

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 23, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Rev. Chester E. Swor, director, Christian Life Crusade, Jackson, Miss., offered the following prayer:

If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.—James 1: 5.

Let us pray.

Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the gift of minds with which to reason. May we enlink our finite minds today to Thy infinite wisdom, that we may think unerringly.

We thank Thee for souls, out of which conscience speaks to guide us. Permeate us with Thy righteousness, that we may decide honestly.

We thank Thee for the endowment of willpower to act as wisdom and righteousness have taught.

May we today lift up our eyes to the hills from which cometh divine help, and to act so that the destiny of our beloved Nation may stand on the solid rock of wisdom, and not on the shifting sands of expediency. Bless our President, our Congress, our Nation.

We pray humbly, urgently. 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.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ELIMINATE SENSELESS SLAUGHTER OF BABY SEALS AND OTHER OCEAN MAMMALS

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

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with Senator FRED HARRIS and several of our House colleagues in introducing a bill today to eliminate the senseless slaughter of baby seals and other ocean mammals.

What we are concerned with today is not merely a conservation act to stop the brutality perpetrated on our ocean's mammals. Rather in a larger sense, what we are doing is to initiate within the councils of our own Government, and hopefully throughout the world, a halt to the spiral of brutality which is too much within us all throughout the world today. A former U.S. Senator once so aptly said:

We are dealing with more than the mere brutalization of animals; we are dealing with the brutalization of peoples who allow the perpetration of these acts.

Not long ago, I received a letter from a 6-year-old constituent soliciting my help in the movement we are beginning on Capitol Hill today. In words so simple they cut right to the substance, he begged:

Please be kind to the seals and don't let them kill anymore.

Today we begin the effort to translate the wisdom of that 6-year-old boy into legislative action.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO INTEREST RATES AND COST-OF-LIVING STABILIZATION

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time in order to explain the unanimous-consent request which I shall make at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, H.R. 4246 passed the House by a vote of 381 yeas to 19 nays on March 10, 1971. This bill extended regulation Q authority to March 31, 1973, and the discretionary authority for the President to impose wage-price controls until March 31, 1973. Authority under the regulation Q provisions of law expired effective midnight March 21, 1971, and authority under the discretionary wage-price controls expire, if H.R. 4246 is not enacted on March 31, 1971.

H.R. 4246 passed the House on March 10 and was referred to the other body.

In order to prevent any hiatus before final enactment into law of H.R. 4246, the Senate, on March 2, passed and sent to the House Senate Joint Resolution 55 which, if enacted, would provide a temporary extension of regulation Q and discretionary wage-price controls until June 1, 1971. This Senate joint resolution was authored by the chairman and ranking majority member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. PROXMIER, and the ranking and second ranking minority members of the committee, Mr. Tower and Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. Speaker, this temporary extending resolution should be enacted if for no other reason in this instance, the financial community would like to see regulation Q authority extended so that any possibility of chaos ensuing from a temporary cease of authority would be avoided.

This resolution provides for no new laws which have not been previously considered by the Congress. It merely will bridge the gap between the cutoff period of March 21, for regulation Q control and March 31 for discretionary wage-price authority.

The basic legislation of H.R. 4246 was fully endorsed by the administration and I see no reason why this temporary resolution should not be adopted.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO INTEREST RATES AND COST-OF-LIVING STABILIZATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consid-

eration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 55) to provide a temporary extension of certain provisions of law relating to interest rates and cost-of-living stabilization.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall object—I am not at all impressed by the gentleman's latest horror and chaos story.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

WEEK OF CONCERN FOR POW'S

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

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the heart of our Nation beats with sympathy for our nearly 1,600 American servicemen held captive or missing in Southeast Asia. This week of national concern serves as a reminder of their sacrifices and commits us to their continuing support.

During these past years and increasingly in recent months our concern has mounted over the plight of these men. We are very proud of their conduct and their faithful adherence to the high standards set forth in the U.S. Code of Conduct. The great fortitude our men have displayed, while enduring the unspeakable mental and physical hardships of captivity, is in keeping with the highest traditions of our armed services and our country. They deserve our prayers and support.

The attention of all Americans centers on these men as we join together in prayer that they will soon be returned to their families and loved ones. We seek to give visible evidence of this country's determination to gain their freedom. Our dedication should be manifested by continuous pressures for their release through every possible channel. The first step is to press the North Vietnamese to provide all POW's the humane treatment required under the rules of the Geneva Convention. We must serve notice on Hanoi that we are united in our determination to secure their release. Our country is committed to this objective.

WESTERN UNION SERVICE: BAD AND GETTING WORSE

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last June 25, I made a statement in the RECORD under the title, "Western Union Service to Congress Lags." The point was that information which I needed on legislation that was pending on the floor of the House did not reach me in time, despite the fact that a telegram had been sent in plenty of time.

Western Union sent a representative to investigate, and in a few days I received

an apology. This was coupled with the statement that things would surely get better.

Last week, as well as many times since last June, there was yet another example that Western Union service has not only failed to provide the swift delivery of messages which they advertise, they have gotten worse. The vote on the SST came late in the afternoon of March 18. The next morning I received a telegram seeking my support for the SST from a constituent. This telegram had been slipped through the mail chute in my office sometime during the night of the 18th.

However, Mr. Speaker, this telegram was sent from Seattle at 10:30 that morning and was stamped as received here in Washington, D.C., at 3:50 p.m. To me this is not only a poor service to us here in the Congress, it is deplorable that the person paying the money to send the message with the thought that it will swiftly reach the person for whom it is intended should be so deceived.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think senders of telegrams should receive their money back when their messages are delayed for such a long period of time.

TRANSIT REVOLUTION

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the January issue of *Railway Age* magazine terms 1971 the year of the transit revolution. The reasons for this heralding of a new era are listed as: a new Federal monetary commitment to mass transit, construction of the world's most modern urban rail system in San Francisco, a Federal executive administration within the Department of Transportation dedicated solely to mass transit, and the new Metro system underway in Washington.

If the President's special revenue-sharing fund for transportation is adopted, 1971 could become year one of the transportation revolution and I support revenue sharing in theory.

Many think of transportation revenue sharing as aid for urban mass transit systems. I hope it is more than that. State and local governments should be strengthened. Local communities should decide how to spend the Federal tax dollar. Transportation systems should be developed according to need. And the principal responsibilities for decisionmaking should return to our State capitals.

The transportation needs and public attitudes differ in each one throughout the country. In our cities people are protesting highway construction. In the suburbs citizens are urging more road construction. These diverse attitudes and needs cannot be accurately gaged and satisfied by isolated Washington planners.

I support the President's revenue-sharing legislation and I urge this Congress to act favorably upon it.

CONFIRMATION OF NEW SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE CHAIRMAN

(Mr. GROVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of comity Members of the House of Representatives observe with restraint the other body's exercise of its parliamentary and substantive responsibilities.

With that in mind I will not comment on the hearings conducted in connection with action on the confirmation of a new chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I do wish, however, for my colleagues to know the outstanding qualities and talents of the gentleman under consideration, Mr. William Casey, of New York.

Mr. Casey is personally known to me, and to all who know him, to be a person of the highest integrity—one whose life story is in the exciting tradition of a Horatio Alger, eminently successfully in business, deeply dedicated to his fellow man in his philanthropy and community work and one with a record of devoted service to his country.

In his return to Government service Mr. Casey brings this brilliant record, broad experience, and keen mind from the private sector to the public sector at great sacrifice and financial loss to himself. Those who know the great man, Bill Casey, trust his confirmation will be expeditious and unanimous.

PRISONER-OF-WAR HEARINGS

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, this morning a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs had some hearings on the prisoners-of-war issue. The first witness was Colonel Oberly who was a prisoner in North Vietnam. I wish every Member of the House could have heard his testimony.

I asked the colonel these questions:

"Is it not true that in 1968 the North Vietnamese said that if the bombing were stopped, they would talk about the prisoner-of-war issue?"

He said, "It was."

I said, "Have they?"

Of course, his answer was, "No."

I said, "Well, now they are saying if we withdraw our troops and set a date that they will talk of the prisoner-of-war issue. Do you believe they will?"

Again, of course, his answer was, "No."

I do not believe everything that this administration or any administration says, but I believe a lot more what Mr. Nixon says than I do what Hanoi says.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE INVESTIGATION AND STUDY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 20

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-45) on the resolution (H. Res. 149) to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 20, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 149

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1971, the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by H. Res. 20 of the Ninety-second Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$150,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all meetings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

Sec. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Sec. 4. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the *Record*.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: On page 1, line 6, immediately following "experts," insert "consultants."

On page 1, line 10, add the following new sentence: Not to exceed \$13,000 of the amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-46) on the resolution (H. Res. 175) to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 175

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1971, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 161 of

the Ninety-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$350,000 including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or by subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD. All of these reports were filed on March 17 and have been available for review since that date.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: On page 1, line 7, immediately before the last comma insert "and consultants".

On page 1, line 13, immediately after the period, insert the following:

"Not to exceed \$20,000 of the total amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the committee amendments?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey if all of the committee amendments for all of these resolutions for the committee work of the House are in conformance with the new Legislative Reorganization Act for the House of 1970?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I say to the gentleman from Missouri that the answer is in the affirmative, "Yes."

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-47) on the resolution (H. Res. 202), to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Armed Services pursuant to House Resolution 201, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 202

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1971, the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 201, by the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$300,000, including expenditures for the employment of special counsel, consultants, investigators, attorneys, experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. Of such amount, not to exceed \$25,000 shall be available for the employment of consultants and consulting organizations; but nothing in this sentence shall be deemed to prohibit the expenditure of all or part of such \$25,000 to cover any other expenses for which payment may be made under this resolution.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, immediately below line 6 add the following new sections:

"SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House; and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

"SEC. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration in accordance with existing law."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee

on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-48) on the resolution (H. Res. 210) providing funds for the Committee on Rules, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 210

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1971, in carrying out its duties during the Ninety-second Congress, the Committee on Rules is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of \$5,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and approved by such committee, and signed by the chairman thereof.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, immediately below line 7, add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration in accordance with existing law."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 218

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-49) on the resolution (H. Res. 218) to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 218.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1971, the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 21, by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$266,500 including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, individual consultants, or organizations thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. However, not to exceed \$10,000 of the amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement

of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

With the following committee amendment:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 5, strike out "\$266,500" and insert "\$291,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-50) on the resolution (H. Res. 225) providing funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 225

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1971, the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$75,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, individual consultants or organizations thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. However, not to exceed \$75,000 of the amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask

unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF STUDIES, INVESTIGATIONS, AND INQUIRIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 114

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-51) on the resolution (H. Res. 226) providing funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 114.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 226

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1971, the expenses of conducting the investigations and studies to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 114, Ninety-second Congress, by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$975,000 for the first session of the Ninety-second Congress, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of investigators, attorneys, individual consultants or organizations thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. However, not to exceed \$20,000 of the amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I will not object—I would like to say at this point that the committee has done a very good job. Comparing the operations of this committee of the House with the operations of the committee of the other body, it is very favorable.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Accounts, on which I serve as a member of the House Administration Committee, conducts searching studies into activities

of the committees which come before us in support of their investigative funding resolutions.

Our purpose is to evaluate the requests in terms of the duties of these committees under their legislative, oversight, and related responsibilities, to be assured they have the resources to perform adequately and effectively. Special effort is made in each instance to obtain assurances from the minority membership of the various committees that they have the staff to participate fully and adequately in their committee activities.

Saving money is of course always an overriding concern, but we also approach the task from the point of view that committees should have the means to do their jobs properly and efficiently. Providing adequate funding brings returns to the House in the form of having the committees equipped to do a better job for the taxpayers of the Nation, in providing good government responsive to the peoples' needs and wishes.

Beyond this, Members of the House will find it of interest to evaluate these resolutions in terms of how they compare with funding provided for committees in the other body. There are 14 resolutions before the House today to provide funding for standing House committees. The funding provided in these measures total just over \$6 million and there are a few resolutions for standing committees yet to come which are expected to total about a million and a half more.

By comparison, the other body has approved resolutions totaling over \$10 million for the Senate standing committees that have requested funding. Broken down as to committees the Senate provided as follows: Armed Services, \$420,000; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, \$330,000; Commerce, \$1,233,800; District of Columbia, \$155,850; Foreign Relations, \$325,000; Government Operations, \$1,582,200; Interior and Insular Affairs, \$200,000; Judiciary, \$3,861,300; Labor and Public Welfare, \$1,540,000; Post Office and Civil Service, \$225,000; Public Works, \$600,000; Rules and Administration, \$113,000; and Appropriations, \$50,000.

The committees of the House carry a major legislative load in the Congress in conducting hearings, evaluating and reporting legislation, performing studies, and countless related activities. They serve a membership of 435 Members of Congress who, in turn, serve that many congressional districts across the Nation. They need the resources to do their work. As you can see, in spite of the fact that we are a coequal body to the Senate and carry a workload of great or greater proportions, the funding contained in these resolutions compares very favorably with that provided Senate committees.

