any manner for submitting applications under the plan.

Section 2018—*Plan Evaluation*. Provides that the State plan shall be evaluated from time to time in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary.

PART C—REINSURANCE COVERAGE

Section 2021—*Reinsurance of Losses under Extended Health Insurance Policies*. Provides that the Secretary is authorized to re-insure against the losses which might be incurred under extended health insurance policies. Temporary reinsurance would be authorized immediately after enactment, but at the expiration of such temporary period, only permanent reinsurance is available to insurers participating in a State-wide plan as provided for in Part B.

Section 2022—*Reinsurance Agreements and Premiums*. Authorizes the Secretary to make agreements with insurers and pools for reinsurance in consideration of payments of reinsurance premiums deposited in the National Catastrophic Illness Insurance Fund provided for in Section 2043 of the bill. Reinsurance offered would pay an insurer or pool for total proved and approved claims for losses in connection with the provisions of extended health insurance over and above the retention of such losses by insurers which were required in accordance with the reinsurance contract. Terms would be made annually in connection with any reinsurance contract.

Section 2023—*Conditions of Reinsurance*. Provides a detailed procedure for implementation of the reinsurance program in a State within specified time requirements, taking into account certain State and local factors which might affect such implementation.

Section 2024—*Recovery of Premiums; Statute of Limitation*. Provides that the Government may recover the courts any unpaid premiums lawfully payable to the Government by an insurer under provisions of a 5-year statute of limitations.

PART D—GOVERNMENT PROGRAM WITH INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE

Section 2031—*Federal Operation of Program in Noncooperating States*. Authorizes after certain determinations that, where a Statewide program cannot be carried out, or that the objective of the program would be materially assisted by the Federal Government's assumption of the plan, arrangements for operation by the Government may be carried out. Insurers would deal directly with the Federal Government as fiscal agents of the United States.

Section 2032—*Adjustment and Payment of Claims*. If a Federally-operated program is provided for, the Secretary is authorized to adjust and pay claims for proved and approved losses covered by extended health insurance.

PART E—PROVISIONS OF GENERAL APPLICABILITY

Section 2041—*Claims and Judicial Review*. Provides procedures for judicial review of disallowances for claims for losses under the reinsurance program, whether State-wide or operating by the Federal Government.

Section 2042—*Fiscal Intermediaries and Servicing Agents*. Authorizes the Government to enter into contracts and other arrangements for claims review, receiving and disbursing funds for making payments, etc.

Section 2043—*National Catastrophic Illness Insurance Fund*. Provides for the creation of a fund for purposes of receiving premiums for reinsurance, paying claims, and so on.

Section 2044—*Premium Equalization Payments*. Provides that the Secretary may make periodic payments to insurers and pools in recognition of reductions in premium rates below estimated risks as provided for in Sec. 2014.

Section 2045—*Records, Annual Statement, and Audits*. Self-explanatory.

Section 2046—*General Powers*. Authorizes the Secretary of HEW to exercise certain powers vested in the Secretary of HUD under the Housing Act of 1950, in addition to powers provided in this proposal.

Section 2047—*Services and Facilities of Other Agencies*. Provides that the Secretary may, on a reimbursable basis, utilize the services of other Government agencies.

Section 2048—*Advance Payments*. Authorizes necessary payment adjustments in connection with the program.

Section 2049—*Taxation*. Exempts the National Catastrophic Illness Insurance Fund from Federal taxation, except that any real property acquired by the Secretary as the result of reinsurance would be taxable by States or political subdivisions.

Section 2050—*Appropriations*. Authorizes such appropriations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill.

APPLICATION OF THE DEDUCTIBLE UNDER THE NATIONAL CATASTROPHIC ILLNESS PROTECTION ACT OF 1971

The deductible, or the amount of medical costs which must be incurred or paid in one year before benefits begin under this insurance, is based on individual or family income and would be as follows:

Adjusted income	Deductible
\$1,500	0
2,000	\$500
2,500	1,000
3,000	1,500
3,500	2,000
4,000	2,500
4,500	3,000
5,000	3,500

And so on up the scale.

"Adjusted income" means the gross income of an individual or family for tax purposes less the aggregate amount of personal tax exemptions allowed.

The deductible would be reduced by the amount of any payments, for the costs of care covered by the Medicare and Medicaid programs, or by any other public or private health insurance policy covering such care.

Example: A family with an adjusted income of \$10,000 would during a year be required to pay or incur medical expenses to the extent of \$8,500 (or to have insurance coverage to meet those expenses in whole or in part; Medicare or Medicaid payments would reduce the deductible similarly). At that point all medical expenses regardless of the extent, during that one year, or for any lengthy illness or injury the treatment of which extends into another year, would be covered under such a policy.

NIXON BUDGET MAKES GOOD READING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, more than any other that I can recall in recent years, President Nixon's budget message of last week merits the widest possible discussion so that the people of this Nation, and all of us, can understand more fully the significant and progressive

changes that are proposed to make government a more useful and responsive servant of the people.

My initial comments on the message when it was delivered were necessarily confined to the most pertinent fiscal facts. I have since given additional time and study to the document and wish to discuss some of the other aspects of the Nixon program.

One might summarize by stating that the Nixon budget message for 1972 has three primary goals:

First, it proposes a careful transition to a peacetime economy in which our resources can be directed to the solution of many domestic problems including those of the environment;

Second, it proposes to use fiscal policy to help us achieve healthy, noninflationary economic growth; and

Third, it proposes to begin a process of shifting governmental power back to State and local governments.

Mr. Speaker, these worthy goals deserve careful consideration by the Congress.

The 1972 budget is a "full-employment budget"—one in which spending is not permitted to exceed the revenues that the economy would produce under the existing tax system at a time of full employment. In this way, the budget will promote orderly economic expansion.

A budget deficit is estimated for fiscal year 1972, but its economic effect will be very different from the inflationary pressure created by the deficits of the late sixties. The deficits of 1966-1968 reflected excessive spending that went far beyond full-employment revenues. Occurring when the economy was already operating at full capacity, they fanned the coals of incipient inflation into a roaring fire.

The President's 1972 budget is the product of an intensive review designed to sort out activities appropriate for the Federal Government from those best performed at the State and local level or by the private sector. The budget calls for a new balance of responsibility and power in America by proposing the sharing of Federal revenues in a way that:

First, alleviates the fiscal needs of State and local governments by providing additional unrestricted revenues through general revenue sharing and eliminating matching requirements with respect to the categorical grants being absorbed into special revenue sharing; and

Second, allows State and local elected officials both the resources and the responsibility for dealing with problems best handled at their levels.

At the Federal level, the budget provides:

First, new fairness in American life, through national strategies to improve the health care of our citizens and to assure, with work incentives and requirements, an income floor for every family in the Nation;

Second, an increase in defense spending in order to protect our national security and carry out the President's strategy for peace;

Third, renewed emphasis on improving the quality of life, including vigorous efforts to protect and enhance the environment, increase recreation facilities, eliminate discrimination, and reduce crime; and

Fourth, a reorganized Federal Government that will be more responsive and restore vigor to our federal system.

FISCAL POLICY FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT

When President Nixon took office 2 years ago, inflation was a direct result of the economic policies of the period 1966 to 1968, when we were mired in war in Vietnam and Federal spending rose sharply. During these 3 years Federal outlays were allowed to exceed full-employment revenues by a total of \$41 billion.

The Nixon administration acted promptly to cool the superheated economy. A budget surplus was achieved in 1969. Spending was restrained again in 1970.

The forces of inflation have been durable and persistent. They remain strong. But their momentum was slowed in calendar years 1969 and 1970, and excessive demand was eliminated as a source of inflationary pressure. The turnaround of this inflationary trend permitted President Nixon to enter the second phase of his plan: To follow more expansive economic policies without losing ground in the battle against inflation.

Last July, the President set forth the budget policy of his administration:

At times the economic situation permits—even calls for—a budget deficit. There is one basic guideline for the budget, however, which we should never violate: except in emergency conditions, expenditures must never be allowed to outrun the revenues that the tax system would produce at reasonably full employment. When the Federal Government's spending actions over an extended period push outlays sharply higher, increased tax rates or inflation inevitably follow.

The 1972 budget complies with this basic guideline. Budget outlays in 1972 are expected to be \$229.2 billion, \$11.6 billion more than in estimated receipts, but still below the \$229.3 billion of revenue that would be produced if the economy were operating at full employment throughout the year.

The principle of holding outlays to revenue at full employment serves three necessary purposes:

First, it imposes the discipline of an upper limit on spending, a discipline that is essential because the upward pressures on outlays are relentless;

Second, it permits Federal tax and spending programs to be planned and conducted in an orderly manner consistent with steady growth in the economy's productive capacity; and

Third, it helps achieve economic stability by automatically providing stimulus during periods of slack—like the present—and imposing restraint during periods when there is a threat of overstimulation.

FIRM CONTROL OVER FEDERAL SPENDING

The budget policy of the administration is to keep firm control over Federal spending. The outlay total of \$229.2 billion in 1972 is the sum of spending for programs that were scrutinized carefully to make certain that they would be managed effectively and efficiently, and that they are essential to carry out present laws or to achieve desirable changes in our national priorities.

If the Congress does not maintain

careful control over budget totals—if we weaken in our resolve to curb spending—outlays could build up a momentum that will carry them beyond full-employment receipts, and we would risk losing the ability to restrain spending in times when a deficit is undesirable. This must not be allowed to happen.

So that it will not happen, I respectfully suggest that we give early consideration to H.R. 2571, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1971, which I introduced with the cosponsorship of members of the Republican leadership and the minority members of the Appropriations Committee. Congress has not always been notably successful at self-control on budget matters. This bill would give us guidelines and restraints against overspending.

Of course, the objective of prosperity without inflation cannot be achieved by budget policy alone. It also requires: that the monetary policy adopted by the independent Federal Reserve System provide fully for the growing needs of the economy; and increased restraint in wage and price decisions by labor and business—in their own and the Nation's interest and as a matter of commonsense.

By working together, the budget, monetary policy, and commonsense in the private sector can bring about orderly expansion.

REVENUE SHARING

The President's revenue-sharing proposal stems from his belief that we must revitalize the American system of government and give the people the opportunity to become more involved in decisions that affect their lives.

During the 1960's, more governmental initiative and power shifted to Washington and away from elected officials in State and local governments. Toward the end of the decade it became apparent that, despite new programs and massive Federal expenditures, government at all levels was not working well. State and local governments were breaking down under an incredible fiscal burden. The redtape involved in the narrow categorical grant system made it almost impossible for the Federal Government to be effective and respond to the needs of individuals in different localities.

The financial squeeze on State and local governments is acute, and shows no sign of becoming less painful. These governments rely mainly on receipts from consumer and property taxes, which have not grown nearly as fast as the demand for State and local government services. As a result, combined State and local debt has increased by over 600 percent since 1948.

The Federal Government helped meet some of this demand by increasing its financial aid, largely through grant programs, which now account for 18 percent of State and local revenues. The results of grant programs have been impressive in some cases. But the grant structure has become a haphazard collection of hundreds of separate programs, each with its own policies, its own requirements and procedures, and its own funding.

Insufficient authority over the use of

resources for federally assisted programs is now lodged at the State and local level. More power—and responsibility—for using federally collected funds must be given to elected officials in these governments. The President's revenue-sharing proposal will furnish State and local governments the money they need to deliver services that can best be performed by them.

This is how revenue sharing will work: In the first full year of the plan, \$16 billion will be directed to the States, with a mandatory pass-through to localities, in a way that will enable them to decide as never before how that money will be spent.

Of the \$16 billion, \$5 billion will be in the form of general revenue sharing, without restrictions. All of this will be "new" money, without matching requirements and with the decision how it is to be used exclusively a State and local matter.

The remaining \$11 billion will be in the form of special revenue sharing, with States and localities having discretion as to how it will be used within each of six broad subject areas. These areas are:

- Urban community development;
- Rural community development;
- Education;
- Manpower training;
- Law enforcement; and
- Transportation.

The hobbling restrictions now accompanying much of the Federal aid in these areas would be removed, along with matching requirements that presently force localities to spend their own matching money on low-priority projects for fear of "losing" available Federal aid.

Of course, neither general nor special revenue sharing can be the vehicle for any retreat from the Federal Government's obligation to ensure equal opportunity and treatment for all. The President's proposals will include the safeguards that now accompany all other Federal funds allocated to the States.

To help State and local governments develop greater capacity to plan and manage their own affairs, the President is additionally proposing a planning-management assistance plan, which will provide \$100 million to help these governments make their own long-range plans and enhance their capability for the efficient use of their growing revenues.

In the first full year of operation, general and special revenue sharing will assign control over the expenditure of an additional \$16 billion to the States and localities affected most by those expenditures. This is nearly half of Federal Government aid, excluding public assistance grants, to States and communities—an historic and massive reversal of the flow of power in America. Moreover, the new funds for general revenue sharing will grow in years to come because they will be tied to the Federal personal income tax base. As that tax base expands, more money will flow to States and localities.

TOWARD A FULL GENERATION OF PEACE

The 1972 budget furthers the President's goal of a full generation of peace in which all nations can focus their ener-

gies on improving the lives of their citizens. The President's strategy for peace will—as it must—be based upon a position of military strength. The purpose of this strength is to prevent war; to this end, we will negotiate with those whose vital interests and policies conflict with our own. As we carry on negotiations, we couple them with other efforts to achieve the same goal. The Vietnamization program is an example, and we are making good progress. By this spring, our authorized troop strength will have been cut approximately in half since the time the President took office, and he will continue to bring American troops home.

Supporting these efforts, the military forces of this Nation and its allies will provide the armed might necessary to deter aggression or to deal with it effectively where necessary. We expect our allies to do more in their own behalf. In the spirit of the Nixon doctrine, many are taking steps in that direction. But we must also do our share. We must be certain that our military forces are combat ready and properly equipped to fulfill their role in our strategy for peace. In addition, we face formidable Soviet nuclear and conventional forces, particularly naval forces, and a further rise in the costs of military equipment and personnel.

For these reasons, the President is recommending an increase of \$6 billion in budget authority for military and military assistance programs. This Nation has the will and the resources to meet its vital national security needs. At a time when we are urging our allies to do more and when our potential adversaries may seek military advantage, we cannot do less.

IMPROVEMENTS IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS

President Nixon's 1972 budget calls for improvement in activities that are appropriately performed by the Federal Government.

The present welfare system is archaic and demanding and imposes a crushing and growing financial burden on States. The President's proposed welfare reform plan would remove the evils of the system by:

First, setting national eligibility standards;

Second, balancing strong training and work requirements with equally strong training and work incentives;

Third, giving financial relief to the States; and

Fourth, establishing a Federal floor under benefit payments for all families with children including, for the first time, those with working fathers.

Other domestic program improvements reflected in the 1972 budget include:

First, social security reform, including an automatic adjustment for increases in the cost of living effective retroactive to January 1, 1971;

Second, a new national health strategy designed to expand preventive care, train more doctors and other health personnel, achieve greater equity and efficiency in the delivery of health care, and provide health insurance for all low-income families with children;

Third, greatly expanded research to prevent or cure cancer and sickle cell anemia;

Fourth, increased Federal leadership and funding to help State and local governments, private industry and the public, control pollution and improve the quality of our environment;

Fifth, a substantial rise in aid to States and localities for recreation facilities, especially new urban areas;

Sixth, increased efforts to eliminate discrimination; and

Seventh, a 32-percent increase in outlays to improve law enforcement at all levels of government, to make our judicial system and to raise the effectiveness of correction and rehabilitation.

FEDERAL REORGANIZATION AND REFORM

The President has proposed a sweeping reorganization of the Federal Government. Currently, the Federal Government is not properly organized to deal with the Nation's domestic problems. Programs that should be joined together to achieve common goals are fragmented among different departments and agencies. The President has therefore proposed the merger of seven existing departments and several independent agencies into four departments:

A Department of Natural Resources;

A Department of Human Resources;

A Department of Community Development; and

A Department of Economic Development.

These new departments will combine with revenue sharing to permit more constructive partnership among Federal, State, and local governments.

Reorganization and reform also carry the promise of significant economies, similar to those we realized when the recommendations of the two Hoover commissions were put into effect. Government reorganization to increase efficiency, direct effort toward national goals, and reduce Federal overhead is immensely popular with the American people. I predict a ground swell of sentiment across the country in support of the reorganization program.

CONCLUSION

The 1972 budget expresses the President's fiscal program for the New American revolution—a peaceful revolution in which power will be turned back to the people and government at all levels will be refreshed, renewed, and made truly responsive. This can be a revolution as profound as that first revolution almost 200 years ago.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MAZZOLI) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States calling for equal rights for women.

This legislation, which is commonly called the Equal Rights Amendment, is not new to the Congress of the United States. Resolutions proposing equal rights have been regularly introduced in every

Congress since 1923. For 48 years the cause of equal rights has been a losing one. However, it must be pointed out that it took 50 years for women to secure the very basic right of the vote. Equal rights, therefore, is still very much alive and well.

In the last Congress, a similar measure was introduced by our colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan. It had 290 cosponsors which is clear indication of the breadth of its support. Identical legislation was offered in the other body by the junior Senator from Indiana, the Honorable BIRCH BAYH.

On August 10 last, House Joint Resolution 264 was passed overwhelmingly by a vote of 350 to 15. But this vote tells only part of the story. It took the adoption of Discharge Petition 5 to get this measure from the Judiciary Committee and onto the floor of the House for a vote. The path toward equal rights for women has indeed been a rough one to trod.

Although I was not a Member of the 91st Congress, had such been the case, I would have supported the discharge petition and voted for the legislation when it came before this House.

There are, of course, many perspectives from which to view this issue. Most have been adequately stated by others more eminent and knowledgeable than I.

But, as an attorney and former State Senator, I believe it would be appropriate at this time to sum up a few pertinent arguments favoring prompt passage and ratification of this legislation.

Basically, it seems to me there are four general areas in which inequality between the sexes presently exists. These inequalities would be corrected by the passage of this resolution and its ratification by the several States.

First, there is the profound question of equal protection under the law.

The 14th amendment prohibits States from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. This amendment also prohibits the denial to any person of equal protection of the law. The fifth amendment established similar restrictions upon the activities of the Federal Government.

Subsequent interpretations of both amendments, however, have not provided clear and positive assurance to women that their rights are equally protected under the law. For example, it was not until 1968 that the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania struck down a law which authorized longer prison sentences for women than for men for conviction of the same crimes.

Adoption of the amendment I propose today will provide such assurance. No longer will the courts in our land uphold, or refuse to review, laws and practices discriminating between and among persons on account of sex.

Second, there is the question of equality of the sexes with respect to property rights. The President's Commission on the Status of Women reported in 1963 that in every State of the Union, legal disabilities of various sorts limited the property rights of married women.

While many of these disabilities have been eliminated, the President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities states that the United States,

even today, lags behind some of the so-called emerging countries in its treatment of women.

Third, there is the question of a woman's right to serve on a jury. The 14th amendment did not automatically open the doors to jury service for women. Until as late as 1966 women were excluded from jury duty in three States. Incredible though it seems, today—1971—20 States and the District of Columbia provide differential treatment for men and women as jurors.

Fourth, and perhaps most critical in today's world, is the right of women to work at lawful occupations of their choice for pay equal to that earned by men doing the same tasks. Economic inequality of the sexes is probably the greatest single complaint of women in our society today. The complaints are well taken.

In some States married women, but not married men, must obtain court approval before engaging in business. So-called "protective labor laws" have frequently resulted in discrimination against female citizens.

Overall, the salaries of women are considerably below those of men performing the same type of work. The present median income for women is 58.2 percent that of men. That statistic is even more unsettling when we realize that it represents a downward trend from 63 percent in 1958.