The House Administration Committee tries consistently to keep the amounts of funding provided committees down to reasonable and sound limits and I believe we have succeeded. The membership of the House can support these resolutions with the knowledge that needed funding is being provided and that at the same time the resolutions have been scrutinized with prudence and care.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, what is the total cost of this resolution?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this resolution totals \$975,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, how does this compare with the costs of the committee for last year?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is an increase from \$681,000.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell the House the justification for approximately a one-third increase, from \$600,000 to \$900,000 in round figures?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from New Jersey will try. I will say that reflected in this increase is the statutory pay increase of 6 percent and the cost of increased subcommittee staffing and additional funds which the committee requested and justified, we felt, for considerably more oversight hearings as required by the amendments to the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Mr. GROSS. If the 6-percent pay increase is any substantial part of the increase, there must be a veritable army employed by this committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. They have a considerable number of employees. There are 46 employees, a large number of which are in the Housing Subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any other committees of the Congress that get \$975,000?

Is that the figure—almost a million dollars?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes, there are. The Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I believe, and the Committee on Education and Labor.

I might say to the gentleman from Iowa, that I, being new as chairman of this Subcommittee on Accounts, have gone into this in great detail and compared it, jurisdiction by jurisdiction, with the committees in the other body, and I find they have vastly more in terms of dollars and in terms of employees for the same jurisdictional areas.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman recall whether this committee got a supplemental appropriation last year?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The answer is that they did not. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, and, in fact, they turned back a small amount of money.

Mr. GROSS. That being the case, why do they need an increase from \$600,000 to \$995,000, or approximately that?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I might say that the Committee on Banking and Currency turned back a total of \$92,000 last year. House Resolution 783, 91st Congress, provided \$331,000 for the full Banking and Currency Committee; House Resolution 784, 91st Congress, provided \$350,000 for the Housing Subcommittee for a combined total of \$681,000 for the Banking and Currency Committee in 1970. Thus the increase is from \$681,000 to \$975,000.

Mr. GROSS. The committee evidently had a sufficient amount of money last year, if it turned money back.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. They did. I might say that they did not have the requirement which we now have in all the committees for intensive oversight. They did not have, in our judgment, adequate staffing for the subcommittees. Funds for additional staff for the subcommittees and for the minority have been provided for all committees making such requests.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I should like to point out to the gentleman that I attended the subcommittee hearing briefly this morning. They were hearing the Committee on Government Operations, which was asking for a million dollars. There was a good deal of questioning, and rightfully so, and a rather thorough discussion of what they planned to do with the money.

The committee has oversight at the Pentagon, among other things, about expenditures there. I calculated that while we were quibbling up there about giving them a million dollars the Pentagon got rid of \$50 million in that hour.

They admitted they really cannot oversee these agencies.

Let me give another example. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee was before us the other day, and he started his presentation by saying:

My counterpart committee in the other body has asked and received \$3.6 million. I am only asking for \$350,000. That is a big argument as to why I should get it.

I said:

Mr. Chairman, I have just one observation: Either they are wasting a lot of money or you are not doing as much as you ought to, and I think probably a little of each is correct.

When we have a committee trying to give oversight to these Government agencies, last year they ran us \$17 billion in debt, \$17 billion more than we took in, and we are talking about giving the Government Operations Committee a measly million dollars to oversee a \$200 billion budget. I think we are being pennywise and pound foolish.

Mr. GROSS. I am in favor of intensive oversight. I would hope, however, that someday oversight would begin to show some results. Up to this point I do not believe it has shown real results.

I am not going to contest this resolution for this money for the Committee on Banking and Currency, but I should like to see some results for the money we are expending.

Mr. HAYS. So would I.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further on that point, I could not agree more thoroughly.

I might say that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) and I and the other members of the subcommittee have impressed upon the committee chairmen their responsibility and the absolute

requirement that they do the oversight required by the law. If they do not do it I can assure the gentlemen when they come back for funds that will be taken into careful consideration.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. In line with what my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) said, I should like to reiterate and reaffirm that we have tried to impress upon each of the committee chairmen and subcommittee chairmen who have come before us we are not trying to clamp down on them so far as expenditure of funds per se is concerned, but we are trying to impress upon them that what we want is a good return on the money we invest and a good and prudent expenditure, when we give them whatever they need.

I would like to say it would help me considerably, sitting on that subcommittee, and I know it would the chairman of the committee if anyone who has any objections or knows of any areas of waste would come to our hearings, point out such areas, and not just raise an inquiry. I mean no criticism of the gentleman from Iowa who is holding the floor, but it would be very beneficial to us if an individual committee member who knew of areas where improvements could be made, would communicate this to us or if he would come to our committee hearings and participate. In that way I believe we could do a better job.

Mr. GROSS. No one is more violently opposed to \$17 billion deficits than I am, but we do not seem to be able to do very much about it. The gentleman from Ohio, my friend (Mr. HAYS) speaks of the Defense Department getting rid of \$1 million in the snap of a finger. I can tell him that the Agency for International Development, that good old foreign handout agency, can get rid of it as fast as the Pentagon does. Yes, I hope someone along the line we can put a stop to these \$17 billion deficits.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I could not agree more. I want only to restate our determination that the oversight be done and that it be done expeditiously and that it be done well, because if it is not done, then these committees will not be funded at this level.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I just wanted to tell the gentleman I agree with him that the foreign aid people can spend money as fast as anybody. The only difference is we do not give them as much, and that is the only thing that slows them down.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to clear

up one fact if I may have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on House Administration that is handling House Resolution 226 on the floor. This Committee on Banking and Currency does have a separate means for additional funding, and historically and traditionally it does come back for an additional appropriation. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that this point was discussed at length the last time that the additional funding was brought up and, as I recall, an agreement was reached that in the future such additional requests would be amalgamated under the aegis of the Committee on House Administration. My question, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is, Does this involve their total funding for the year, barring an emergency, or is this committee coming back through the same or diverse but routine channels; and, conversely, do we now avoid coming back not necessarily under a supplemental appropriation but under some other authorization for additional funds?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. This does contemplate full funding for the committee for the year. If it develops that it is insufficient—and in the past it has not—they would have to come back through the same process to the Committee on House Administration, to the Subcommittee on Accounts, and then back to the floor for additional money.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. It is very reassuring. I hope we would be alerted for some ruse or device for unnecessary foreign travel or other expenditures by this particular committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I assure the gentleman that we are looking at those matters with great care.

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

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, but I shall not object.

As a former member of this committee I have an observation that I hope will be taken in the spirit in which it is intended. The legislative branch of the Government has from time to time been criticized for not exercising the oversight which some feel they should exercise in various programs. Throughout the years I served on the Subcommittee on Accounts and the Committee on House Administration it was my observation—and I made this statement to the committee chairman over and over again—that rather than asking for too much money, it was my opinion that they were asking for too little money for specific reasons. Specifically, they were not asking for enough money with which to exercise the oversight which they should in order to assure that the programs that we here in the Congress enact are being carried out and are being carried forward according to congressional intent.

Mr. Speaker, I said then and I say now that every single legislative committee in the House of Representatives—and I cannot speak for the other body—but by comparison there is certainly an element

of truth in what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) said about them spending too much on occasion and the House spending too little. But I believe sincerely that if this legislative branch of Government is going to be coequal and if it is going to rescue itself from the domination of the executive branch of the Government and the other body on occasion, as someone has just said, that this U.S. House of Representatives should grant to each of its legislative committees sufficient money with which to hire sufficient staff to draft legislation that we as legislators feel is in the best interest of this country so that we can avoid the dictation of the executive branch of Government.

Mr. Speaker, we do not draft nearly as much of the legislation here on the Hill as we should. More often than not we just introduce legislation that the executive branch of the Government feels is needed. I believe every committee in this House ought to have the capability within its own staff to draft the legislation it needs for carrying out the programs that we feel this country ought to have. I want to encourage them to quit asking for less and start asking for more so that we can free ourselves from the domination of the executive branch of Government.

In this particular resolution most of this additional money they are asking for—and they are asking for none for additional staff as I understand it, but they simply want a piddling \$60,000 more to do field investigations within the United States to see if congressional intent is being adhered to. If we do not ask for a beefing up of the staffs, then we will be in the same position as we have been in the past, but we should not have to take our legislative recommendations from the executive branch downtown.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Let me indicate, first of all, that I have a great deal of respect for the chairman and for the members of the committee. But I must observe that insofar as the staffing of that committee and other committees of the House is concerned, we observe a noticeable absence of blacks and other minorities on the staffs of these various committees of the House.

It is my understanding that this matter has been brought before this honorable body before, and it is my further understanding that this honorable body has simply ignored the matter of either the exclusion of blacks or minorities from these various committees of the House. Even worse, the House has gone along with a token expression of representation of blacks and other minorities on the various committees.

I would simply indicate, Mr. Speaker, that it seems to me that this honorable body makes a mockery out of all its commitments, it makes a mockery out of all

its pledges, and it makes a mockery out of all its efforts when it pushes the various agencies of the Government to hire on an equal opportunity basis and it does not hire on the same basis. Further, it makes a mockery out of its efforts to push the private sector to do this, while this very honorable body excludes blacks or minorities from the committee staffs or treats them in a token fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to speak for another minority. As Republicans we would like to have our equal share of the committee funds and committee staffing also.

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

Mr. FREY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, just very briefly, we would be glad to do so if we could find some black Republicans. We would be glad to treat all in a fair manner.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 8, immediately after the period insert the following:

"Not to exceed \$390,000 of the total amount provided by this resolution shall be made available for the expenses of the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency in accordance with this resolution which shall be paid on vouchers authorized by such subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such subcommittee or the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration."

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the committee amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-52) on the resolution (H. Res. 236) to provide funds for the expenses of the Committee on

Standards of Official Conduct, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 236

Resolved, That (a) effective January 3, 1971, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is authorized, in carrying out its functions and duties under the rules of the House, to incur such expenses, not to exceed \$25,000, as the committee considers appropriate, including expenditures—

(1) for the employment of committee staff personnel;

(2) for the procurement of services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); and

(3) for specialized training, pursuant to section 202(j) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 72a(j)), of committee staff personnel performing professional and nonclerical functions. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

(b) Not to exceed \$13,000 of the total amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); and not to exceed \$5,000 of such total amount may be used to provide for specialized training, pursuant to section 202(j) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 72a(j)), of staff personnel of the committee performing professional and nonclerical functions; but neither of these monetary limitations shall prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

Sec. 2. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration in accordance with existing law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE INVESTIGATION AND STUDY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 22

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-53) on the resolution (H. Res. 253) to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by H. Res. 22, and asked for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 253

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1971, the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 22, by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$250,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, individual consultants or organizations thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. However, not to exceed \$25,000 of the amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services

of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES INCURRED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 213

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-54) on the resolution (H. Res. 272) providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to H. Res. 213, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 272

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1971, the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 213, by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$1,100,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, individual consultants or organizations thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. Of such amount \$85,000 shall be available for each of seven standing subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor. However, not to exceed \$10,000 of the amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "\$1,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,250,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to clarify the legislative history with respect to the amount to be allocated to the minority.

While not expressly stating such in the introduced version of House Resolution 272, it was contemplated that the minority would be allocated \$220,000 for all minority expenses—including investigative staff salaries, travel, and other expenses. In amending the resolution to provide the Committee on Education and Labor with an additional \$150,000, it is my understanding that the House Administration Committee's intention was that the minority be provided an additional \$60,000.

In conformity then with the intention of the House Administration Committee, and the rules of the Committee on Education and Labor which require that I allocate a portion of our committee budget to cover all minority expenses, a total of \$280,000 will be allocated to the minority.

EXPLANATION OF RESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR MINORITY

Under the resolution submitted, originally, the minority was to receive \$220,000 or 20 percent of the total amount requested by the committee of \$1,100,000.

Under the agreement reached by the House Administration Committee, the overall budget of the committee was increased to \$1,250,000.

The increase of \$150,000 provided by the House Administration Committee is to be allocated as follows: \$90,000 to majority full committee and \$60,000 to the minority.

As a result of this action, the minority is now to receive a total of \$280,000 for the first session; that is, \$220,000 provided in the original resolution plus the \$60,000 added by the House Administration Committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE INVESTIGATION AND STUDY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 279

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-55) on the resolution (H. Res. 279) to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 217, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 279

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1971, the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 217, by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$533,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, individual consultants or organizations thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid

out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. However, not to exceed \$35,000 of the amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 18

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. 92-56) on the resolution (H. Res. 285) to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 18, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 285

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1971, the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 18, by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$478,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, individual consultants or organizations thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. However, not to exceed \$15,000 of the amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE INVESTIGATION AND STUDY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 170

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-57) on the resolution (H. Res. 290) to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 170, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 290

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1971, the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 170, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$989,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, individual consultants or organizations thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. However, not to exceed \$50,000 of the amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultant or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 92-58) on the resolution (H. Res. 301) to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies by the Committee on House Administration, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 301

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1971, the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on House Administration, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$400,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and for the procurement of services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)), shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. Not to exceed \$65,000 of the total amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the several resolutions just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS TO BE HELD ON O'HARA-McNAMARA SERVICE CONTRACT ACT OF 1965

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to my colleagues that the Special Subcommittee on Labor will begin oversight hearings on the O'Hara-McNamara Service Contract Act of 1965 on March 30.

The Service Contract Act was designed to provide a measure of wage protection for employees at the bottom of the economic ladder such as maids, janitors, restaurant workers, guards, and other service employees who were employed under Government contracts. It was also intended to stabilize labor-management relations in the highly competitive service industry.

We are deeply disturbed at recent reports that the administration is attempting to convert this wage-protection bill for service employees into a wage freeze and in some cases, wage reduction mechanism. I hope it is not true that this economically vulnerable group of people have become the latest unwilling conscripts in the President's economic game plan.