The foregoing are but a few of the many examples which can be cited to illustrate the real need for this legislation.

It goes without saying, that I do not share the view of some of my colleagues who contend that legislation in this area is unnecessary because equality of rights of the sexes already exists.

I am pleased to say that more and more of my colleagues are arriving at my point of view. For the first time in our history, an equal rights amendment was passed by the House of Representatives during the last Congress.

Events would indicate that now this year the climate is even more favorable for the enactment of an equal rights amendment. For instance, only last week Switzerland granted voting rights to its female citizens. While this is a belated and most modest step toward equality of the sexes, particularly on the part of a country I had been taught was the flower of democracy, it does, indeed, prove that things are on the move all across the world.

Finally, if we are tempted to the view that inequality between the sexes does not exist, let us be reminded that this very question is pending before the other body at this time. The Senate Rules Committee is pondering the "momentous" question of whether or not to grant young women the same right to serve as pages as young men possess.

I am told that the Rules Committee of that body has appointed an ad hoc committee to study this weighty question. I submit that it has been this tendency on our part to study questions of discrimination and inequality of the sexes rather than to solve them, that makes the resolution I have introduced today so important.

The passage of this resolution would demonstrate to the rest of the world that as our Nation approaches its 200th birthday, it is a responsible democracy extending equal rights to all its citizens.

The resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. —

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein). That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

"SEC. 3. This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification."

NATION'S ECONOMY HURTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. STRATTON). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration's economic policy which has brought this Nation to a 6.2 unemployment rate and the highest interest rates and tightest money market conditions in our history is hurting not only the small businessmen and the prospective American homeowner, but now even the upper income segment of our economy. The crisis in our economy today has brought numerous States and cities to the brink of bankruptcy with no visible means ahead to keep them from going under.

I believe that the biggest complaint that most Members have heard from their districts is that "we are in real financial trouble" from one end of the economic scale to the other.

Mr. Speaker, I would like on this occasion to bring to the attention of the Members an excellent article that appeared in the New York Times regarding the financial problems, even the impending financial disaster that is facing people all over the country:

WE ARE HURTING SPREADS AS NATION'S ECONOMIC CRY

(By Phillip Shabecoff)

WASHINGTON, Feb. 7.—Bernard Burns, a fire battalion chief in Pittsburgh, is worried about his job—not about losing it but about doing it right. With a citywide economy move on, some fire engines are now manned by only three men—about half the complement of 20 years ago—and the cutback, he fears, could be disastrous.

Peter F. Flaherty, Pittsburgh's young Mayor, is also interested in good fire protection, but he is caught up in a broader problem—a financial squeeze that threatens the city's very solvency. So among other things he is holding down on fire department hiring—34 positions there are now vacant—and hoping for the best.

Each man, city official and firefighter, is feeling the bite of hard times. And while

their troubles may not be as immediate as those of a jobless engineer or a family on welfare, they show how far economic dislocation has reached into the institutions and organizations that are the foundation of American society.

From the teacher in St. Louis whose greater workload gives her less time with slow learners to the New York educator who has had to give up his limousine, from officials of churches, civil rights groups, foundations, charities, hospitals and cultural groups, the same complaints are being heard:

"We are hurting."

"We are in real financial trouble."

"We need help."

The prolonged, eccentric combination of sharply rising prices, declining business activity and growing unemployment not only is eroding the viability of many of this country's institutions but also is exposing basic flaws in the way they obtain and spend money.

Some lucky ones are snugly insulated from the economic storms. A winning professional football team—the Oakland Raiders, for example—still attracted sellout crowds and made profits last year. A few—most notably banks benefiting from higher interest rates—actually came out well ahead. And many have stripped down to essentials, eliminating waste in the process.

But interviews with leaders of dozens of representative institutions in recent weeks indicate that the nation's economic ills have created widespread unease and often disruption of services.

There were no signs of general panic. Most of the leaders interviewed were confident that their own organizations would ride out the storm by cutting corners, pinching pennies and dispensing with nonessential activities where possible.

But there was wide agreement that the recession was providing a painful lesson. Many of the leaders acknowledged, for example, that for the first time in their lives it had been brought home to them that the nation's economic resources were finite.

And many have also become convinced that they must begin thinking of basic reforms in their financing and spending policies, that more government support is essential and that new priorities must be established.

"MAY HELP US SEE"

"Our society has enough resources to handle the important things," said Nils Y. Wessell, president of the Albert Sloan Foundation. "But we must determine what is important. If you look at the disparity between what this country spends on education and what it spends on tobacco, chewing gum and alcohol, you can see what is wrong. This recession may help us see."

Most economists trace the roots of the nation's economic troubles to President Johnson's decision in 1965 to accelerate this war and war spending in Vietnam without raising taxes, telling Americans that they could afford guns as well as butter.

A serious inflation followed, however, and when the Nixon Administration took office it sought to stop it by making money expensive and scarce, by reducing Government spending and by generally slowing down business activity.

The economy slowed according to plan—unemployment rose to 6 per cent of the country's work force by the start of this year, the highest level in nine years—but inflation, the most sustained inflation in American history, remained essentially unchecked. Between the end of 1966 and the end of 1970, the Consumer Price Index rose by about 24 per cent.

Americans, already shaken by social and political problems, began to lose confidence in the economy and question whether the country was really as rich as they had thought. For many of the institutions that

serve them, that kind of economic climate was pure poison.

SCHOOLS HARD HIT

Among the hardest hit have been the schools—private and public, from elementary through graduate school level.

Throughout the country public school systems like those in St. Louis or Youngstown, Ohio, or Scarsdale, Mount Pleasant and East Islip in the New York suburbs have been encountering growing reluctance by voters to approve school bond issues, increases in school budgets or higher school taxes.

"Schools in Missouri, and very likely everywhere else, are facing a financial crisis," said Warren M. Brown, superintendent of the Ferguson-Florissant School District, which serves a middle class area of neat homes and shopping centers on the edge of St. Louis.

The school district is financed by local property taxes, but this year worried residents of the area revolted against higher taxes, rejecting five successively smaller proposed increases.

"Many of them have been laid off by McDonnell Douglas or, if they still have jobs, see their neighbors out of work," explained Mr. Brown at the school district headquarters overlooking playing fields and a half-frozen pond.

"The cost of living is zooming and people are losing jobs," he continued. "They don't want to harm the school program, but the property tax is the only place most of them have any kind of option for keeping their expenses down."

60 WORKERS DROPPED

"We didn't fire any teachers, but we had to drop 60 other people—custodians, matrons, librarians, teachers' aides—and we didn't hire 30 new teachers that we needed," Mr. Brown said. The school also had to drop some other services such as remedial reading and medical programs.

For the school district, Mr. Brown said, the financial squeeze means that "children will get less individual attention, that the school programs will deteriorate in an insidious way with more kids in each class and fewer books among them, and that the school plant itself will deteriorate."

Gall Glenn, who teaches third grade at the district's Bermuda Schools, fears that all of this is having an especially bad effect on children like Kevin, who is one of the slowest readers in the class. "You see, Kevin wants to learn and if I had more time to give him he would learn," she said.

But because of the money problems, Mrs. Glenn does not have a teacher's aide to help her any more, and she must spend many hours grading papers. Her workload is greater, her patience is thinner, and she is giving Kevin less of her time.

On the campus of Notre Dame University in South Bend, Ind., one day not long ago, the famous golden dome still gleamed richly under a layer of dull, early-winter clouds. But in the school's business office, directly below the dome, money problems were mounting.

These problems, it might be said, helped send Joe Theismann and Tom Gatewood, Notre Dame's all-American passing and catching combination, to the Cotton Bowl in Dallas, where they were instrumental in defeating the University of Texas.

COSTS CONTINUE UP

A major reason that the school administration broke a long-standing precedent and allowed the team to play in a postseason bowl game was that the school needed money.

Father Jerome Wilson, vice president and business manager of the university, explained that while the school didn't feel it had to go to a bowl game every year, it had done so the last two seasons to raise money for a black studies program and for scholarships for black students.

Every year since 1961, the school has raised

tuition costs by \$100 a year. But last year rising costs forced the school to increase tuition by \$200 and it may have to go up by the same amount this year, Father Wilson said.

"There are signs that the families of our students are feeling the pinch," he observed. "For the first time that I can remember we cannot find jobs for all the boys who need them."

State and local governments are also in distress. The recession has meant both increased demands for their services and smaller tax revenues coming in.

In California, Gov. Ronald Reagan is proposing among other things drastic cuts in welfare and Medi-Cal (California's version of Medicare) in order to reverse a mounting budget deficit. But with the state badly hit by unemployment as a result of a drop in Government contracts and other factors, these services are more in need than ever.

Because more people are unemployed and Californians are wary of spending money, tax revenues are way down. But all of the state government's expenses, from new buildings to mental hygiene programs, are way up.

The Pittsburgh city government, despite an austerity program instituted by Mayor Flaherty, will have a budget that is higher by \$1.2-billion in 1971, with no new revenues in sight.

FORCED TO COMPROMISE

Because of the fiscal situation, the city has had to make compromises with its needs. The vacancies in the Bureau of Fire and the three-man fire crews are among the results.

On Christmas Eve, Battalion Chief Burns recalls, he took his undermanned crew to help fight a six-alarm fire that was sweeping through the Garfield section of Pittsburgh.

"I was pumping, raising ladders and trying to keep the fire from spreading," Chief Burns recalled. "I couldn't tell the men what to do. I remember when I was a kid I would go to the engine house where my father worked and there would be seven men on a rig. Now we're working with a bare minimum of men. A crew reduced to three men is often in the position of actually having only one man attacking the fire. But you won't know it until it's your house that's on fire."

All told, Mayor Flaherty planned to cut 900 employees from the city's payroll at the end of the year, including building inspectors, cleaning women, clerks, and the administrator of the meter maid program, who earned \$11,602 a year. Budget cuts have been made in cultural programs, allocations for a police academy and even a grant to a war veterans' society.