We are also disturbed that the contractor turnover rate for Federal service contracts is reportedly in excess of 90 percent, resulting in extra costs to the Government and the erosion of the stability of labor-management relations in this industry. Even more disturbing are recent press reports that a notorious and repeated violator of the act is about to be relieved from the act's provisions that violators be placed on an ineligible bidders' list.

We intend to explore all of these matters fully and welcome testimony or statements from our colleagues.

PAN AMERICAN DAY

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 338.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 338

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Tuesday, April 20, 1971, for the celebration of Pan-American Day, on which day, after the reading of the Journal, remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INCREASED CITIZEN'S CONCERN OVER DIRECTION OF NATIONAL PRIORITIES

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, business in Chicago prevented me from returning to Washington in time to participate in either of the two votes on the Yates' amendment striking SST funds from the Department of Transportation Appropriation. If present, I would have voted for this amendment. I am on record as paired for the amendment.

At this time, I would like to congratulate my good friend and Chicago neighbor, SID YATES, for his persistence in leading this fight against a strong and well-financed opposition. As one who has only recently changed his mind on the necessity of Government sponsorship of the SST, I would agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), when he says that this victory is the result of an increased citizen's concern over the direction of our na-

tional priorities. I hope that this vote signals the beginning of an increased citizen awareness and participation in government.

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE TO 18

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 223) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 26]

Ashley	Edwards, La.	Martin
Blanton	Foley	Metcalfe
Brown, Mich.	Ford,	Mink
Chisholm	William, D.	O'Hara
Clark	Fraser	Pelly
Clay	Gallagher	Price, Ill.
Collier	Goldwater	Rangel
Collins, Ill.	Green, Pa.	Rees
Corbett	Hanna	Roberts
Corman	Hawkins	Rooney, N.Y.
Delaney	Hébert	Rosenthal
Dellums	Hogan	Scheuer
Dent	Howard	Scott
Diggs	Jarman	Steele
Dingell	Jones, Tenn.	Stephens
Dowdy	Keating	Teague, Calif.
Drinan	Landgrebe	Tiernan
Dwyer	Leggett	
Edwards, Calif.	McCulloch	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 378 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE TO 18

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 223) with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) will be recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a rather happy occasion for me to sponsor and cosponsor the so-called 26th amendment to the Constitution. It has been my privilege heretofore to cosponsor the 23d—extending the right to vote in presidential elections to residents of the District of Columbia—24th—abolishing the poll tax in Federal elections—and the 25th—dealing with Presidential inability and succession—amendments, three constitutional amendments, and if this 26th amendment is ratified I will lay claim to sponsoring and cosponsoring four constitutional amendments. I say with all due modesty this is rather an achievement, and an achievement that I am extremely proud of.

Mr. Chairman, a government of, by, and for the people should be deeply interested in the right to vote. This right is the most basic of all.

The ballot box is the mechanism by which the will of the people shapes government. Democracy draws its strength and assures its survival through the exercise of the vote.

Throughout our history a continuing question has occupied the attention of Americans: Who, among our citizens, shall be eligible to participate as voters? On at least four occasions our Constitution has been amended to enlarge or protect political participation. The 15th amendment—removing the test of color from the ballot box; the 19th amendment—woman's suffrage; the 23d amendment—District of Columbia vote for President and Vice President; and the 24th amendment—abolition of the poll tax. In recent years the Congress has vigorously acted to assure the free exercise of the right to vote. The proposed 26th amendment to the Constitution embodied in House Joint Resolution 223 represents another step in the American tradition of enlarging the franchise.

Members will recall that provisions of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 lowered the minimum voting age to 18 in Federal, State, and local primary and general elections. The measure was overwhelmingly approved in both Houses of Congress. Some of us expressed reservations about the constitutional authority of the Congress to modify voting age qualifications by statute. Nevertheless, we confidently expected a prompt resolution of the question by the Supreme Court. Six months after its enactment, the Supreme Court rendered its decision on the constitutionality of various provisions of the act. It upheld all provisions of the act save those reducing the minimum voting age in all elections. By a 5 to 4 decision the Court upheld the lower voting age for national elections but invalidated the statute insofar as it attempted to lower the minimum voting age in State and local elections. As a result of the Court's decision two sets of electoral machinery must be established in 47 States which to date have not lowered the voting age to 18 for State and local elections. This dual voting age system is estimated by the Bureau of the Census to affect well over

10 million potential voters, or approximately 8.5 percent of the resident population 18 or over.

Although nine States today permit persons under 21 to vote in all elections, only three, Alaska, Georgia, and Kentucky, permit 18-year-olds to vote—Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Montana require at least 19 years of age; Hawaii, Maine, and Nebraska require at least 20 years of age. A dual-age voting system will be expensive and administratively burdensome to operate. A recent nationwide survey among election officials indicates that separate electoral facilities and procedures will have to be developed; separate Federal ballots would have to be prepared for each congressional district. Separate registration, separate voting and separate counting of the newly enfranchised present serious threats of uncertainty and delay in the tabulation of the election results in 1972. Additional voting machines may have to be purchased in order to accommodate the 18-to-20-year-old voter who at present is only permitted to vote in national elections. Alternatively, mechanisms to lock levers in voting machines under State and local offices may have to be installed, or separate paper ballots listing only Federal candidates may have to be used. Resort to one or more of these procedures would involve additional personnel, additional training, and additional expenses.

To suggest that these problems were "caused" by the enactment of the Federal statute or by the decision of the Supreme Court does not offer a constructive remedy to the problems States and localities now confront.

Whatever new separate procedures and facilities ultimately are established, election officials estimate that the added costs to State and local governments will be substantial. Estimates of these expenses suggest a nationwide cost of approximately \$20 million.

Although recent referendums in several States indicate popular disapproval of the 18-year-old vote, these decisions were made before the Supreme Court upheld the 18-year-old vote in Federal elections. Now confronted with dual-age voting and the substantial administrative difficulties and expenses that such a system involves, it is inconceivable that the citizens across the Nation would now opt for a dual voting system.

Indeed, many State legislatures today are attempting to bring their voting age qualifications into line with the Federal standards in time for the 1972 elections. In New York State, for example, a proposal to lower the voting age is scheduled to be voted on in a popular referendum later this year. I am advised that similar referendums appear also to be scheduled later this year in the States of Kansas, Maine, and New Mexico. In other States, however, such efforts may fail to produce the desired voting age uniformity in time.

A revision of the State voting age qualification apparently requires an amendment to the State constitution in every State. Processing such a constitutional amendment differs from jurisdic-

tion to jurisdiction. In at least 16 States the adoption of an amendment requires approval by two separate sessions of the State legislature to be followed by a referendum. Because not all State legislatures meet annually and a number of States require approval by two sessions of the legislature and because every State except Delaware requires a referendum to be held on a proposed amendment, it appears that more than 20 States will be unable to lower the voting age prior to November 1972.

Only an amendment to the U.S. Constitution of the type embodied in House Joint Resolution 223 can guarantee the uniformity of State and Federal voting age requirements by the next national election.

Although individual State efforts to achieve national voting age uniformity by 1972 by State constitutional amendment seem futile, there is a realistic possibility that by the next national election the proposed new article of amendment now before the House may be ratified. More than 45 State legislatures are meeting this year. Approximately half that number are scheduled to meet in 1972, and it is likely that special sessions in the fall of 1971 and the spring of 1972 will be held to deal with the issue of reapportionment. A reasonable period, therefore, exists within which the State legislatures may ratify the proposed new article.

ACTION BY THE OTHER BODY

The Senate Judiciary Committee confirmed a Senate resolution to House Joint Resolution 223 as reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary. The Senate resolution, which is identical to House Joint Resolution 223, was approved unanimously by the other body—94 to 0—on Wednesday, March 10. Final action on the Senate resolution in this Chamber will permit prompt transmittal of the proposed 26th amendment to the States for ratification.

ANALYSIS OF THE RESOLUTION

The resolution contains the customary provision that the proposed new article to the Constitution shall be valid as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years after it has been submitted to them by the Congress.

Section 1 of the proposed new article would prohibit the United States or any State from denying or abridging the right of citizens of the United States to vote on account of age if such citizens are 18 years of age or older. This provision is modeled after similar provisions in the 15th amendment, which outlawed racial discrimination at the polls, and the 19th amendment, which enfranchised women. The reference to "State" encompasses other governmental bodies within the State such as municipalities, sanitary districts, and school boards. The section contemplates that the term "vote" includes all action necessary to make a vote effective in any primary, special or general election including, but not limited to, registration or other action required by law prerequisite to voting, casting a ballot, or having such ballot counted properly and included in the

totals of votes cast with respect to candidates for public or party office and propositions for which votes are received in an election.

Section 2 confers on Congress the power to enforce the article by appropriate legislation. Any exercise of power under this section must not only be "appropriate" to the effectuation of the article, but also must be consistent with the Constitution. This section does not preclude States from enacting legislation implementing the amendment so long as it is not inconsistent with congressional legislation. The power conferred upon Congress by this section parallels the reserve power granted to the Congress by numerous amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed 26th amendment is part of a constitutional tradition of enlarging participation in our political processes. Its approval will eliminate substantial administrative burdens and costs which would otherwise be incurred by the States in the operation of a dual voting system. It will avoid the dangers of uncertainty, delay and confusion inherent in such a system. For these reasons, I urge adoption of the resolution, now. I am confident that the States will ratify before the presidential elections of 1972.

I am informed that a number of the States, as it were, are waiting in the wings to make their bow by way of ratification of this so-called 26th amendment.

Finally, I wish to point out that there is a great ground swell for the 18-year-old voting amendment. This movement for voting by youths cannot be squashed. Any effort to stop the wave for the 18-year-old vote would be as useless as a telescope to a blind man. As I said before, even the august body called the Senate approved the proposed amendment unanimously. Our Judiciary Committee approved the resolution 32 to 2.

Nor is it anomalous that I, the eldest in this body in service, should pump for voting for our youth. Youth will be served. That is an old, ancient saying, which is quite true today.

You know, youth wanes by increasing years, but the increase usually brings wisdom. Of course, I cannot be young again by any manner of means any more save in spirit. But maybe be offering this amendment I can at least wear, shall I say, the rose of youth.

The youth of America is our oldest tradition. That tradition has been in existence for over three centuries. Let us offer it our respect by a favorable vote.

I do not believe that youth will fail us if we offer our youth the privilege and responsibility of the ballot. It has been said that in the lexicon of youth there is no such word as "fail." They will not "fail" us. Some of our youth have disappointed us, but the preponderant majority are as sound of mind as they are strong in body. In the long run our voting youth will not betray their elders.

Indeed, eventually we all must resign ourselves to their care as we grow older. Thus, let us prepare them early by giving them the ballot.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF).

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Last year when this issue came into focus I announced my support of a constitutional amendment. I reaffirm my position. It is too bad the Congress did not proceed initially on that course, because the result of the course that was chosen has been near disastrous. The Congress erred in failing to take the constitutional amendment route, and then in the drafting of the statute itself, the Congress erred in at least two particulars. The first error was in the language of the clause addressed to the 18-year-old franchise. That language limits its thrust and effect to primaries and elections. In doing so, it excludes from its impact other anterior steps in the voting process, including nomination, either by petition or by convention.

Finally the Congress erred in confining the impact of its statute to the denial of the right to vote, when, in fact, if the House intended to be thorough, it should have also proscribed the abridgement of that right.

Now, in the shadow of the Court's decision, we are confronted with what is called, in shorthand terminology, dual age voting. As the chairman has indicated, we do face next year, unless this problem is promptly and effectively corrected, confusion, chaos, and possibly other difficulties at the polls.

We have three options as we choose a solution. We have only three. One would be to repeal the faulty statute we passed last year and thereby restandardize within each State the voting age in both State and Federal elections. The second would be to allow the individual States individually to decide whether they could live with the duality problem or should adjust their own laws to standardize the voting age at 18. And, finally, we can standardize the voting age at 18 by approving this constitutional amendment. The first of those alternatives, let us face it, is absolutely unrealistic. The second is altogether unlikely. The third is the only reasonable, feasible, functional choice.

As responsible legislators we must make that decision today. We must propose this constitutional amendment promptly and allow the individual States, as the Constitution explicitly provides, to make their own decisions whether the Nation should attempt to live with this problem of dual voting or solve it by this change in our Federal Constitution.

Let me suggest that that change in no way offends our federalism. On the contrary, it accords with it, because the States are given the opportunity in the amending process to make their own judgments. I repeat, it is the only mechanism by which the States can effectively resolve the dual age voting problem.

It is possible for them to do so seasonably. It will not be long before the primaries are upon us and the State legislatures must act, if they are to do so effectively, sometime before early spring of 1972.

The time frame seems to be very abbreviated, but let me suggest that of the

15 constitutional amendments after the Bill of Rights, 10 were ratified in a time frame of less than 14 months. So if we move promptly, it is reasonable to expect that we can conclude this job in a timely fashion.

Forty-three of the State legislatures are in session this year, and about half that number will be in session early next year. In addition to that, largely because of the problems connected with the decennial census and redistricting and reapportionment of the State legislatures, there are likely to be a number of special sessions of the legislatures in many of our States this fall, and early next year, so it is realistic to expect that we can, if we act now favorably, accomplish this goal in time to permit proper functioning of the voting process next year.