"We should rebuild 25 miles of streets a year," said Bert Demelker, director of public works. "Now maybe we do 17 miles and it is backing up on us. And I don't even know what asphalt will cost next year."

IMPACT ON BLACK COMMUNITY

Organizations that depend on donations, on income from endowments and on governmental support have been especially vulnerable to the effects of the economic slowdown. They are often the very institutions whose services are in greatest demand during hard times.

The black community has once again been hard hit by unemployment and other aspects of the recession, although the disparity with whites is somewhat smaller than in the past. This time, however, an organization such as the Urban League, which helps ameliorate some of the impact on blacks, has itself been hurt.

Last Jan. 1 staff members of the Urban League voluntarily began to donate 5 per cent of their weekly salaries to a league "survival fund." The money will be put into black-owned banks and held ready for expected emergencies this year.

"It's less on the table at the end of the week, or a hat or a skirt I don't buy," said Beverly Adams of the New Urban League in Boston, where the survival fund idea originated a year ago.

But it really doesn't affect me at all," she added. "I am not losing anything because of my own conception of what this will do for me eventually. People have presented an idea to me here and I want to be part of it. I'm single, but people with families are also giving up the money and I don't think of it as a sacrifice."

Museums, symphony orchestras and other cultural institutions are also hurting.

In Severance Hall, a marble-laden monument to what Cleveland deemed architectural splendor in the nineteen-thirties, a quarter of all seats have been vacant this season at concerts of the Cleveland orchestra. In the past the orchestra rarely played before anything but a sell-out crowd.

"People are not buying season tickets," explained George Karner, business manager of the orchestra. "People are being more selective about their buying and making sure they get the most for their money. They are also buying the less expensive seats."

UNABLE TO CUT COSTS

Although revenues are down, the orchestra could not cut costs. "We can't pinch pennies by getting rid of a second violinist and a tympanist or by reducing the number of concerts," said Kenneth Haas, assistant general manager of the orchestra. "And we can't raise prices because people simply wouldn't pay."

Last spring the orchestra was forced for the first time to conduct a mass fund-raising drive to keep itself in business. Before, donations had been made by a "select list" of wealthy Cleveland residents.

The orchestra's management thought of the drive as an emergency measure. But this year again—and for the foreseeable future—it will have to make a mass appeal for funds if it is to survive, Mr. Haas said. The wealthy few can no longer support the orchestra.

The Experiment in International Living, a nonprofit institution that, among other things, sends groups of American students abroad to live with foreign families and brings foreign students to the United States, is being squeezed from all directions.

Its enrollment of just under 2,000 is almost as high as last year, said Gordon Boyce, president of the organization, but corporate donations are down by two-thirds from 1969, foundation giving is off and the return from portfolio investments is sharply down.

The institution is trying to cope with the recession by furious corner-cutting. Its employees will not be given any big merit pay raises this year. It hopes to save \$5,000 by eliminating free coffee to staff and students at its headquarters in Putney, Vt. It has moved to less elegant, less expensive quarters in New York. Its top executives are giving up their free cars. It is sending 12 students instead of 10 students abroad with each group leader.

EXPENSE ALLOWANCES CUT

"Our trustees told us to cut our budget by \$150,000," Mr. Boyce said. We started by reducing expense allowances to trustees.

He added, however, that the organization might have to cut some service programs that are not self-supporting.

Hospitals, even those like the plush, newly renovated St. Francis Memorial Hospital in San Francisco, are in trouble too.

"It's been hell for six months," said Orville N. Booth, executive vice president and administrator of St. Francis.

It now costs the hospital \$97 a day to provide a room and subsidiary care for a patient. Five years ago it cost about \$65 a day. "Costs, wages and construction have been phenomenal since 1966," Mr. Booth explained. A nurse who made \$425 a month in 1966 now makes \$725 a month.

SLOWDOWN IN MEDICARE

A new problem at St. Francis is the slowdown in Medicare payments from Washington. "We have close to \$150,000 in claims outstanding but nothing is happening," said Mr. Booth. "We feel it is just a slowdown to keep dollars from getting into the system."

Mr. Booth said that the hospital would be able to recover from the short-term impact of the slump even though it now is losing money. Over the long run, however, economic factors will speed the enactment of a national health insurance program, he said. "I only hope," he added, "they do it with sensible controls."

At the Sloan Foundation, one of the nation's wealthiest, 51-million to \$2-million will be trimmed from the \$15-million it usually gives for projects in science, technology, education and other areas each year, according to Mr. Wessell, its president.

"The tragedy is, this comes at a time when recipients' needs are greater than ever," Mr. Wessell said. "If you multiply our experience by all the foundations, the impact would be substantial."

And at the Kingston Presbyterian Church in Kingston, N.J., Christmas carols at holiday services were accompanied last year by a single organist. The year before, the church hired instrumentalists for the holiday, but this year the church is having money problems and had to save the \$200 cost of musicians.

The organ itself was bought in 1968 after the church conducted a \$5,000 fund raising campaign. "Getting \$5,000 then was so easy it was terrifying," recalled the Rev. James L. Mechem, pastor of the church.

FUND CAMPAIGN FALLS SHORT

This year Kingston church tried to raise \$9,000 to paint its white steeple, to buy new fire doors, to pay for needed repairs and to catch up with its rising costs.

But after reaching all 200 families that make up the congregation, only \$3,800 had been raised. Some of those who pledged money had lost their jobs and couldn't meet their pledges. Others in the middle class community simply could not afford to give money this year.

"Our life is going to be a lot simpler," Mr. Mechem said. "We'll have to stick tight with the basic elements of church life and just pinch a little more."

"In a way, this might strengthen the church," he continued. "Whatever our financial problems, we may all find something in the experience of supporting each other in times that could be more pleasant."

Many institutions, like the Kingston church, are getting back to basics and finding that they can do without many of the frills and extras they have been adding bit by bit, year by year. A lot of waste apparently is being scraped out of the American economy, some economists feel, and higher productivity ought to be the result.

A THUMBNAIL FACT SHEET OF WAGE BOARD BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRASCO) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the wage board bill I have introduced today will provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the U.S. Government.

The bill will eliminate discrimination in wages paid to nearly 800,000 loyal Federal blue collar or prevailing rate workers who have suffered gross inequities and unfair treatment for many years.

The bill will provide by statute the first equitable system for adjusting and fixing the pay rates of wage grade employees. There is within every State a large number of wage grade and non-appropriated fund employees who have been discriminated against. One cannot stress too strongly the need for immediate action. The issue has been ignored too long by those who had the power to correct this unjust system.

Prevailing rate employees make up 27 percent of those paid exclusively from appropriated funds. Adding the thousands of employees included in the non-appropriated fund list, the number would be about 800,000.

These patient workers have been loyal to their Federal job stature, but we cannot ask them to be patient any longer. Rankling is the fact that the President vetoed a bill which would have helped these people—vetoed it at the end of the last Congress.

The need is apparent for speedy action on this measure to cope with unfair treatment which has snowballed over the years and has made these loyal Federal workers the stepchildren of the Government service.

This bill, in setting up 10 steps in pay differential, will not only correct the gross inequities of the present three-step system but will establish a range of rates so Federal Wage Board can win comparability with private industry, who now operates successfully under similar rate ranges.

As things now stand, the pay differential for classified white collar workers is about 30 percent; the pay differential of blue collar workers in private industry follows a similar pattern; but the wage board blue collar workers in Federal installations can only increase their rate of pay by 8 percent. How, under existing rules, do you reward these employees, particularly since most of them are in the final step shortly after they begin work?

Supervisors are given the privilege of a five in-grade system now, so they can enjoy continued financial rewards while the workers they supervise are stuck in an inflexible grade system.

This bill will also establish a Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee within the Civil Service Commission with an impartial chairman appointed by the President to insure that the broad interests of both sides are represented and protected.

Five members of the committee will be appointed by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission from labor unions representing the largest number of prevailing rate employees under exclusive recognition in Government service. Management officials, five in number, will be appointed from each of the four executive agencies—other than the Civil Service Commission—and military departments having the largest number of prevailing rate employees and an employee of the Civil Service Commission appointed by its Chairman.

An important feature of the bill is that it would include the provision that the nonappropriated fund workers will re-

ceive the same benefits as the wage grade workers.

This measure is vital to the Federal service. These workers have been more than patient, but their patience is growing thin and they could, should we ignore them, resort to other means to correct a mishmash of antiquated Executive orders and chaotic regulations.

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL HEALTH MANPOWER COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MINISH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation in line with the Carnegie Commission recommendations for obtaining improved medical and dental services.

This bill would establish a National Health Manpower Commission empowered to make a thorough study of health manpower, changing patterns of health care delivery, as well as the effectiveness of Federal health programs, health research and agencies administering these programs.

It is appropriate to point out that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has projected a shortage of 25,000 doctors, 56,000 dentists, 210,000 nurses, and 432,000 allied medical personnel by 1980. Presently, the spread of physicians and allied health personnel is so unevenly distributed that there are many areas critically short of needed health personnel.

The entire concept of health care has undergone drastic changes within the last decade or two, and we have learned much more about preventive health care. We have more geriatric patients who require skillful and attentive treatment if they are to live their full quotient of years. Pediatric and obstetrical care have undergone drastic revision, although facilities and health personnel are not presently available to all who require them. Many women receive little if any prenatal care, with resultant infant mortality or offspring with unnecessary birth defects. Orthodontic and dental care, so frequently needed by young people, are not available to many persons on a regular basis. X-rays and inexpensive cancer-detecting tests have never been taken by many citizens.

The list is too long to enumerate. Yet there is no program or service more basic or more important than health services. Moreover, it is not only the poor, the isolated, or members of minority groups who have difficulty obtaining these services. Given the shortage of doctors and medical personnel, middle-class Americans also suffer from a deprivation of medical services.

However, there are many potential remedies. Expansion of group practice, usage of expanded allied health care personnel and technology, to name only a few, can alleviate the health care crisis. The updating of training curriculum in health areas and more efficient usage of existing manpower are other possibilities.

These and related issues must be dealt with in depth, and not through a cursory study that describes the problem without developing workable solutions. It is my belief that a National Health Manpower Commission can provide sorely needed guidance and direction.

The legislation I have introduced would establish a commission composed of 40 members, who are all Presidential appointees. At least 20 of them would represent consumers of health care within our Nation. The Commission would hold hearings, take testimony and receive appropriate evidence to permit it to properly fulfill its function. The Commission would then submit to the President and the Congress interim reports after its first year of existence, with a final report due before its expiration. This report would contain a detailed statement of findings and conclusions that would establish a broad-based approach to health care. Such an approach, rather than the piecemeal one we now have, would enable us to fully meet the goal of sufficient health care for all.

SPECULATION, FRAUD, AND BANKS—V

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the more one hears about the collapse of the Sharpstown State Bank, the more intriguing the whole mess gets. It is in fact one of those situations that gets "curiouser and curiouser."

First of all came the revelations that the Sharpstown State Bank made incredibly large unsecured loans to some very unlikely people—mostly high officials in Texas. It would be unlikely, to say the least, that all these people chose one little old bank to do their loan business with, and all at the same time, alone and unaided. One gets the feeling that they were sent there. Not that they did anything wrong, but that they got such huge loans on such flimsy collateral.

Next one learns that the fellow who owned the bank also owned the stocks that the big loans bought.

Then one learns that the friend of the fellow who owned the bank and who also owned the companies that the big loans bought then bought this selfsame stock from the State officials—and paid something like \$5 a share over the then going market price.

Then one learns that the State of Texas had very large deposits in the Sharpstown State Bank. But that might not have been so unusual, since it was the second biggest State bank around, and from all accounts at least, the deposits were secured.

And now come the credit unions. It seems that the Sharpstown Bank had many large depositors who were credit unions. One credit union in Massachusetts put something like \$3 million into Sharpstown. It looks as if a large one in Dallas also had a big deposit there. The Government Employees Credit Union of San Antonio had perhaps \$300,000 in Sharpstown.

You might ask why these credit unions had such huge deposits at this out-of-the-way bank.

The reason is that Sharpstown was offering 7½ percent interest on very large deposits. Not bad, but not out of line for the times. Well, now we learn that the bank was sweetening the pot with points on the side. These deposits were placed by brokers, who do not work for free, and who also seem to have been giving their clients a little action in order to attract their funds. The credit unions were not going to Sharpstown because they liked the 7½-percent interest that was advertised. They went because they thought they could get maybe 10 percent for their money.

There is nothing wrong about a bank seeking deposits in an aggressive manner. But it is one thing to compete and another thing to offer side points as an added inducement. The use of such a device is called push money in the retail world. Push money is a little reward that distributors pay to retail sales people who push their particular line. A less polite way of putting it is bribery. Well, the use of side points in the manner of the Sharpstown Bank is no different from employing push money in retail competition. It is wrong, and in the banking business, it can lead to substantial losses.

A bank cannot be operated like a chain letter. Financial pyramids or chain letters collapse when the money stops coming in, or whenever the wind blows cold.

I think that push money is a practice that banks ought to refrain from. To make sure they do, I am proposing legislation to outlaw the practice.

Mr. Speaker, I include two news articles relative to this subject:

SAN ANTONIO CREDIT UNION DOLLARS IN SHARPSTOWN BANK (By James McCrory)

The Government Employees Credit Union, the largest in San Antonio with 35,000 employees, had money in the Sharpstown State Bank when it closed its doors, the San Antonio Express-News learned Friday.

The amount and whether it was in a single certificate of deposit or in several such deposits, was not made known, but it was learned that officers of the credit union have put in their claim with the receivers and are awaiting developments.

A source close to the union said it has been in contact and initiated procedures to protect the union's investment and "to see where we fit in the final liquidation."

It is known that the credit union has more than \$20,000 in one or more certificates of deposit with the defunct bank, because otherwise it would have no worries. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. insures individual amounts up to \$20,000 fully.

Union officials are cheered by a report from John Slocum, chief of the FDIC liquidation division, that depositors would be paid their deposits above \$20,000 at a rate of 90 cents on the dollar after the bank has turned its assets into cash.

Slocum said the bank's inventory of assets included \$17.8 million in cash and easily convertible assets, and \$40.9 million in outstanding loans and discounts. Real property holdings, including the bank building, come to about \$22.9 million.

Officers and representatives of the local union have scheduled a meeting with U.S. Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez Saturday to discuss the situation.

Gonzalez was called on by the union in his capacity as a representative of the dis-

trict and as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

The congressman Wednesday revealed he had been informed that \$2 million to \$3 million in credit union money from Massachusetts had been placed in the Sharpstown bank on high yielding certificates of deposit at the time it closed.

He understood, Gonzalez said, credit union officers in Massachusetts had seen advertisements that the bank was paying 7.5 per cent on large denomination certificates of deposit and he said he would ask committee chairman Wright Patman to investigate the extent of the practice of advertising such rates and of the possible giving of "points" on the side.

What has not been revealed (in the Sharpstown operation), Gonzalez said in reference to the Massachusetts credit union deposits, is that "they were offering 2 points more on that kind of business," leading the unions to believe they would be getting 10 per cent.

Another report circulating in Washington during the week was that a large Dallas credit union had deposited a large amount of funds in Sharpstown.

The local credit union group reports it is taking all the steps necessary to see that the credit union is protected, and it thinks it is in good position at the present time. Union officials are keeping in touch with the receivers of the bank, the State Credit Union Commission, and the State Banking Commission, on developments.

The situation is expected to come up for discussion at the meeting of the government employees group Feb. 25.

GECU CASH IN SHARPSTOWN

Officials of San Antonio's Government Employees Credit Union Saturday said it has investments in the Sharpstown State Bank, as well as in 13 other banks within the state.

Jim R. Williams, president, and Joseph Curella, chairman of the board of directors of the 35,000-member credit union, said that as of Friday the union had assets of \$30,895,329.46 and that over a two and one-half year period, the credit union has made investments in excess of \$10 million in various banks.

"I assure the members of GECU that this credit union is completely solvent and has no liquidity problem," Williams said.

ANNUAL CREDIT

He said the union, chartered by the state to serve federal government personnel and their dependents throughout the San Antonio area, has just satisfactorily completed its annual audit conducted by a local CPA firm.

Williams said that GECU currently has \$2,650,000 invested in certificates of deposit in 14 banks throughout Texas, \$300,000 of which is on deposit in the Sharpstown Bank. The officials noted that it also has \$2.9 million in federal government securities.

"It has been implied in some news stories that banks do not normally pay 7.5 per cent on certificates of deposit. This is not so. For example, the Feb. 5 issue of the Wall Street Journal carries an advertisement from a Houston bank (Main) offering 7.5 per cent on one, two and three year certificates on deposits of \$100,000 or more."

BONUS POINTS

Williams and Curella pointed out that GECU has received some bonus points in addition to the 7.5 per cent on certificates from practically every bank it has dealt with, particularly in the Dallas-Fort Worth and Houston areas.

The officials said there is \$1,091,547.25 in the credit union reserves to cover potential losses on loans and investments. Williams said he has confidence that GECU along with the other 26 credit unions will recover all funds on deposit in the Sharpstown Bank.

He said he bases his feeling on statements made by the state banking commissioner.

Robert E. Stewart, and state credit union commissioner, Bruce Gibson, who have said the Sharpstown Bank has sufficient assets to where all depositors will receive all their money.

90 PERCENT

This is further substantiated by John Slocum, chief of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, liquidating division, who has been quoted in various news stories that depositors will receive at least 90 per cent of the uninsurable deposits, and the credit union has no problem.

"There will be no reduction of dividends since we have a large reserve set aside specifically for this particular purpose," Williams said.

U.S. Rep. Gonzalez, member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, told *The Light*, "There really isn't any danger. Everything indicates it's solvent. There's no question in my mind that the funds are not in danger."

Williams and Curella met with Gonzalez Saturday to provide him with information on the GECU and to give him a clear understanding of the union's current financial standing.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. BINGHAM, for 1 hour, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, for 20 minutes, today.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, for 1 hour, February 17.

Mr. McKEVITT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PELLY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOW, for 30 minutes, today.

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

Mr. MAZZOLI, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. BARRETT, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BRASCO, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MINISH, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MICHEL and to include an editorial.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, in five instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT in three instances.

Mr. GIAIMO to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. CHISHOLM to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. WARE.

Mr. TERRY.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. CRANE in five instances.

Mr. GUE.

Mr. SCHMITZ in four instances.

Mr. WINN.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.

Mr. FORSYTHE.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. PEYSER in 10 instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in four instances.

Mrs. DWYER in five instances.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. WYMAN in four instances.

Mr. SCHWENGLER in three instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. BOB WILSON in four instances.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. DEVINE.

Mr. STAFFORD.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. LLOYD in three instances.

Mr. VEYSEY.

Mr. ROBISON in three instances.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. HASTINGS.

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

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. REES in two instances.

Mr. DELLUMS in five instances.

Mr. HEBERT.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mrs. CHISHOLM.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. CARNEY in three instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. MANN in 10 instances.

Mrs. MINK in three instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. RODINO in four instances.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. FOUNTAIN.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. MONAGAN in six instances.

Mr. RARRICK in five instances.

Mr. McCORMACK in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in five instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER in two instances.