Last year, I believed that the Congress was taking an unwise and unconstitutional approach in attempting to lower age qualifications for voting in 48 States by Federal statute. It was argued on the floor in this body and in the other body that the legislation was supported by the 14th amendment.

When the Supreme Court was confronted with this vexing question, a majority agreed that Congress could not lower age qualifications for voting by statute under the 14th amendment. However, although a majority of five Justices found the Congress in error regarding its legal theory, four Justices agreed with the Congress. Mr. Justice Black, one of the five Justices who said that the 14th amendment did not uphold the statute, found that the statute was valid—but only for Federal elections—under section 4, article I of the Constitution. And thus, ironically, a view espoused by only one Justice was combined with the views of four dissenting Justices to produce the result that the statute was in part constitutional and in part unconstitutional. In a sense eight Justices dissented from the holding in the case.

The result is the problem of dual-age voting. The 18-year-old citizen may vote for candidates for the House, the Senate, and the presidency, but he may not—unless he resides in Alaska, Kentucky, or Georgia—vote for candidates for any other office.

Congress now has the opportunity to correct this problem. I believe that the age qualifications for voting in any and all elections should be lowered to 18 because that portion of our citizenry between 18 and 21 years of age has a vital stake in the decisions which guide this Nation, has demonstrated an increasing awareness of the problems before us, and is more knowledgeable than any such previous group in our history. Moreover, the right to vote an anterior to all other rights. It is so important that it should be placed beyond the power of any legislature either to deny or to abridge it. The vice of the statutory approach is that the Supreme Court or the Congress is free to change its mind and each is capable of doing so quickly, and what was easily given might easily be taken away.

Today, we have the opportunity to correct the mistake of last year. On March 10, each Member of the other

body—all 100—went on record in support of a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age. And the administration has indicated its unqualified support for such a constitutional amendment.

What does the proposed constitutional amendment accomplish? It does not grant the right to vote to all citizens 18 years of age or older. Rather, it guarantees that citizens who are 18 years of age or older shall not be discriminated against on account of age. Just as the 15th amendment prohibits racial discrimination in voting and just as the 19th amendment prohibits sex discrimination in voting, the proposed amendment would prohibit age discrimination in voting, but only against those citizens who are 18 years of age or older. In this regard, the proposed amendment would protect not only an 18-year-old, but also the 88-year-old. A citizen of the United States may still be denied the right to vote for valid reasons, but such reasons may not be race, sex, or age—if he is 18 years of age or older. For example, a State law that prohibits convicted felons from voting would not be affected by the proposed amendment. Just as black felons and female felons are not guaranteed the right to vote by the 15th and 19th amendments, felons who are 18 years of age or older would not be guaranteed the right to vote by the proposed amendment.

The proposed amendment in fulfilling its purpose would produce a considerable overlap with State laws which may appear purely redundant, but which makes clear the true nature of the proposal. Today, the citizen who is 21 years of age may vote in any State. Yet, the proposed amendment would bestow an additional constitutional right upon such citizen—the right not to be discriminated against on account of his age. However, in doing so, I believe that it is fair to say that there is no intent to change that citizen's status in any way. If State law today requires that such citizen register in order to vote, the proposed amendment would not grant a constitutional right to ignore the State-imposed precondition. If State law today requires that such citizen have registered for the last election in order to have the right to initiate legislation by signing a petition, the proposed amendment would not grant a constitutional right to ignore the State-imposed precondition. There is no intention to change the status of that 21-year-old citizen by means of the proposed amendment. If such citizen's right to vote is being denied or abridged, it is obviously not on account of his age. If he claims that his right to vote is being denied or abridged by the State-imposed preconditions, that claim must be resolved by other principles and provisions of law.

What the proposed amendment will do is to place the 18-year-old citizen in the shoes of the 21-year-old citizen in the above instances. The status of the 18-year-old citizen is changed. He is to be treated under the State voting laws as the 21-year-old citizen was prior to the ratification of the proposed amendment.

Hence, the overlap of the proposed amendment serves to make clear its central purpose—to bestow on those 18 years of age and older the voting rights enjoyed under State law by those who today meet the State age qualifications for voting. No more is intended; and no less.

Thus, the proposed amendment, rather than establishing an absolute right to vote, prohibits only a certain kind of discrimination.

Moreover, the proposed amendment does not establish that age qualifications for voting must be set at 18. It does ban age qualifications above the age of 18. It does not ban age qualifications below the age of 18. Thus, a State legislature could lower the voting age for elections held within the State to an age below 18. And so long as the Supreme Court's decision in Oregon against Mitchell stands, the Congress could lower the voting age for so-called Federal elections to an age below 18.

The proposed amendment would protect citizens who are 18 years of age or older against age discrimination. I have not found any attempt in the reports of the Judiciary Committee in either this body or the other body to define what is meant by a "citizen." The reason for the silence in these reports is that the proposed amendment rests on prior law, including section 1 of the 14th amendment, for the meaning of citizenship. Let me say that there is absolutely no intention to tamper with such law. That is true in spite of what is to me the inartful form of the operative clause of the proposed amendment, which reads:

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

Although the use of commas in that clause might lead one to infer that one must be 18 years of age or older to be a citizen, the members of the committee reporting this legislation had no intention to establish any such standard. I believe that our purpose would have been better reflected by reporting House Joint Resolution 401, which I cosponsored. Its operative clause reads as follows:

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

I find that language truer to our purpose. I hope that it will remain clear to all that House Joint Resolution 401 and House Joint Resolution 223 are identical in scope and meaning.

If House Joint Resolution 223 becomes ratified in law, it will do more than simply constitutionalize title III of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970; it will do more than simply correct last year's mistake. To illustrate the distinction between the statute and the proposed constitutional amendment, let me underscore the following points.

First, the statute was limited to the right to vote "in any primary or in any election." The proposed amendment is not so limited; it protects the "right to vote" not only in such elections but

otherwise. The "right to vote" is a constitutional phrase of art whose scope embraces the entire process by which the people make their political choices. This includes not only the right to vote for a Congressman or a mayor in a general, special, or a primary election, but also the right to nominate by petition or convention or the right to participate in procedures such as initiative or recall where they have been adopted. In the words of the committee's report:

The proposal embodied in House Joint Resolution 223 confers a plenary right on citizens 18 years of age or older to participate in the political process, free of discrimination on account of age.

This plenary right, of course, refers to citizen's right to make political choices and not to the right to be a choice; that is, a candidate for office.

Second, whereas the statute protected only against the denial of the right to vote, the proposed amendment would protect against either the denial or the abridgement of the right to vote. I do not believe that the limited protection of the statute was the result of a conscious rational judgment. The proposed amendment would also correct this error. Since so much of our constitutional law and our statutory law heretofore distinguished denials and abridgements of the right to vote, the oversight in the statute might have proved to be a source of mischief.

Since at every turn we find that the proposed amendment is an improvement over present law, one might reach the conclusion that support for this measure would be unanimous. However, there are some who oppose this measure on the grounds of the States rights doctrine. The argument cannot be predicated on a legal basis because the Constitution itself allocates rights between the Federal and State Governments and whatever becomes part of the Constitution also shares in allocating rights. The argument must rather rest on policy grounds. It is argued that it would be better to allow each State to decide this issue for itself. But, in the other body, where States are represented as such, that argument was unanimously rejected. Why? Because Oregon against Mitchell has created an emergency in the administration of elections so that the States are no longer free to contemplate these noble questions at their leisure. If something is not done before the 1972 elections, chaos and confusion will grip the polling booths across the country. And the overwhelming majority of the States find it impossible to help themselves in this emergency. We have more than a suspicion that they want help. If we are wrong, it will take only the silence, inaction, or rejection on the part of 13 legislative bodies in separate States to tell us. And remember that there are 99 legislative bodies that will be presented with the question of what is best for the States. It will only take 13 to block ratification. I believe that the States should decide what is best for them. But without the submission of the proposed constitutional amendment, the States are not able to choose effectively.

I do not find it persuasive to argue the right of the State to choose where, in fact, the law in most States makes a choice impossible.

For these reasons I urge the adoption of House Joint Resolution 223.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman from Virginia yield some time, because one or two of the gentlemen to whom I propose to yield time are not present.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I labor under no illusion that this proposition is in the least part in jeopardy before this House. I anticipate that it will be adopted by the requisite two-thirds vote of this House this afternoon and before the afternoon is very much older.

I may say that personally I have no fear of the 18-year-old franchise. I believe that in the two States which have had reasonably long experience with it, it has been demonstrated that the younger voters—the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old voters—are absorbed into the general pattern and there is no disruption that should cause anybody any trouble.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have decided in my best conscience that I must vote against this proposal this afternoon, because the people of Michigan so decisively in the last election voted it down.

In 1970, only 39 percent of the people of the State of Michigan voted in favor of amending our State constitution to extend the voting franchise to those 18 years of age and older. Only 39 percent were in favor. In my own district, only 37 percent of the people voted for it. In fact, the issue carried in only nine precincts out of the 261 precincts in my district.

It occurs to me that if ever there was a mandate at the ballot box on an issue certainly here is that mandate.

I know the argument is made there has been an additional ingredient added into the situation, in that last December the Supreme Court in effect wrote a law different from that which the Congress voted and extended the right to vote to 18-year-olds only in national elections. Congress never passed any such law. The congressional act was intended to cover all elections. But the Supreme Court says what we did was to act only in national elections.

I know that additional ingredient has been added into this situation since the 1970 elections, but at the time the people of Michigan voted on this issue Congress had already spoken. The President had already signed into law the Voting Rights Act of 1970, which included title III, which purported to extend the right to vote in all elections across the board, State and local, as well as Federal.

Nevertheless, the people of my State resoundingly said "No" and the people of my district resoundingly said "No." So under the circumstances, I feel myself mandated to represent them here.

So often I have people say to me "What good does it do to vote?" I say to you that if the decision of the people made at the ballot box is to be completely

ignored, indeed that question becomes awfully hard to answer.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I appreciate the gentleman's statement that the people of Michigan have by a resounding vote turned down the vote for 18-year-olds. Would the gentleman venture a guess as to what the outcome might have been if indeed the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds had been permitted to vote on that proposition?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I dare say that the result would not have been different in Michigan nor would it have been different in my district, for the reason that it was so overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But the question is was it defeated by those who are not directly involved in terms of permission to do so. If we had permitted 18-, 19-, or 20-year-olds to vote on this particular question as to whether or not they should be permitted hereafter to vote in elections, do you think the outcome would have been different?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. No; I think the outcome would have been the same.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE).

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not have any mandate. It has been some years since the people of Texas voted on this question. They rejected it at that time. I do not know what they will do in the future. I am not trying to say what my State or any State should do within its own jurisdiction, nor am I trying to pass upon whether 18-, 19-, or 20-year-olds or 16-year-olds or 12-year-olds should vote. I am, however, of the opinion that we would do well to maintain our system of a federal union with the States having some voice in their own internal affairs, and certainly retaining the right to fix the qualifications of voters for local office.

I know that there has been a strong argument made that now the States must maintain two separate accounts to determine who may vote only for Federal officials and who may vote for State and local officials, such as for justices of the peace. True, as a result of legislation and of court decisions the State election officials have to keep two separate sets of ballots and it is expensive. I heard the argument made that in one of the States in the Northeast it cost them \$700,000 to meet this double standard and the argument is made that to avoid that expense we should pass this constitutional amendment.

Why do we have to pass a constitutional amendment if, let us say, in Texas they want citizens to vote at 18? Congress does not have to submit to any kind of amendment. If Maine or Oklahoma wants to allow 18-year-olds to vote they can allow it without any action by this body. That can be determined by the home State as it should be. The legislators of any State can right now submit amendments to the State Constitu-

tion and if the people of the State involved want it, they can pass it. I have no quarrel with that. If Ohio wants to give the ballot to 16-year-olds that is their right but I do not want Ohio or any other State to tell Texas what we must do, nor do I want Texas to try to control the local affairs of any other State. I do not know why we should be dictated to by some other States, even though three-fourths of the other States want some other age limit.

I do not know why it should be our business here to deny the people of any State the right to determine who are the voters in their States for State offices. The Supreme Court held that is the privilege of the States at the present time. Now we propose to come along and say if a three-fourths majority of the States decide that they want to make some other State give the ballot in local elections to someone 18 years of age, that this majority is justified in imposing their will on the States which may have a different view. I do not believe anything of the kind. I think if Virginia wants to give the ballot to 12-year-olds, it is perfectly all right with me, but I do not want it in Texas, and I do not think the people of Texas want it.

Nor do I think that it is any of the business of this Congress to tell the people of Texas what qualifications they shall set for local elections. That is all that you do if you adopt this constitutional amendment and if it is adopted by a vote of three-fourths of the States.

That is all that you will have accomplished. You will not have given any freedom of choice to anybody, because every State in the Union today has that freedom within its own boundaries. Every State right now has the right to let 18-year-olds vote or has the right to cut this down and only give people 48 years old the right to vote if they want to. I think that is the way it ought to be. Each State should have the right to decide who is going to vote in their local elections.

Now, why do you want to do this? Is there any good reason for doing this, other than a mean desire to interfere with your neighbor's business? I think we have had enough of this matter of interfering with the business of everyone else. If we will go home and attend to our own business, I believe this country would get along a whole lot better. If there is a Member on this floor who can give any reason for denying each State the right to decide this matter of age of electors in local elections I would respectfully invite him to do so.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLODY).

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, in urging overwhelming approval today of the proposed constitutional amendment extending voting rights to our young citizens 18, 19, and 20 years of age—I want to recall that I have sponsored and supported this measure in earlier Congresses.

It had been my hope that the shortcut route of extending voting rights to these younger citizens by way of legisla-

tion—in contrast to an amendment to the Federal Constitution—might satisfy the constitutional requirements.

It now appears that the constitutional requirement was satisfied by our action at the last session insofar as Federal elections are concerned. However, the U.S. Supreme Court, in the case of Oregon against Mitchell, ruled on December 1, 1970, that an amendment to the Constitution would be essential to lower the voting age for State and local elections.

Our present dilemma results from the action which we took in the last Congress as construed by the Supreme Court. In other words, we will now have a dual system of voting—one applicable to State and local elections—and the other applicable to elections of Federal offices.

According to a report filed in the other body just a few weeks ago, it was shown that in my State of Illinois the Secretary of State, John W. Lewis, estimates that there could be a 40- to 50-percent increase in election costs because of the need to keep two sets of registration books and two sets of ballots. The chairman of the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners estimated the additional cost for the city of Chicago as ranging from \$150,000 to \$200,000 at each general election.

By acting speedily here today and submitting that constitutional change to the States for ratification, the confusion, the threatened additional expense, and the distinct possibility of voting irregularities—and fraud—can be avoided.

Mr. Chairman, I had occasion to communicate with the county clerk of Lake County, Mrs. Grace Mary Stern, who advised that the permanent registration records were being equipped with tabs to identify the voters who are less than 21 years of age. As the voters attain their 21st birthday, the tabs are removed in order that full voting rights can be accorded these young voters. She indicated also that the electronic voting system would require some modification in order to limit the right of younger voters to cast votes for Federal offices. She is endeavoring to reduce added expense as fully as possible but indicates that some additional expense would be incurred, in addition to a certain amount of confusion.

Mr. Chairman, the county clerk of McHenry County, Mr. Vernon Kays, indicates that unless we are able to provide uniformity of voting rights as between citizens between 18 and 21 years of age—and those above that age, McHenry County will be subjected to substantial additional expense—and much confusion.

Mr. Chairman, the Illinois General Assembly is in session at this time, and, according to my advice, will act promptly to ratify this constitutional change. Earlier, I indicated my feeling that speedier action by the States might occur through State conventions convened for this purpose. However, my information is that the State legislatures, for the most part, are waiting for us to act and will undertake ratification without delay. In fact, I would expect this constitutional amend-

ment to be ratified in record time through affirmative action of the State legislatures.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the 18-year-old vote all the way, but, more importantly, at this juncture, I am for the elimination of the discrepancy which now exists in the voting rights of those who are above and below the 21-year-age mark. The action we take today can be the most important step in eliminating this discrepancy. I urge a favorable vote of the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD).

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I am very, very happy that this legislation concerning a constitutional amendment for the 18-year-old vote is before the House of Representatives today.

In the 90th Congress I was the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 18 which would have provided for an 18-year-old vote in America.

In the 91st Congress I was the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 18 which, again, would have provided for an 18-year-old vote.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen the past history on this legislation. We are aware that we did pass legislation for an 18-year-old vote which the Supreme Court determined could only apply in Federal elections.

We are today going to pass I am sure a constitutional amendment which will provide for the 18-year-old vote throughout the Nation. I believe that this is fair, that this is just, that this is something that our country should do in order to recognize that our 18-year-olds, our 19-year-olds, and 20-year-olds are adults in America.

But, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the most important thing that we should concern ourselves with today is to see that, in reality, our 20-, 19-, and 18-year-olds do actually vote in America in all elections.

As we all know, this legislation must be accepted by 38 State legislatures throughout the country. We also know that many, perhaps, two dozen States in past years have voted down on referendums the 18- or 19-year-old vote proposal. I feel that unless we improve this legislation, unless we make it acceptable to people throughout the country, we will never get the 38 States to agree. Therefore, we will not have a truly 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old vote in this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I shall offer at the proper time an amendment to this legislation which involves a bill I introduced several weeks ago to provide for a moving down from 21 to 18 the age of majority in this Nation under all law.

This is the way Great Britain recently handled the 18-year-old vote. They said, yes, we will give all of the privileges of adults to people who are 20, 19, and 18, but we will also give them all the responsibilities of adults at ages 20, 19, and 18, and that means responsibility for signing contracts and many other things.

There is an indication that perhaps this amendment may be out of order; that a point of order may be made

against this amendment because it is not germane. I feel that it is absolutely germane. In this legislation we are talking about privileges and responsibilities being given to people who are 20, 19, and 18. My amendment reducing the age of majority from 21 to 18 will do exactly the same thing—it will deal with privileges and responsibilities of people 20, 19, and 18 years of age.

I hope that this will be considered, because I feel many people in the House and perhaps many members of the Committee on the Judiciary who may not be in favor of an 18-year-old vote are well aware that we can pass this today. We can say we did it here in the House of Representatives, we got a two-thirds vote on it, and so we are in favor of reducing the voting age, knowing that many State legislatures will not bite the bullet, will not, in view of the recent referendum which they have had on this issue, agree, and in reality we will not have an across-the-board 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old vote in this country. But I feel if we add this amendment to the provision, if we say yes to the young people, we not only want to give you the vote, we not only think you can handle the vote, but we also think you are adult enough to be able to handle responsibilities of majority in this Nation, then I feel that we will be able to see in a very short time 38 States agree with what the Senate did a short while ago, and what we are about to do here today, we may then really say to the young people, we believe that you are truly adult.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope there will not be a point of order made against the amendment. I hope the amendment will be adopted, because I feel this is the only way we can assure that we will see an 18-year-old vote in America.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK).

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the proposed constitutional amendment, and I want to commend a group of young people that I think have demonstrated what young people can do by working within the system, and by a tremendous effort on their part, to persuade enough Members of both the House and the Senate to support this legislation. They are the members of the Youth Franchise Coalition, which is a group of young people who have really tirelessly lobbied on behalf of this proposition which they believe in very strongly.

I am hopeful and I am expectant that all of their work is today going to bear results, and I congratulate them.

I want to say this—that I think the amendment that was talked about by the earlier speaker, although I know it is very well intentioned, and well motivated, might have the effect, instead of helping, of clouding what otherwise is a very clear issue, because as the gentleman from Virginia stated so well, we are legislating today not only for our own legislative purposes, but really in response to a Supreme Court decision which had the effect of frustrating what had been our purpose when we passed the statute lowering the voting age sometime ago. I

think that the issue right now is very clear that will be presented to the various State legislatures for proposed ratification.

I think to include as part of the constitutional amendment a provision that would affect contract rights and property rights might well have the unintended effect of hurting our cause.

So when the gentleman offers his amendment, I, for one, will be in opposition to it.

Mr. Chairman, last May during our consideration of the Voting Rights Act of 1970, I suggested to my colleagues that we let the Supreme Court of the United States determine whether we had the power and authority to lower the voting age to 18 by simple statute rather than by constitutional amendment.

On December 21, 1970, the Supreme Court answered that question "yes and no." In the cases of Oregon against Mitchell; Texas against Mitchell; United States against Arizona; and United States against Idaho, the Court, in its opinions decided that Congress could indeed lower the age by statute with respect only to Federal elections, but that a constitutional amendment was necessary to lower it in State and local elections—in the absence of a State statute.

At the present time only three States—Alaska, Georgia, and Kentucky have set their minimum voting age at 18. Montana and Massachusetts adopted a 19-year-old standard, and Maine and Nebraska have set the age at 20. The other States are either in the process of lowering their voting age minimums or are still at age 21.

Since only three States now have 18-year-old voting, the other 47 States must face the problem of providing separate registration and voting for persons in elections for President and for Senators and Representatives in addition to registration and voting for State and local officials. Also, there will be some people who are only qualified to vote for Federal candidates.

At this point in my remarks I include pertinent portions of an excellent review and analysis of the situation as made by Johnny H. Killian, legislative attorney, American Law Division, Library of Congress:

PROSPECTS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RAMIFICATIONS

Any decision of the Court, but especially decisions of a constitutional nature, has myriad ramifications, leading off into practical consequences, doctrinal implications, precedential bases for subsequent decisions, and dicta which is never developed further. Where the Court is as fragmented as it was in this decision, it is quite difficult to separate one radiation from another. But some things can be said, some with certainty, others less assuredly.

State Election Practices—As a matter of immediate, practical effects, the decision will require the States to institute some changes in their electoral practices. Since only three States presently set the voting age at 18, 47 States must provide for separate registration and separate voting for some persons in elections for President and for Senators and Representatives who are not qualified to vote for state and local officials. Additionally, because of the residency provisions of the Act, there will be some persons who are only

qualified to vote for presidential electors. Since most of the States conduct elections for federal and for state and local officials simultaneously, there will be problems related to furnishing ballots to persons not qualified to vote on every office and especially problems related to equipping voting machines.

Too, there will no doubt arise problems of interpretation relating to Titles II and III. For example, the residency provisions of Title II clearly relate only to the vote for presidential electors, but Title II applies "in any primary or in any election". The Court's decision qualifies the "any" to mean any congressional or presidential primary election or election. Clearly, voters between the ages 18 to 21 will be able to vote for presidential electors in the November election. The wording should mean they will be able to vote in presidential preference primaries. In States in which states of delegates compete in an election to be sent to the presidential nominating conventions, should not voters of this age group be allowed to vote? But what is to be the case in States where delegates to the state conventions are elected and the state conventions select the delegates to the national conventions? Is the result to be the same if the state conventions only select delegates to the national conventions and transact no other business or, on the other hand, if the state conventions also nominate candidates for state offices or endorse state candidates for later party primary elections and adopt party platforms? What is to be the case in States where, instead of elections, state conventions are the result of a progression of conventions or caucuses at the precinct, county, and district level? Is this age group to participate? Regardless of the number or types of functions performed by the conventions? If the conventions also select state and local party officials to serve for the next two or four years regardless of presidential politics? The practical problems may be numerous.²

No help in solving these problems is to be expected from the legislative history because Congress intended that 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds should participate in the entire electoral process, federal, state, and local. It did not have to face questions related to when the federal and state processes were interrelated, inasmuch as it was the Court's decision which permits the voters of that age group to participate in one process and not in the other.

FOOTNOTES

¹This comment, of course, assumes that state residency laws, currently under extended attack, *infra*, pp. 42-47, are not shortened either as a result of court decisions or merely as a result of purely voluntary state action. The foregoing comments assume also that age minimums above 18 are not struck down or changed by state or federal constitutional amendment.

²The complexities of the processes by which we nominate our presidential candidates is set out in detail in Paul David, et al., *The Politics of National Party Conventions* (Washington: 1960), and Nelson Polsby & Aaron Wildavsky, *Presidential Elections: Strategies of American Electoral Politics* (New York: 2d ed. 1968). Suffice it to say that in very few States are national convention delegates selected in primary elections associated with presidential candidates; in the other States, the selection is a blend of elections, caucuses, and conventions, in which both national and state political issues are inextricably scrambled. If the States are required to permit the 18 to 21 age group to participate partially in this system, the problems of separating the strands will dwarf the dual registration and voting problems of the general election. Further complications are possible because the nominating process is regulated only partly by state laws; parts of

the process are subject only to party rules, giving rise to possible "state action" limitations under the Fourteenth Amendment. But inasmuch as the nominating process is an integral part of the election process, the parties might be held affected by state action, under the "white primary" rationale. So far as the Act under consideration is concerned, Congress may in any event as an exercise of its necessary and proper powers have authority to reach private action in order to regulate adequately the state-directed processes.

In recognition of the many and serious problems created by the act of Congress and the decision and opinion of the Supreme Court, I joined with several colleagues in urging that a constitutional amendment be offered to the States for ratification which would permit them to avoid most of the problems created by the Congress and the Supreme Court with respect to the 18-year-old vote matter.

Several joint resolutions were introduced to accomplish this result, including House Joint Resolution 223, sponsored by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER. It was this resolution that the Judiciary Committee has reported—House Report 92-37—under date of March 9, 1971, and it is this resolution which was passed by the Senate March 10 by a vote of 94 to 0.

As with other recent offerings, it permits the ratification within 7 years by three-fourths of the several States, of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that—

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

As stated in the committee report—page 6—substantial added costs to State and local governments are involved in maintaining separate procedures for those between 18 to 21 and those over 21. Reports and estimates submitted to the committee were as follows: Connecticut, \$1.3 million; New York City, \$5 million; St. Louis, \$2.5 million; New Jersey, \$1.5 million; Dade County, Fla., \$400,000; Washington State, \$200,000; and Chicago, \$200,000.

No doubt similar reports would be obtainable from jurisdictions across the country. The secretary of state of Illinois, John W. Lewis, has estimated that it would cause an increase of from 40 to 50 percent in election costs for our State.

In House Joint Resolution 223, sponsored by Representative CELLER, we have a proposal that would lower the voting age to 18 in all elections. It is the product of hours of testimony before the Judiciary Committee and careful consideration of the evidence by members of that committee. It deserves early consideration in this session and, in my opinion, strong support.

The alternative—failure by Congress to make voting standards uniform in all elections—is grim to contemplate. Sizeable new expenditures, confusion, and electoral delays are all highly probable if States and localities are forced to create a dual-age system of voting. The costs

of adapting existing procedures to two different standards for voting, one for State and local elections, the other for Federal elections in the 47 States which do not permit 18-year-olds to vote is expected to run between \$10 and \$20 million.