Mr. STEPHENS in two instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. CHAPPELL in three instances.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolu-

tion 135 of the 92d Congress, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on February 17 next.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 135, the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 17, 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:

249. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the cooperation between the Federal Government and the States with respect to environmental regulations for mining operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

250. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

251. A letter from the Director, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assure protection of environmental values while facilitating construction of needed electric power supply facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

252. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish an Environmental Financing Authority to assist in the financing of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

253. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 48 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 76) to increase the maximum compensation allowable to receivers and trustees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas; Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 943. A bill to provide mortgage protection life insurance for service-connected disabled veterans who have received grants for specially adapted housing; (Rept. No. 92-8). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas; Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 460. A bill to amend section 620 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the length of time community nursing home care may be provided at the expense of the United States; (Rept. No. 92-9). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas; Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 481. A bill to provide for the adjustment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, of the legislative jurisdiction over lands belonging to the United States which are under his supervision and control; (Rept. No. 92-10). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS; Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Activity of the In-

terstate and Foreign Commerce, 91st Congress (Rept. No. 92-11). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 4084. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to provide protection thereunder against losses resulting from earthquakes and earthslides; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 4085. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits thereunder, with subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits and a minimum primary benefit of \$100; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 4086. A bill to prohibit the broadcasting of paid advertisements in all cases where broadcasting stations are required to provide free broadcasting time for political campaigns; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. FUQUA, and Mr. CHAPPELL):

H.R. 4087. A bill to require the Council on Environmental Quality to hold public hearings in which all points of view can be expressed prior to any final action or recommendation by such Council to the President; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 4088. A bill to provide for reimbursement of U.S. cities for a portion of expenses incurred in connection with the entertainment of foreign officials to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMÁS:

H.R. 4089. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require that any air carrier proposing to discontinue any air transportation to or from any point named in its certificate must give notice thereof at least 60 days in advance of the proposed discontinuance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4090. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in recognition of the 150th anniversary of Greek independence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 4091. A bill to establish a senior citizens skill and talent utilization program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4092. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4093. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide additional beds and special units in Veterans' Administration hospitals for the care and treatment of veterans afflicted with alcoholism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4094. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits (subject to the existing actuarial reductions) at age 50 whether or not disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mrs. GRASSO,

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WYMAN):

H.R. 4095. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require that any air carrier proposing to discontinue any air transportation to or from any point named in its certificate must give notice thereof at least 60 days in advance of the proposed discontinuance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 4096. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLING, Mr. BRADEMÁS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DOW, and Mr. EDWARDS of California):

H.R. 4097. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORSTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. MORSE):

H.R. 4098. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. RED of New York, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 4099. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BOLAND, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. DIGGS):

H.R. 4100. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCCLOSKEY (for himself, Mr. DRIVAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. KASTENMEIER):

H.R. 4101. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOOR-

HEAD, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 4102. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. YATES, and Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4103. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. REES, Mr. SISK, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, and Mr. ANDERSON of California):

H.R. 4104. 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. DAVIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SISK, Mr. STEELE, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. VANIK, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 4105. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research, educational, and assistance programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DELLENBACK (for himself, Mr. WYATT, Mr. STEELE, Mrs. GRASSO, and Mr. COTTER):

H.R. 4106. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the membership of the House of Representatives to 437 Members; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4107. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to require motor vehicle safety standards relating to the ability of the vehicle to withstand certain collisions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 4108. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs, produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4109. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide additional funds for certain federally assisted law enforcement programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4110. A bill to repeal chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code (relating to firearms), to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, and to restore chapter 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect before its amendment by the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4111. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4112. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his

official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MCCLORY, and Mr. McFALL):

H.R. 4113. A bill to require the Department of Defense to determine disposal dates and methods for disposing of certain military material; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NEZDI, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERNE, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SIKES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. YATES, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 4114. A bill to require the Department of Defense to determine disposal dates and methods for disposing of certain military material; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4115. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. NELSEN, and Mr. HARVEY):

H.R. 4116. A bill to provide more effective means for protecting the public interest in national emergency disputes involving the transportation industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4117. 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. GAYDOS:

H.R. 4118. A bill to assure an opportunity for employment to every American seeking work; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4119. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$650 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4120. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron ore, iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4121. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase OASDI benefits by 25 percent (with a \$100 minimum) and raise the earnings base, with subsequent adjustments as the cost of living rises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BARING, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DUN-

CAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.R. 4122. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research, educational, and assistance programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. GIAIMO (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 4123. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research, educational, and assistance programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS (for herself, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DONOHUE, and Mrs. HANSEN of Washington):

H.R. 4124. A bill to create a national system of health security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. GUDE, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NIX, and Mr. O'NEILL):

H.R. 4125. A bill to amend the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 (Public Law 91-652); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. GUDE, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. POEHL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 4126. A bill to amend the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 (Public Law 91-652); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 4127. A bill for the relief of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4128. A bill to provide for more efficient operation and maintenance of federally supported waste treatment facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4129. A bill to amend section 13 of an act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 4130. A bill to assure opportunity for employment and training to unemployed and underemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON of California):

H.R. 4131. A bill to provide that certain expenses incurred in the construction of a school in Compton, Calif., shall be eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HICKS of Washington:

H.R. 4132. A bill to exempt from the interest equalization tax certain acquisitions made before the enactment of the Interest Equalization Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOGAN (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROY, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 4133. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a national catastrophic illness insurance program under which the Federal Government, acting in cooperation with State insurance authorities and the private insurance industry, will reinsure and otherwise encourage the issuance of private health insurance policies which make adequate health protection available to all Americans at a reasonable cost; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself, Mr. COLMER and Mr. HEBERT):

H.R. 4134. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 to authorize the Federal Government to institute measures for the protection of defense production and of classified information released to industry against acts of subversion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Internal Security.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. RARICK, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. SATERFIELD, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SLACK, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KING, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. GRIFFIN, and Mr. ASHBROOK):

H.R. 4135. A bill to make it a Federal crime to kill or assault a fireman or law enforcement officer engaged in the performance of his duties when the offender travels in interstate commerce or uses any facility of interstate commerce for such purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. PIKE, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. BARING, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ESHELMAN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. RHODES, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. FLOWERS):

H.R. 4136. A bill to make it a Federal crime to kill or assault a fireman or law enforcement officer engaged in the performance of his duties when the offender travels in interstate commerce or uses any facility of interstate commerce for such purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself, Mr. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. HULL, Mr. DORN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. McCULLOCH, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. HALEY, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 4137. A bill to make it a Federal crime to kill or assault a fireman or law enforcement officer engaged in the performance of his duties when the offender travels in interstate commerce or uses any facility of interstate commerce for such purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH (for himself and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 4138. A bill to terminate the Airlines Mutual Aid Agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:
H.R. 4139. A bill to amend title II of the

Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, with a minimum primary benefit of \$110 and subsequent cost-of-living increases, and to raise the amount individuals may earn without suffering loss of benefits; to amend title XVIII of such act to make health insurance benefits available without regard to age to all individuals receiving cash benefits based on disability, and to provide coverage for qualified drugs under part B of such title; to raise the contribution and benefit base; and to authorize appropriations to finance the cost of these changes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 4140. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, relating to law enforcement assistance, to encourage the States and units of local government to provide civil service coverage for all law enforcement personnel other than elected officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4141. A bill to create a national system of health security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINK:

H.R. 4142. A bill to increase the authorization for the appropriation of funds to complete the International Peace Garden, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4143. A bill to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to provide that all passenger train discontinuances must be in accordance with the provisions of section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 4144. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that an abortion in facilities of the uniformed services may be performed only in accordance with the requirements of the law of the State in which the abortion is performed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 4145. A bill to establish the National Health Manpower Commission to study and report recommendations with respect to health care delivery, allied health manpower, and Federal health assistance and research programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4146. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4147. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish and carry out a bottled drinking water control program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN (for himself and Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. SKES, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. LEGGETT):

H.R. 4148. A bill to establish a temporary Emergency Guidance Board to facilitate economic recovery with minimum inflation by establishing price and wage guidelines and encouraging voluntary adherence thereto; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MINISH, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FRASER, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MANN, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 4149. A bill Conquest of Cancer Act;

to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 4150. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require that any air carrier proposing to discontinue any air transportation to or from any point named in its certificate must give notice thereof at least 60 days in advance of the proposed discontinuance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4151. A bill to establish a National College of Ecological and Environmental Studies; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. POAGE (for himself and Mr. BELCHER) (by request):

H.R. 4152. A bill to protect the public health and welfare and the environment through improved regulation of pesticides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 4153. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 4154. A bill to amend the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, to provide grants and loans for persons who have buildings or structures registered in the National Register in order to preserve such historic properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 4155. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to substantially increase Federal assistance to schools in the health professions for the construction, operation, improvement, and expansion of their facilities, to make available increased financial assistance to students, to provide incentives to expand training capacity, and to encourage the establishment of additional schools in health manpower shortage areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4156. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to continue and broaden eligibility of schools of nursing for financial assistance, to improve the quality of such schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 4157. A bill to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4158. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 4159. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide grants to States for the establishment, equipping, and operation of emergency communications centers to make the national emergency telephone number 911 available throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself and Mr. MIKVA):

H.R. 4160. 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. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 4161. A bill to equalize the retired pay

of members of the uniformed services of equal grade and years of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4162. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4163. A bill to provide Federal assistance for special projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to provide emergency care for heart attack victims by trained persons in specially equipped ambulances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4164. A bill to make it a Federal crime to kill or assault a fireman or law enforcement officer engaged in the performance of his duties when the offender travels in interstate commerce or uses any facility of interstate commerce for such purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4165. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4166. A bill to establish annual import quotas on certain textile and footwear articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4167. 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.