The States have shown themselves as favoring an 18-year-old vote. Governors have strongly encouraged such action. At least 34 States either have or will shortly have proposals in their legislatures to lower the voting age to 18. But only 25 of the 47 States which do not allow 18-year-olds to vote could lower their voting age before the 1972 elections without resorting to some extraordinary procedure, such as a special statewide election. Twenty-two States face procedural delays in their amendment process that would prevent final action to lower the voting age by 1972.

A Federal amendment to the Constitution is the only realistic hope in most States for 18-year-old voting before the 1972 elections. It took the States an average of 15 months to ratify each of the last three amendments to the Constitution. An amendment to lower the voting age would stand an excellent chance of ratification within a similar period.

Adoption of House Joint Resolution 223 is a reasonable—and highly practical—means of eliminating the wasteful and unjustifiable costs of a dual-age voting system.

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

My principal concern with this particular measure is one that has to do with permitting 18-year-olds to vote, for instance, in local and municipal elections in college towns. For example what would happen in a community like Urbana, Ill., with an influx of 20,000 or 25,000 students from outside the State coming into that community and being given the opportunity to vote at 18 years of age? For goodness sakes, we could have these transients actually controlling the elections, voting city councils and mayors in or out of office in a town in which they have a dominant voice. Personally, I feel that this is bad. We have seen evidence of this in Madison, Wis., where in one local election the students of the University of Wisconsin were able to band together and elect several officials who could care less how the city was run and who have no responsibility whatsoever about taxes which have to be raised to fund certain municipal functions in the city.

What should my position be if I am opposed to that kind of thing coming about and am opposed to encouraging this result in any one of the college towns around the country?

Mr. RAILSBACK. Let me just tell you my feelings about that. I hope some of the other Members will feel free to participate.

My belief is that the general laws relating to residence should apply. This involves certain criteria which includes

among other things the intention of the person; that is, where the person intends to reside, and where he does his banking, pays his taxes and whether he is in effect a transient, which would mean his residence would be his permanent home or where he intends to return and all of these things. There are a number of criteria.

I would say before a person or before a student should be permitted to register to vote in a community where he is attending college, that he would have to express to the satisfaction of the registrar there that this was indeed going to be his permanent residence. This should be under oath. I think the laws have been frustrated in some instances. In other words, I think there are students right now trying to register and vote in certain communities who should definitely not be permitted to vote in that area. What you have to do is to look at all of the criteria—where they do their banking and where they pay their taxes, and if they would still be living with their parents where their parents live and all of these different criteria.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, you know in the taking of the census this past year our two boys who were away at school were considered to be residents for census purposes of New Haven, Conn., rather than Peoria, Ill. I thought that was wrong. I thought that their residence ought to be the residence of their tax-paying parents. All our local and State programs that are dependent on these population factors are hurt by the fact that they are considered to be residents of some place other than their hometown.

Mr. RAILSBACK. As I mentioned, I think that the laws of residence are very, very clear. They have been established by a whole series of precedents. My own belief is that these precedents have been frustrated in certain instances where students have been permitted apparently in large numbers to register in their college community. In my opinion, this is wrong because the chances are that they are going to return to their own communities.

Mr. MICHEL. Of course, that is a very easy thing to do because youngsters normally stay in school for 4 years. It would be very easy to register in the first year in college, and then there are 3 or 4 years when it would be no problem at all for them to meet the requirements as to residency.

The same thing is true in coming home during the summer months—a student could register there as well and so for all practical purposes be eligible to vote twice.

I, too, feel that this is wrong, but the fact that we both feel this way is not going to provide much comfort to the residents of some of our small college towns around the country when they are confronted with this kind of situation.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he might require to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to speak briefly on the joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18. There are several compelling arguments in favor of the constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18 in all elections.

The first and most obvious argument for the right of 18- to 21-year-olds to vote is that if they are old enough to serve in the Armed Forces of their country, they are old enough to vote. It seems basic to me, Mr. Chairman, that if a man can be sent to a far-off land to fight and die for his country, under a democratic system of government he should have a voice in selecting the officials who make these vital decisions.

Second, I believe that 18- to 21-year-old citizens are, on the whole, as informed and as concerned as their elders about the problems facing our country. Moreover, America's youth are better educated than at any time in our history and perhaps better educated than the youth of any nation in the history of mankind. According to a recent report by the Bureau of the Census, only one out of every 100 Americans over the age of 14 cannot read and write.

Third, if we permit our young people to participate in the political process, the overwhelming majority of them will respond by working constructively within the system rather than going outside the system and resorting to acts of violence to achieve their goals. In this way, the political alienation of our youth will be significantly reduced.

Fourth, our young people will bring fresh ideas and high ideals into the political system about how we can create a more decent America and a more decent world.

Finally, there is an important practical reason why Congress should pass the joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment extending the right to vote to 18-year-olds. The recent Supreme Court ruling on the Federal law extending the right to vote to 18-year-olds upheld the application of this law in national elections, but declared it unconstitutional in State and local elections. As a result of the Supreme Court decision, any State which fails to lower the voting age to 18 in State and local elections before 1972 will have to institute dual voting and registration procedures. It has been estimated that these dual procedures will cost an additional \$750,000 in my own State of Ohio; \$1.3 million in Connecticut; \$5 million in New York City; \$2.5 million in St. Louis; \$1.5 million in New Jersey; \$400,000 in Dade County, Fla.; \$200,000 in Washington State; and, \$200,000 in Chicago.

Mr. Chairman, immediate, favorable action by Congress on the constitutional amendment extending the right to vote in all elections to citizens 18 years of age or older, and ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States as soon as possible, is the only reasonable alternative to a costly and chaotic situation. I, therefore, recommend the adoption of this constitutional amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield

3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to join with my colleagues in support of this proposed constitutional amendment. I voted for the legislation authorizing those 18 through 20 years old a vote in local and State as well as Federal elections last year. Now, with the action of the Supreme Court, it is necessary for us to give the non-Federal voting right to these citizens by constitutional amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we, I am sure, are hardly aware of what seems to me to be the unfairness of men 18, 19, and 20 years of age being sent to war, many of them to die, many of them to be grievously wounded, by Presidents and Congresses for which they have never had an opportunity to vote. That is still because neither the President nor Members of the Congress have been voted upon under the legislation on this subject adopted last year.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is properly a matter of Federal action and responsibility. The voting privilege for those 18 to 20 should be uniform throughout the Nation. I believe this is one of the best generations of young people we have ever had. Some of them have been misguided, but many of them have had the very sincere feeling of frustration that the establishment was against them; that they had no voice in the decisions of their country; and the only way they could make themselves heard was by dissent that erupted in forms of violence.

When this amendment which we propose today becomes effective by the ratification of the States, every person 18, 19, and 20 years of age, as well as everyone over 21, shall have the same voice in the election of the Congress and in the election of the President, and in determining the policies of our country. I think that is a sharing with these young citizens of privilege and responsibility that they deserve and should enjoy.

One other thing, Mr. Chairman. What we propose to do in the Federal enfranchisement of those 18, 19, and 20 years of age is exactly what we did in enfranchising the black slaves with the 15th amendment and exactly what we did in enfranchising women in the country with the 19th amendment. Therefore, it seems to me that this proposed amendment is perfectly in consonance with those precedents.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to say that I think we are today moving toward giving the privilege and the responsibility for the carrying on of this great Republic into the glories of the future to one of the most deserving of all of our groups of citizens, those who have borne the burdens of its wars, and in whose hearts are the hopes and promises of our long years ahead.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I might say to my colleague that giving the State the right to enfranchise young people is what should

have been done by us prior to putting through in a hurry, hurry, hurry a little over a year ago something that now will put more or less pressure on the States. Now we are following the processes of the Constitution.

Mr. PEPPER. At least we are now achieving our objective by proceeding through constitutional amendment.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WIGGINS).

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is quite simple. It contains few, if any, ambiguities. But I think for purposes of legislative history, we should discuss at least a few matters. One thing we should discuss is age as a standard of voting. It is proposed in the amendment, if ratified by the States, to establish a national age standard for voting at 18 years of age or over.

Since the right to vote cannot be denied, according to the amendment, to any citizen otherwise qualified who has attained that age, it is implicit that no upper age limit of voting may be established by the Congress or by any State. Doubtless a rational case might be made to deny the franchise to the very elderly or to the senile, for example, using many of the same arguments which are used to support this amendment. Such an upper age limit, however, would not be permissible, as I read this amendment.

We all know that the current proposal has gained wide acceptance on the strength of the popular non sequitur, "Old enough to fight, old enough to vote." It is perhaps a paradox, Mr. Chairman, that the other side of the coin, "Too old to fight, too old to vote," will not be possible under the proposed amendment.

A fair reading of the amendment would appear to permit States or the Congress to establish a lower voting age than 18 years, if they so desire. The injunction that voting may not be "denied or abridged" would reasonably not be a bar to extending or granting the franchise to younger citizens. Although no debate on this occurred in the committee, I understand there is no constitutional bar to 17-year-old voting if that be the desire of the States or of the Congress.

The amendment is addressed to the single political act of voting. It does not deal expressly with age qualifications to be an officeholder, for example. As I read the amendment, States may if they wish follow the Federal pattern and impose more restrictive age standards—but otherwise nondiscriminatory qualifications—for holding any elective office.

The act of voting, to which the amendment is addressed, encompasses, as I read it, the full range of rights to participate in the election process. It is anticipated that 18-year-olds could not be denied the right to participate fully in the nominating process, whether by signing nominating petitions, voting at party conventions, or participating in the selection of delegates thereto.

The right to vote without discrimination on account of age after reaching age 18, as I read this amendment, is intended to reach all elections. Distinctions between voters in State and National

elections, State and local elections, primary and general elections, school board contests, bond issue elections, whatever—no such distinctions may be made in any such elections on the basis of age. A qualified voter in any election is intended to be a qualified voter in all elections.

It is perhaps unnecessary to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the language "by any State" in the amendment is intended to reach all of the political subdivisions within a State as well.

The amendment in my view is not without technical imperfections. I would have preferred that it follow the pattern of the 18th amendment and commenced with the words "After 1 year from the ratification of this article."

If the 38th State ratifies this amendment within weeks of a scheduled bond issue election in another State, or a scheduled municipal election, for example, who can say that such election will be certified as valid if 18-year-olds did not have the time to register and participate in that election? I regret hearings were not held by my Judiciary Committee so as to give proper consideration to such real and ominous problems. But, Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that any amendment would not prevail today and, indeed, this amendment is going to be passed overwhelmingly.

As the Chairman and the Members know, I oppose the amendment. I do so because I believe it is unwise and completely unnecessary. My opposition, however, is not based upon age. I have urged my own State legislature to lower the voting age in California. My opposition is contained more fully in the dissenting views which are printed in the committee report, and when we go back into the House I will ask unanimous consent to include those dissenting views at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following material:

DISSENTING VIEWS

We respectfully dissent from the judgment of our Judiciary Committee colleagues that the United States Constitution should be amended to permit citizens 18 years old or over to vote in all elections, State or Federal.

At the outset it should be understood that we do not oppose a reduction in the voting age if that be the will of the people within those jurisdictions affected. Each of us has urged a lowering of the voting age in our respective States. We do oppose, however, the imposition of an unwanted voting standard in State and local elections by others unaffected by that standard. In short, as the law is presently interpreted, States have the right to fix non-discriminatory voter qualifications for their own elections and we believe it should remain that way.

On March 2, 1971, the Judiciary Committee voted to report this amendment favorably to the House. It did so after a discussion (which could not fairly be characterized as a debate) of less than one hour. The amending resolution had not been favored by prior hearings before any House committee in this Congress, or any preceding Congress since 1943.

When one reflects upon the enormous responsibility a committee shoulders in recommending a change in our fundamental law, it must be acknowledged that the Judiciary Committee acted precipitately in this

case. Its efforts are wholly out of character with its previous careful deliberations of proposed constitutional amendments.

The primary causes of this unfortunate reversal of form are the Voting Rights Act of 1970 and the Supreme Court's interpretation thereof in *Oregon v. Mitchell*.

In the 91st Congress, it will be recalled, the House accepted a Senate amendment to the Voting Rights Act which authorized 18-year-old voting in all elections. Many in this House resisted that amendment on constitutional and policy grounds. The Supreme Court might have resolved our questions, but it did not. *Mitchell v. Oregon* satisfied no one, especially those charged with the responsibility of conducting future elections. It is fair to point out that the turmoil which now forces the Congress to consider action is wholly of its own making. True, the Supreme Court compounded our problems, but it did so in response to an act of Congress which 132 of us regarded as improvident and unconstitutional in the first place.

We are asked to support the proposed amendment on the ground that it will eliminate the prospect of confusion and expense in maintaining dual voter lists for future elections. The amendment's supporters believe that it provides the best escape from the problems which the Congress and the Court joined to create. It could with equal logic be argued that this should be accomplished by a simple repeal of the Senate amendment which thrust duality upon us. We reject each of these proposals.

There is a better way.

There are few attributes of State sovereignty more fundamental than the right to determine the qualifications of those who may participate in the voting process. It is a right granted in the body of the Constitution and recognized as recently as the *Mitchell* case itself. Justice Black, who tipped the scales in that decision in favor of the Federal right to determine age qualifications in national elections, spoke powerfully of the State's right to establish similar qualifications for their own elections. He said:

"No function is more essential to the separate and independent existence of the States and their governments than the power to determine within the limits of the Constitution the qualifications of their own voters for State, county, and municipal offices and the nature of their own machinery for filling local public offices." *Mitchell v. Oregon* (No. 43, Dec. 21, 1970, p. 9.)

Other recent decisions of the Court have indicated a renewed interest in the vitality of the Federal system. In *Younger v. Harris*, for example, decided only a few days ago, Justice Black spoke for a more united Court when he called for:

... a recognition of the fact that the entire country is made up of a Union of separate state governments, and a continuance of the belief that the National Government will fare best if the States and their institutions are left free to perform their separate functions in their separate ways. This, perhaps for lack of a better and clearer way to describe it, is referred to by many as "Our Federalism," and one familiar with the profound debates that ushered our Federal Constitution into existence is bound to respect those who remain loyal to the ideals and dreams of "Our Federalism." The concept does not mean blind deference to "States' Rights" any more than it means centralization of control over every important issue in our National Government and its courts. The Framers rejected both these courses. What the concept does represent is a system in which there is sensitivity to the legitimate interests of both State and National Governments, and in which the National Government, anxious though it may be to vindicate and protect federal rights and federal interests, always endeavors to do so in

ways that will not unduly interfere with the legitimate activities of the States. It should never be forgotten that this slogan, "Our Federalism," born in the early struggling days of our Union of States, occupies a highly "important place in our Nation's history and its future."

The President, too, is fashioning programs which are designed to return power to the States and to reverse the trend toward centralizing authority in the national government.

All of these efforts, by the Administration and the Judiciary, represent a wholesome trend.

The pending amendment, however, is a step backward which should not be taken.

The contemplated amendment may have superficial appeal to some because, if ratified, it would avoid the inevitable confusion and expense of dual age voting. But States need not suffer the confusion and expense if they wish to avoid it. They may change their laws to conform to the Federal standards. Some States, however, may wish to endure these admitted problems as the price of adhering to a policy concerning voting age contrary to that expressed in the amendment. No State should be denied that right.

As we take these preliminary steps toward imposing an 18-year-old voting standard on the Nation, it is well to remember that the enthusiasm of a few is apparently not shared by the many.

Only three States now permit 18-year-olds to vote; 47 do not.

Several States (Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, and Nebraska) have recently adjusted their voting standards downward, but have refused to accept the 18-year-old standard sought to be imposed by this amendment. Only the voters in Alaska adopted the 18-year-old standards in a recent referendum.

Even more States (Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Washington and Wyoming) have flatly refused to make any change at all, when given the recent opportunity to lower their age standards for voting. The policy of these States is to be thwarted by the proposed amendment.

In summary, we are convinced that this republic will be better served in the long run if the sovereignty of our States is not further eroded by denying to them the power to fix non-discriminatory qualifications for voting in their own elections.

We urge a "No" vote on the amendment.
CHARLES E. WIGGINS.
WILEY MAYNE.

Mr. Chairman, fundamentally this amendment is offered and will pass for no better reason than that the young people affected by it insist on its passage, and, we lack the collective will to say "no" to them.

In this we sadly mirror the permissiveness of society as a whole.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD).

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution. I have been a cosponsor of this resolution ever since coming to the Congress.

I should like to compliment the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), the chairman of the committee, and the members of his committee for the dispatch with which they have handled this matter, giving us an opportunity to vote on this important issue so early in this session of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, today we are considering a House joint resolution which I have cosponsored that proposes a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18 in State, local, and Federal elections. The Senate has recently approved an identical resolution by a unanimous vote of 94 to 0, and I would hope that my colleagues will do the same today in the House of Representatives.

I would like to remind my colleagues that last year Congress enacted legislation which enfranchised the voters between the ages of 18 and 20 with full voting rights in all elections. However, on December 21, 1970, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled on the constitutionality of this law. While it upheld the granting of voting rights for 18-year-olds by statute in congressional and presidential elections, the Court struck down the provision for voting in State and local elections.

We are now left in a very precarious position. Presently, there are only three States which permit 18-year-olds to vote in State and local elections—Kentucky, Georgia, and Alaska. This means that it will be necessary for 47 of our 50 States to maintain separate voter registration lists and separate balloting procedures.

Needless to say, the result is extra and unnecessary administrative expenditures to our States and municipalities at the very time when these units of government are literally crying out for more funds. In many instances these extra expenditures are extremely costly. For instance, it is estimated that the lack of uniformity in voting ages will cost New York City alone approximately \$5 million. While the full impact on the State of Michigan has not yet been determined, it is estimated that approximately one-quarter of a million dollars will be required merely to provide adaptors for the State's 8,000 voting machines.

To avoid this additional cost and potential confusion, either Congress must pass a constitutional amendment or the States must act individually to lower the voting age. However, because of State requirements for amending State constitutions, 22 States cannot act to lower their voting age prior to November 1972. An amendment to the U.S. Constitution would make it possible to avoid this and lower the voting age in time for the 1972 elections.

Aside from the confusion and obvious inequities which presently exist and aside from the additional costs involved, there are additional reasons why Congress should pass this resolution today. In my own State alone there are approximately 500,000 young men and women between the ages of 18 and 20 who will be voting for the first time in 1972. It simply does not make good sense to allow our new young voters to participate in national elections which predictably involve the most distant, complex, and far-reaching issues of the day, and then deny them the right to participate in local elections involving issues with which they are much more familiar, and, in most cases, which are much less complex.

For these reasons, once again, I would urge all my colleagues to vote affirmatively today.

The time is long past due for all Americans between the ages of 18 and 20 to have the opportunity to vote for the people who represent them on the local levels of government as well as the national.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MAZZOLI).

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, I should like to echo the sentiments which have been conveyed earlier today concerning the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) for his cosponsorship of this amendment. The gentleman has made a most distinguished record, really a very historic record, since he has been in this House, and I should like again to congratulate him.

Mr. Chairman, I come from the State of Kentucky, which has had the privilege and honor to recognize the talent, usefulness, and devotion of young people by granting them the right of franchise at age 18 for the past 16 years.

We have had a great deal of discussion today. This will be continued today. There will be newsletters written and there will be radio broadcasts and television announcements of all the great concerns many of my colleagues feel, in good faith, concerning the constitutional questions that this type of proposal arouses.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, as one who has worked in the political context of Kentucky and has been active in politics in Kentucky for the past 4 years, we have found, and I have personally found, that the young people of America in the course of their activities in politics have really infused new blood, infused new thoughts, infused a much needed new enthusiasm into the political process. They have brought to the political process in Kentucky, and in all other States that have permitted 18-year-olds to vote the idealism that sometimes we, as their elders, have allowed to dissipate. They have brought to the political process the willingness to do the hard and mundane and drudge work that comprises the bulk of politics. They have worked uncomplainingly in situations which many of our contemporaries simply refuse to work in.

So, Mr. Chairman, Chairman CELLER, and Members of this august body in which I have now the privilege to serve, I should like to urge that you do pass this proposal today. I should like to urge that in your communications to constituents you indicate the usefulness of this proposed amendment, the wisdom of it, and the fact that it has produced good in our State and will produce good for the United States of America.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I have concluded to vote for this amendment. I do so with some reluctance, not because I am perturbed by the thought of the 18-year-old vote; in fact, I voted for that as a member of the general assembly of my own State over 20 years ago.

But I am concerned about the method

whereby we have arrived at the situation in which we find ourselves today, and still more by the implications of where we may go from here if we follow the constitutional guidance of some of the opinions handed down by the Supreme Court in the case which passed on the validity of the statute which we adopted last year.

The Congress has contributed to the situation in which we find ourselves by trying to impose an 18-year-old vote by statute without reference to any amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I voted against that effort last session because, according to my understanding of the Constitution, it was plainly unconstitutional. The Court, really by the decision of one member whose views were not shared by any other member of the Court, has, in a rather strange decision, which is not one of those most distinguished on the part of the Court, I think it is fair to say, come up with an anomalous situation whereby it has been held that we could constitutionally do this by statute as to Federal offices but not as to State offices. Hence we find ourselves in the peculiar situation in which we are here this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I have no particular concern, I say, about the age for voting. I think a man could arrive at a conclusion anywhere at ages between 18 and 21 with fair reasonableness. You have to draw a line somewhere, and I am content to see it drawn anywhere in a reasonable area, but I am concerned with interpretations of the Constitution which torture it out of shape.

Mr. Justice Black, in his opinion which led to this hybrid situation in which he upheld our statute as to Federal elections and not as to State elections, has taken one part of the Constitution which talks about times, places, and manners of holding elections and which gives some Federal power as to such subjects and has equated it with another section which talks about the qualifications of voters and which leaves that completely to the States, just as if these obviously deterrent things were one and the same thing. However, the real threat to our federal system lies in the decision by Justices Brennan and Douglas that under the 14th amendment, as they claim it is a denial of equal protection of the laws to deny the vote to people 18 years of age. I submit, if that is true, then it is just as much a denial of the equal protection clause to deny a vote to people 17 years of age. Even Justice Black does not buy that solution for our problem.

What I suggest to you is this: We have a situation in a few States which voted for 18 years of age and we have a few which voted for 19 and 20 years of age as the legal age at which to vote, and although it may make a local difference here and there for a short period of time, the Republic is going to survive wherever we draw that age line. The Republic will not be destroyed or saved by the 18-year-old vote, but the Republic is very likely to be destroyed, or at any rate its constitutional basis is very likely to be permanently changed and altered, if we follow the constitutional theory which is laid

down by Justices Douglas and Brennan in their opinion in Oregon against Mitchell. I suggest to my professional colleagues here in the House, and also to all others who are concerned, that they read those opinions and that they think very carefully on the question of where we may be going in this so-called Federal Republic. At this point Mr. Chairman, I am including a copy of my individual views found in the report on the resolution, House Joint Resolution 223:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF HON. DAVID W. DENNIS
OF INDIANA

1. I have never believed that granting the vote to those between 18 and 21 years of age would, over the long run, either save or ruin the Republic. The question, on its own merits as a matter of policy, has achieved a sort of symbolism which, I believe, exceeds its intrinsic importance. Some individuals should certainly vote at 18, others make incompetent voters at any age, and a line must be drawn somewhere. The general area of 18-21 seems to be a reasonable area in which to make demarcation; and, for my part, I believe that men of good will and good judgment could honestly differ on the exact year to pick, and that no decision made would necessarily be more or less meritorious than another.

2. Federal action in this field, however, is another matter, for, regardless of the degree of importance which one may attach to the question of the 18-year vote, as such, any attempt to resolve the issue on the Federal level necessarily involves Constitutional questions and problems of Federalism, the importance and sweep of which may far outstrip that of the immediate problem of setting the most desirable voting age.

I have never had any serious doubt that, under our Constitutional system, voting qualifications in general, and age qualifications in particular, were basically matters for determination by the several States of the Union, and were not to be determined by the Federal government.

On this basis I voted against the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970, Public Law 91-285, 84 Stat. 314, because I believed that several provisions of this statute were unconstitutional—and notably that its provisions which purported to set 18 years of age as the legal voting age in all elections were quite plainly unconstitutional.

Briefly, I based this belief on the provisions of Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution of the United States, reading as follows:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature;" on that provision of the 17th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States which provides that: "The electors [for election of United States Senators] in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors in the most numerous branch of the State legislatures;" on the language in Section 2 of the 14th Amendment, which, by providing a penalty for State denial of the vote to any male inhabitant "being twenty-one years of age", assumes that the State has the power and right to deny the vote to a male inhabitant who is less than 21 years old; and, finally, on the uniform practice over the years which not only left the determination of over qualifications to the laws of the several States, but which, uniformly, adopted the route of amendment of the Federal Constitution, whenever it was desired to change voting qualifications through Federal action—as in the cases of Federal abolition of State restrictions on voting by reason of race (15th Amendment), sex (19th Amend-

ment), and, with respect to Federal elections, the failure to pay poll taxes (24th Amendment).

I will add that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Oregon v. Mitchell* on December 21, 1970, is not one which greatly impresses me or which operates to alter my basic thinking about the proper nature of our Federal system.

I accept the decision, of course, as the law of the case and as the law governing the particular problem and situation with which we are now faced; but, like Abraham Lincoln with respect to the *Dred Scott* decision, and like Mr. Justice Harlan in his very able dissent in *Oregon v. Mitchell* I take a generally dim view of the underlying approach upon which this decision seems to operate and of the possible further extension of the Constitutional point of view upon which it would appear to be based.

Nor is one's respect for the result heightened by the fact that, in essence and in practical effect, this result represents the views of just one member of the nine-member Court. The opinion of Mr. Justice Black clearly discloses an acute perception of the dangers to Federalism inherent in the views of his four Colleagues who, with him, make up the five-man majority in respect to the validity of the 18-year-old vote provisions of Public Law 91-285 as to Federal elections. Yet he has sustained these provisions as to Federal elections by what, with all respect, must surely be regarded as a tortured view of Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, whereby he equates regulations as to "the Times, Places, and Manner of holding Elections" with regulations respecting "the Qualifications requisite for Electors", which are provided for in Article I, Section 2.

Finally, I do not agree that there is anything in our Constitutional history to indicate that denial of the vote to those 18 years of age—any more than the continuing denial of the vote to those 17 years of age—is a denial of equal protection of the laws, or that Section 5 of the 14th Amendment grants to the Congress any power to adopt legislation against such an alleged denial of equal protection.