H.R. 4168. 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. SNYDER:

H.R. 4169. A bill to provide a penalty for unlawful assault upon policemen, firemen, and other law enforcement personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 4170. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase and expand the national resources for the education of doctors of medicine and osteopathy; and to promote the role of academic medical centers in improving the delivery of health services and medical care; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4171. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to expand and improve our Nation's resources for the training of physicians, dentists, optometrists, pharmacists, podiatrists, veterinarians, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4172. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 10-percent increase in annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4173. A bill to amend the extended benefit provisions of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to provide for such benefits in periods of continued high unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 4174. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act to allow an option in the adoption of advanced time in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 4175. A bill to repeal the act of January 11, 1971, amending the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself and Mr. BARRETT):

H.R. 4176. A bill to assist in meeting the housing goals of the American people by creating the Home Owners Mortgage Loan Cor-

poration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 4177. A bill to require the inspection of certain towing vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4178. A bill to provide for the licensing of personnel on certain vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4179. A bill to modify the flood protection project at St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 4180. A bill to compensate certain growers, manufacturers, packers, and distributors for damages sustained by them as a result of their good faith reliance on the official listing of cyclamates as generally recognized as safe for use in food prior to the unexpected action taken by the United States restricting their future use in foods and drinks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 4181. A bill relating to the recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 4182. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States and their political subdivisions for real property taxes not collected on certain real property owned by foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4183. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 3, United States Code, to provide for the protection of foreign diplomatic missions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 4184. A bill to amend title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require that programs and projects assisted thereunder be for the benefit of children from low-income families; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4185. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Gateway National Recreation Area in the States of New York and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 4186. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. GERALD, R. FORD, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. RHODES, Mr. POFF, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BELL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOW, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. CLANCY):

H.R. 4187. A bill to restore balance in the federal system of government in the United States; to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ERLNBORN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRENZEL,

Mr. FREY, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. GROVER):

H.R. 4188. A bill to restore balance in the federal system of government in the United States; to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANSEN of IDAHO, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KING, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. KYL, Mr. LATA, Mr. LENT, Mr. LUJAN, and Mr. McCLOBY):

H.R. 4189. A bill to restore balance in the federal system of government in the United States; to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McCLORE, Mr. McCOLLISTER, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. McKEVITT, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MATHIAS, of California, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. PELLY, and Mr. PEYSER):

H.R. 4190. A bill to restore balance in the federal system of government in the United States; to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. POWELL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ROBINSON of New York, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. RUTH, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona; and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 4191. A bill to restore balance in the federal system of government in the United States; to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. THONE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WARE, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WINN, Mr. WYATT, Mr.

WYDLER, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. ZION):

H.R. 4192. A bill to restore balance in the federal system of government in the United States; to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. BROTZMAN, and Mr. DONOHUE):

H.R. 4193. A bill to restore balance in the federal system of government in the United States; to provide both the flexibility and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 4194. A bill to limit the authority of the President of the United States to intervene abroad or to make war without the express consent of the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4195. A bill to make requirements with respect to the disclosure of marital status the same for men and women in matters relating to voting qualifications in Federal elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4196. A bill to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4197. A bill to provide for the designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Jackson, Miss., as the "Medgar Evers Memorial Veterans Hospital"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide deduction from gross income for additional commuting expenses of handicapped persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 4199. 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. BRASCO:

H.R. 4200. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 4201. A bill to establish the Big Thicket National Park in Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 4202. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to prohibit the induction of any person if any of certain relatives of such person dies, is captured, is missing in action, or is totally disabled as a result of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4203. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co. for inclusion in the Independence National Historical park, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas:

H.R. 4204. 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.

H.R. 4205. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for expenses paid by him for the education of any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4206. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount allowed as a child-care deduction, and to eliminate the income ceiling on eligibility for such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4207. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4208. A bill to permit State agreements for coverage under the hospital insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4209. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4210. 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. CORDOVA (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. CAMP, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ULLMAN, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 4211. A bill to provide that the social security benefits provided by the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 for certain uninsured individuals at age 72 shall apply in the case of residents of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 4212. A bill to end discrimination in the availability of Federal crop insurance and to authorize the appropriation of additional funds for the administration of the Federal crop insurance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4213. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by adding a new title, which restores to local school boards their constitutional power to administer the public schools committed to their charge, confers on parents the right to choose the public schools their children attend, secures to children the right to attend the public schools chosen by their parents, and makes effective the right of public school administrators and teachers to serve in the schools in which they contract to serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4214. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,680 to \$2,500 (or \$3,600 in the case of a widow with minor children) the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CHAIMO, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FREY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. McDONALD

of Michigan, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MIKVA, and MOSHER):

H.R. 4215. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research, educational, and assistance programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DOWNING (for himself, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SATERFIELD, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. POFF, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WAMPLER, and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia):

H.R. 4216. A bill to remove the present \$1 million limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling and paying the claim of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge and Tunnel District arising out of the collision of the U.S.S. *Yancey* with the bridge-tunnel span; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. McCLOREY):

H.R. 4217. A bill to prohibit the discharge into any of the navigable waters of the United States or into international waters of any military material or other refuse without a certification by the Environmental Protection Agency approving such discharge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SKES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 4218. A bill to prohibit the discharge into any of the navigable waters of the United States or into international waters of any military material or other refuse without a certification by the Environmental Protection Agency approving such discharge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 4219. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BELL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mrs. GRASSO):

H.R. 4220. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to protect, manage, and control free-roaming horses and burros on public lands; to the Commission on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KEITH, Mr.

KOCH, Mr. LENT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. RONCALIO):

H.R. 4221. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to protect, manage, and control free-roaming horses and burros on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STEELE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 4222. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to protect, manage, and control free-roaming horses and burros on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4223. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize advance educational assistance allowance payments to eligible veterans at the beginning of any school year to assist such veterans in meeting educational and living expenses during the first 2 months of school, to establish a veterans' work-study program through cancellation of such advance payment repayment obligations under certain circumstances and to provide for direct payment of educational assistance allowance to educational institutions on an optional basis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself and Mr. McCLOREY):

H.R. 4224. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands in Idaho," approved May 31, 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZEK, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. RIEGLE, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. CELLER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. CHAIMO):

H.R. 4225. A bill to amend the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 (Public Law 91-652); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 4226. A bill to authorize the establishment of an older worker community service program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4227. A bill to amend the provisions of law providing compensation for work injuries suffered by Federal employees with respect to the entitlement of firefighters in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4228. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 4229. A bill to provide a program to improve the opportunity of students in elementary and secondary schools to study cultural heritages of the major ethnic groups in the Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4230. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4231. A bill to improve and increase postsecondary educational opportunities

throughout the Nation by providing assistance to the States for the development and construction of comprehensive community colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4232. A bill to provide compensation for totally disabled local firemen or survivors of local firemen killed or disabled while performing their duties in an area of civil disorder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4233. A bill to require the establishment of marine sanctuaries and to prohibit the depositing of any harmful materials therein; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4234. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANDGREBE (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 4235. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part of imported meat be labeled "imported" at all stages of distribution until delivery to the ultimate consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 4236. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 to extend black lung benefits of orphans whose fathers die of pneumoconiosis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. REUSS, and Mr. RIEGLE):

H.R. 4237. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps and to provide that no citizen of the United States shall be committed for detention or imprisonment in any facility of the U.S. Government except in conformity with the provisions of title 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. ABUREZK, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. POURCEL, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. STOKES, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WYATT, Mr. YATES, and Mr. ZABLOCKI):

H.R. 4238. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps and to provide that no citizen of the United States shall be committed for detention or imprisonment in any facility of the U.S. Government except in conformity with the provisions of title 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DENT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VIGORITO, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 4239. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps and to provide that no citizen of the United States shall be committed for detention or imprisonment in any facility of the U.S. Government except

in conformity with the provisions of title 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CELLER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MINNISH, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 4240. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps and to provide that no citizen of the United States shall be committed for detention or imprisonment in any facility of the U.S. Government except in conformity with the provisions of title 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. REES, Mr. SISK, Mr. TEAGUE of California, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 4241. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps and to provide that no citizen of the United States shall be committed for detention or imprisonment in any facility of the U.S. Government except in conformity with the provisions of title 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 4242. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain benefits in connection with second-class mail rates to publications issued by State departments of agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 4243. A bill to reestablish congressional responsibility in the determination of foreign military commitments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. CLARK, Mr. FISH, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DENT, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. ADDABBO, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. STEELE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. FLOOD, and Mr. O'HARA):

H.R. 4244. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to include qualified drugs, requiring a physician's prescription or certification and approved by a formulary committee, among the items and services covered under the hospital insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. ROE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. PODELL, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ANDERSON of California, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 4245. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to include qualified drugs, requiring a physician's prescription or certification and approved by a formulary committee, among the items and services covered under the hospital insurance

program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. REUSS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MINISH, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. REES, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. KOCH, Mr. COTTER, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 4246. A bill to extend until March 31, 1973, certain provisions of law relating to interest rates, mortgage credit controls, and cost-of-living stabilization; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 4247. A bill to regulate the dumping of material in the oceans, coastal, and other waters and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 4248. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent across-the-board benefit increase with subsequent cost-of-living increases, to raise the earnings base, to liberalize the retirement test, to increase widows' and widowers' benefits, to improve benefit computation, to increase the lump-sum death payment, to provide benefits for additional disabled children and dependent parents of insured individuals, and to liberalize qualification for disability benefits; to provide Medicare benefits for all individuals receiving such benefits based on disability; to provide benefits for dependent brothers and sisters of retired, disabled, or deceased insured individuals; and to provide \$5,000 income tax exemption for individuals 65 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4249. A bill to establish the Hells Canyon-Snake National River in the States of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4250. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to establish standards of conduct for certain employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, to provide guidelines with respect to arrangements between Veterans' Administration health facilities and affiliated institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4251. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide improved medical care to veterans; to provide hospital and medical care to certain dependents and survivors of veterans; to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4252. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the amount of annual and sick leave which physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery may accrue and accumulate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4253. A bill to provide for the better utilization of scarce medical personnel within, and to improve the efficiency of, the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4254. A bill to provide for the orderly expansion of trade in manufactured products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4255. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron ore, iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4256. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHMITZ (for himself, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DENT, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. LENNON, Mr. RARICK,

Mr. ROUSSELOT, and Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia):

H.R. 4257. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that an abortion in facilities of the uniformed services may be performed only in accordance with the requirements of the law of the State in which the abortion is performed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 4258. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide an additional source of financing for the rural telephone program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself and Mr. REUSS):

H.R. 4259. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus personal property to State fish and wildlife agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Wisconsin, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. ZION, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. FISHER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SLACK, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. HALEY, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. LATTI, Mr. DORN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. RARICK, and Mr. DICKINSON):

H.R. 4260. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BRAY, Mr. STEED, Mr. BARING, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. SCHMITZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. POWELL, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. ESHLEMAN, and Mr. EVANS of Colorado):

H.R. 4261. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. FISH, Mr. WATTS, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and Mr. RONCALIO):

H.R. 4262. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4263. A bill to add California-grown peaches as a commodity eligible for any form of promotion, including paid advertising, under a marketing order; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. MATHIAS of California):

H.R. 4264. A bill to provide for the payment of losses incurred by growers, manufacturers, packers, and distributors as a result of the barring of the use of cyclamates in food after extensive inventories of foods containing such substances had been prepared or packed or packaging, labeling and other materials had been prepared in good faith reliance on the confirmed official listing of cyclamates as generally recognized

as safe for use in food under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. VIGORITO, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 4265. A bill to provide for the payment of losses incurred by growers, manufacturers, packers, and distributors as a result of the barring of the use of cyclamates in food after extensive inventories of foods containing such substances had been prepared or packed or packaging, labeling and other materials has been prepared in good faith reliance on the confirmed official listing of cyclamates as generally recognized as safe for use in food under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 4266. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT (for himself and Mr. SISK):

H.R. 4267. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a uniform system for the application of sales and use taxes to interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROOKS, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 4268. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, with a minimum primary benefit of \$100, and to increase to \$2,400 a year the amount of outside earnings a beneficiary may have without loss of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. SIKES, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 4269. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, with a minimum primary benefit of \$100, and to increase to \$2,400 a year the amount of outside earnings a beneficiary may have without loss of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOSS, Mr. REES, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 4270. A bill to designate the San Joaquin Wilderness, Sierra National Forest, and Inyo National Forest in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEGS, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSHER,

Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON):

H.R. 4271. A bill, Newsmen's Privilege Act of 1971; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself, Mr. Mr. STOKES, Mr. THONE, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 4272. A bill, Newsmen's Privilege Act of 1971; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 4273. 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. WINN:

H.R. 4274. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, to exclude from coverage by the act every household which has a member who is on strike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 4275. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional civil service retirement and sick leave benefits for air traffic controllers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 4276. A bill to establish annual import quotas on certain textile and footwear articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN (for himself and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H.R. 4277. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Fort Constitution National Historic Site in New Hampshire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.J. Res. 322. 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. BINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 323. 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. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. KEITH, Mr. STAFFORD, and Mr. STEELE):

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.J. Res. 325. 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. McCLOSKEY (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. WHALEN):

H.J. Res. 326. Joint resolution designating of third week of April of each year as Earth Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINNEY (for himself and Mr. STEELE):

H.J. Res. 327. 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. MORGAN:

H.J. Res. 328. 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. MOSS:

H.J. Res. 329. Joint resolution authorizing

the President to proclaim the period February 6 through February 12, 1972, as "Active 20-30 Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.J. Res. 330. Joint resolution authorizing the President to declare the 3d calendar week in September of each year as "National Cystic Fibrosis Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.J. Res. 331. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.J. Res. 332. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the fourth Sunday in November in each year as "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.J. Res. 333. 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. BINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution proposing a multilateral treaty to bar all military installations on the seabed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mr. LENNON):

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the pollution of waters all over the world and the necessity for coordinated international action to prevent such pollution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MANN, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SIKES, Mr. RHODES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. WALDIE):

H. Con. Res. 147. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the pollution of waters all over the world and the necessity for coordinated international action to prevent such pollution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. YATRON, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. YATES):

H. Con. Res. 148. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the pollution of waters all over the world and the necessity for coordinated international action to prevent such pollution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. BYRON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. STEELE, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HALEY, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. GRAY, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. BRAY, Mr. WINN, Mr. GIAIMO, and Mr. MADDEN):

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in opposi-

tion to the closing of Public Health Service hospitals and clinics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself, Mr. HEBERT, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. RABICK, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. STEED, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. NIX, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. KYROS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. McMILLAN):

H. Con. Res. 150. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in opposition to the closing of Public Health Service hospitals and clinics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL (for himself, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. KEITH, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. TIERNAN, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. HUNGATE, and Mr. MINISH):

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in opposition to the closing of Public Health Service hospitals and clinics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNING (for himself, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. DORN, Mr. MANN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. LENNON, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SIKES, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HAGAN, and Mr. GETTYS):

H. Con. Res. 152. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in opposition to the closing of Public Health Service hospitals and clinics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. CELLER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. PODELL, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. RODINO, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in opposition to the closing of Public Health Service hospitals and clinics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. CABELL, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. WHITE, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. FREYER of North Carolina, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. ROBERTS):

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in opposition to the closing of Public Health Service hospitals and clinics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY (for himself, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. WYATT, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VANIK, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. NEDZI,

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. KARTH, Mr. FRASER, Mr. MONAGAN, and Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania):

H. Con. Res. 155. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in opposition to the closing of Public Health Service hospitals and clinics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAILLIARD (for himself, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. MOSS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. BURTON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. McFALL, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. REES, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mrs. MINK, Mr. CULVER, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, and Mr. RONCALIO):

H. Con. Res. 156. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in opposition to the closing of Public Health Service hospitals and clinics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. Con. Res. 157. Concurrent resolution to provide \$100,000,000 annually for cancer research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DELLENBACK (for himself, Mr. WYATT, Mr. STEELE, and Mr. ULLMAN):

H. Res. 220. Resolution directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to study revisions in the apportionment formula needed to accurately reflect population growth and changing patterns of population; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H. Res. 221. Resolution establishing the Select Committee on Privacy, Human Values, and Democratic Institutions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FREY, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KEMP, Mr. McCLORY, and Mr. MATHIS of Georgia):

H. Res. 222. Resolution to provide for free Federal telecommunications system service to patients in veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. MINISH, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SISK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. LINK):

H. Res. 223. Resolution to provide free Federal telecommunications system service to patients in veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 224. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H. Res. 225. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies by the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 226. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 114; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. Res. 227. Resolution providing for the copying and distribution by the U.S. Capitol Historical Society of the film of the ceremonies and reenactment of the 100th anniversary of the Second Inauguration of President Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4278. A bill for the relief of Hom Wai Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4279. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Stavrakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 4280. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Buonincontro and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4281. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe and Angiolina Grifoni Ciprietti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4282. A bill for the relief of Emilio Garcio-Sumayod; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4283. A bill for the relief of Marianna Marino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4284. A bill for the relief of Maria Martinangelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4285. A bill for the relief of Antonio and Concetta Mattalano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4286. A bill for the relief of Nunzia Platina to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 4287. A bill for the relief of Angel Aguilus and his wife, Lydia Solomon Aguilus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 4288. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Lo Duca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4289. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Pickering to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 4290. A bill for the relief of Ramesh Lilaram Daswani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 4291. A bill for the relief of Girolamo Asaro, Francesca Asaro, and Maria Antonina Asaro to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4292. A bill for the relief of Margarita Badolamenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4293. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Fontana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4294. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Rugeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4295. A bill for the relief of Calvin Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4296. A bill for the relief of Barbara Sears Carroll (nee Barbara Sears); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4297. A bill for the relief of Maria E. Egea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4298. A bill for the relief of Mr. Elias Adib Elias, and his wife, Ruth S. Elias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 4299. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ciancio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4300. A bill to provide for the free entry of one electron spin resonance spectrometer for the use of the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 4301. A bill for the relief of Jose Antonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4302. A bill for the relief of Andria Davies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4303. A bill for the relief of the estate of Patrick H. Harrington, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4304. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4305. A bill for the relief of Raymond P. Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4306. A bill for the relief of Florinda Soares Rebelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4307. A bill for the relief of Alexandrinha de Medeiros Saprano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKINNEY:

H.R. 4308. A bill for the relief of William J. Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 4309. A bill for the relief of Miss Leticia Criman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4310. A bill for the relief of Charles Colbath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4311. A bill for the relief of Santo Sapienza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 4312. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Malowicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 4313. A bill for the relief of Ida Kunstmann, Waldemar F. Kunstmann, and Annellese E. Kunstmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 4314. A bill for the relief of Guiseppa Grasso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4315. A bill for the relief of Maria Scire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 4316. A bill for the relief of Timothy L. Ancrum (also known as Timmie Rogers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4317. A bill for the relief of Peter Goldson, his wife, Merva Hedy Goldson, and child, Brian Goldson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4318. A bill for the relief of Mary Lou Joseph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 4319. A bill for the relief of Josephine Dumpt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 4320. A bill for the relief of Lydia Bernardez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4321. A bill for the relief of Jane V. R. Bryant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4322. A bill for the relief of Antonino Greco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4323. A bill for the relief of Josephine P. Hynes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4324. A bill for the relief of Victoria Louise Soberanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4325. A bill for the relief of Arpi L. Vartian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4326. A bill for the relief of Christoline A. Ysaguirre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 4327. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Stevenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 158. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in respect to the act of Mary Perkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

13. By the SPEAKER: Memorial from a special aide to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; relative to an amendment to the constitution of the Commonwealth granting the right to vote to all persons over 18 years of age; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

14. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to Federal-State revenue sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

15. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, relative to the restoration of funds for the Hanford diversification project in Washington; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

24. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Common Council, Buffalo, N.Y., relative to declaring January 15 a national holiday in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

25. Also, petition of Orville L. Cain, Grass Valley, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

26. Also, petition of Milton Mayer, Newark, N.J., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

27. Also, petition of the Council of the City of New York, N.Y., relative to income tax deductions for child care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—Wednesday, February 10, 1971

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 26, 1971)

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of grace and God of glory, we pray for all those to whom Thou hast committed the Government of this Nation. Grant to them at this time special gifts of understanding and wisdom, of counsel and strength, that being devoted to what is right and just, they may de-

vised such legislation as will be for the welfare of this Nation and the peace of the world.

O Thou protector of the traveler, we thank Thee for the safe return of voyagers in space and for the advancement