I cannot but agree with Mr. Justice Harlan when he says, in his dissenting opinion: "Except for those who are willing to close their eyes to constitutional history in making constitutional interpretations or who read such history with a preconceived determination to attain a particular constitutional goal. I think that the history of the Fourteenth Amendment makes it clear beyond any reasonable doubt that no part of the legislation now under review can be upheld as a legitimate exercise of congressional power under that Amendment."

The question remains, what do we do now? The Court has spoken, and the Congress is now taking the proper route—if it wishes to act in this field—of proceeding by way of Constitutional Amendment, as Congress ought to have done in the first instance.

It is true, also, that the hybrid election system caused by the Court's decision, will pose problems of complication and expenses to the several States in the conduct and holding of elections, which a uniform voting age, applicable to all elections, will serve to obviate.

On the other hand it is equally true that the States can, in due course, correct this situation by action on their own part, if they wish to do so—and if they do not so wish, it is at least a fair question whether the Congress should attempt to force the issue by proposing an amendment in a field which has always been one particularly reserved for the jurisdiction of the several States.

We sometimes lose sight of the fact that each of the States, at any time, could have

acted to lower the legal voting age, had it so desired; but only a few States had done so previous to the enactment of Public Law 91-285. The decision of the Court, and its practical effect, may or may not impel additional State action. There is nothing unthinkable about leaving this decision solely to the several States. Nor has there, as yet, been any manifestation of a great demand, within the several States (as distinct from the ranks of the Congress) for a lowering of the voting age.

Submission of a Constitutional Amendment, however, is an appropriate and legal procedure, which still leaves the ultimate question of ratification of the amendment to action by the several States, in accordance with Article V of the Constitution.

We are, therefore, now presented with a Constitutional approach to this problem; and certainly a man could support the proposed 18-year-old vote amendment who could not, for Constitutional reasons (18-year vote and/or otherwise) support or vote for Public Law 91-285.

One final word: the question of passage and ratification—or the reverse—of this particular amendment, is, to my mind, much less important than are the broad Constitutional questions raised and discussed in the several opinions in *Oregon v. Mitchell*. It is not too much to say that the future course of our Republic, and the whole question of its continued Federal character, may be profoundly influenced by whether, and to what extent, the views of Mr. Justice Harlan as expressed in *Oregon v. Mitchell* may, in the future, prevail over the judicial philosophy of Mr. Justice Douglas and Mr. Justice Brennan.

DAVID W. DENNIS.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, as a longtime supporter of the proposal to enfranchise all Americans between the ages of 18 and 20, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 223, which would, by constitutional amendment, lower the minimum voting age to 18 years in State and local elections, as well as in Federal elections.

The legislation we are now considering is a direct consequence of a 5-to-4 decision rendered on December 21, 1970, by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Oregon against Mitchell*. The High Court in that case upheld the provisions of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970—Public Law 91-285—lowering the minimum voting age to 18 for Federal elections, but invalidated such provisions with respect to State and local elections.

The Supreme Court decision has left most States in the unfortunate situation in which 18- to 20-year-olds may vote for their President, but not their Governor; for their U.S. Senator and Congressman, but not their State or local legislators, or even their hometown mayor.

The present situation is neither realistic nor sensible. The 47 States which do not allow 18-year-olds to vote are facing an intolerable burden. Either these States must quickly enact their own constitutional amendments to allow these young voters to participate in State and local elections, or some form of dual voting methods will have to be designed and installed. If, as is probable, each of the 47 States adopts a different method of dual voting, future elections in our

highly mobile society could be strangled by a jungle of procedural redtape. This truly was not the intent of Congress when it passed the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970.

Moreover, it is clear that these young voters have earned the right to full participation in our political system. They are better equipped today than ever in the past to be entrusted with all of the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship. Their demonstrated intelligence, enthusiastic interest, and desire to participate in public affairs at all levels exemplify the highest qualities of mature citizenship.

Today's young voters have a great deal to contribute to our society. Although some of the student unrest of recent years has led to deplorable violence, much of this unrest reflects the concern of today's youth about the important issues of our time. We must direct these energies into our political system and give our young people genuine opportunities to influence our society in peaceful and constructive ways.

The report of the President's Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence eloquently described the relationship between campus unrest and the inability of our younger citizens to take a constructive part in the political process. The Commission stated, in pertinent part:

The anachronistic voting-age limitation tends to alienate them from systematic political processes and to drive them into a search for an alternative, sometimes violent, means to express their frustrations over the gap between the Nation's ideals and actions. Lowering the voting age will provide them with a direct, constructive, and democratic channel for making their views felt and for giving them a responsible stake in the future of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the time has come to extend the vote to 18-year-olds in all elections—because they are mature enough in every way to exercise the franchise, because they have earned the right to vote by bearing the responsibilities of citizenship, and because our society has so much to gain by bringing the force of their enthusiastic idealism into the constructive mechanisms of elective government.

These considerations were given overwhelming support by the other body on March 10, 1971, when, by a unanimous vote of 94 to 0, it passed similar legislation. This distinguished body should do no less for the young people of our country. I urge a unanimous vote for House Joint Resolution 223.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, we are asked today to change the fundamental law of the land by a constitutional amendment.

The resolution proposed is one which very clearly erodes traditional concepts of federalism upon which our Government has been based.

Surely, if any power is to be reserved to the States, it should be the power to determine the age at which a citizen becomes eligible to vote in State and

local elections. This has been firmly established in our law since the founding of the Republic and had remained unchallenged until the Senate last year amended the Voting Rights Act of 1970 to authorize 18-year-olds in all, not just Federal, elections to vote. A majority of the House unwisely accepted this amendment over the objection of Members who then warned that it was clearly unconstitutional. And the Supreme Court promptly so held insofar as State and local elections are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, in the case of *Mitchell* against *Oregon* the Supreme Court upheld the act's setting of voting qualifications in Federal elections, but struck down the statutory attempt to force 18-year-old voting in State elections. Though thus rebuffed by the High Court, it was perhaps too much to hope that those who led the Congress down the primrose path of unconstitutionality last year might become somewhat less assertive of leadership in the continuing effort to blanket younger age groups into the franchise.

But the rest of us should at least be sobered by the thought that on the record thus far the proponents of this resolution have proved to be something less than omniscient in matters of constitutional law.

They have renewed their attack upon the federal system, and I protest that they do so with unseemly and unnecessary haste.

The resolution we consider today was reported out by the Judiciary Committee on March 2 with less than an hour's discussion and barely a week after organization of the committee on February 23.

There were no hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary or any other committee of this Congress, or any preceding Congress since 1943. Is this the kind of careful deliberation and investigation which any proposed constitutional amendment should merit at the hands of a responsible legislative body. I think not. Why the big hurry? Why are we in effect falling all over ourselves in the rush to thrust the vote upon the very young? Can it be in some way related to our knowledge that 18-year-olds assuredly will be voting for Members of Congress in the next congressional elections? Can it be that we are ready to surrender the federal system without a whimper rather than run the risk of offending this large 3-year class of new voters, the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds? I hope not.

Lobbying groups are already hinting that they have the soon-to-be enfranchised in their pocket, and will turn them against Congressmen who now refuse to go along. But those who think these young voters will applaud and reward a fawning and precipitous congressional approach to this important resolution may be in for a rude disappointment. It has been my impression that today's 18-year-olds know a good deal more about the American system of government than many of us give them credit for. If they are as well informed as I think they are, they will not appreciate a currying of their favor by passing this

bill at the expense of the federal system. They know that under that system certain powers are reserved to the States, and that foremost among these has been the exclusive right to prescribe reasonable regulations for the conduct of State and local elections, including the determination of qualifications for voters in those elections.

In the "Federalist No. 59," Alexander Hamilton strongly upheld and made abundantly clear the intent of the framers of the Constitution to proscribe any Federal Government meddling in State and local elections, in the following language:

Suppose an article had been introduced into the Constitution, empowering the United States to regulate the elections for the particular States, would any man have hesitated to condemn it, both as an unwarrantable transposition of power, and as a premeditated engine for the destruction of the State governments? The violation of principle in this case would have required no comment; and to an unbiased observer, it will not be less apparent in the project of subjecting the existence of the National Government, in a similar respect to the pleasure of the State governments. An impartial view of the matter cannot fail to result in a conviction, that each, as far as possible, ought to depend on itself for its own preservation.

Make no mistake about it, my colleagues, what is mounted today is indeed "an unwarrantable transposition of power; and just such an 'engine for the destruction of the State governments' as Hamilton contended no man should hesitate to condemn. It is a direct assault upon the federal system.

It is one thing for the National Government to prescribe voting qualifications in national elections, but quite another for it to say who shall vote in State and local elections, for such officers as members of city councils, school boards, and county boards of supervisors. If high school students are to be permitted to vote on school bond issues, then certainly this decision should be made closer to home than at the Federal level.

I personally favor the Iowa Legislature giving the vote to 18-year-olds, and I have urged them to so vote, and I would so vote if a member of that body myself. But this is a matter for State, not Federal action.

Five States—Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, and Nebraska—have recently adjusted their voting standards downward, but have refused to go so far as to enfranchise 18-year-olds. Through referendums 14 more States—Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming—have refused to make any change at all when asked to lower their age standards for voting. Thus we have a situation in which the people of 19 States have already rejected 18-year-old voting by referendum. But if this resolution which we are considering today is passed and the amendment is subsequently ratified by the legislatures of barely 38 States—without approval by the people of each State in referendum—then the other 12 States would have no choice but to comply.

If federalism means anything my colleagues, it means that no State in the Union should be forced to permit voting by 18-year-olds in its local and State elections when a majority of its own citizens have shown their opposition to such action by referendum. True federalism would require the defeat of the pending amendment, so that each State can continue to decide for itself, in conjunction with the people in each of the 49 States that require submission of amendments to the State constitution to referendum, what the minimum age for voting in its State and local elections shall be.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to join me in voting to maintain and preserve, not weaken, our federal system, by voting "no."

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) one-half minute.

Mrs. ABZUG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to move to revise and extend my remarks in a minute in the RECORD.

In the meantime, I want to say I think it is terribly important for 18-year-olds to be able to vote on the question of making war and peace as well as to have the power to determine who will be the sheriff maintaining the peace. I think that is the significance of the 18-year-old amendment that we are seeking here today.

The political system needs the 18-year-olds just as we need more young people here in the House of Representatives. I believe the right of the 18- to 21-year-olds to vote will strengthen our power structure. I think many of the programs and the direction of our country, would be changed—Not only the emphasis upon the illegal war in the Indochina and our economy of war, but our failure to protect the country's resources, and provide for its inhabitants all would be considerably changed by the introduction of the 18-year-olds to all parts of our political processes: at the congressional level as well as at the State and local levels. The House of Representatives more than any other branch of Government is intended to be the direct voice of the people. And in a nation which is getting younger all the time, there are no young people in Congress. The youngest Member of the House is 30, although under the Constitution you can run for the House at age 25, and the age range goes up to 82. The average age of Members of the House is 51.9 years, and in the Senate it is over 56. We need the 18- to 21-year-old votes to begin to make a change in this body, in its shape and in its responsiveness.

I believe that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), who has presented this amendment for our consideration today, deserves great appreciation on our part for bringing this issue before us.

The time for the total enfranchisement of the 18-year-old citizen is now. Since 1942, when the first resolution to amend the Federal Constitution to lower the voting age to 18 for all elections was introduced, national sentiment for such

an extension of the voting population has steadily grown. The result is that the current controversy centers not on whether the 18-year-old should have the unequivocal right to vote in all elections, but rather, how that right should be granted.

The 11 million 18- to 21-year-olds of today are generally better educated and more prepared, more capable and more aware than their counterparts of years ago. They should not be deprived of their tremendously significant participation in the selection of elective officials at all levels of government.

The Federal constitutional amendment would sooner extend on a national scale the 18-year-old vote than would alternative measures. It would sooner eliminate the high costs of maintaining the dual suffrage system necessitated by 18-year-olds presently being able to vote in Federal but not State or local elections. Finally, the constitutional amendment would sooner eliminate the possibility of confusion and delay resulting from this dual voting system.

But, unless this amendment is made effective as soon as possible, the unjust, costly, and unnecessary situation now existing will prevail for some time to come. This is so because of the State constitutional mandates restricting the respective States as to how soon they can act on their own.

I am proud to be part of the effort to extend the 18-year-old vote through a Federal constitutional amendment. It is the most practical and far-reaching method of achieving a goal sought by many, and, as yet, achieved by only a few.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, the time for an idea comes for strange and wonderful reasons and for many different reasons.

Some will be voting for this amendment because of the fiscal crisis that faces the States because of the dual age requirements that will be involved in the 1972 elections.

Some will be voting for it because they have been for the 18-year-olds voting for a long, long time.

Some will be for it because they recognize the difficulties that our younger generation faces and the consequent necessity to make them a part of the action at an earlier age.

For all these reasons, it is obvious that the time for this idea has come.

When we are talking of amending the basic document under which we live, it is only fit and proper that there be different reasons for getting together the kind of consensus that is needed to pass an amendment to our Constitution.

It is not necessary for everybody in the Chamber or, indeed, for everybody in all the States to feel that the action which was taken by the Congress in the last session was wise. I happen to be one who voted for that statute and believed that it was wise. It is not necessary for everyone in this Chamber to agree that the Supreme Court decision on this subject was wise. I happen to be one who thinks that decision was not wise.

It is not necessary in short that all of us agree on all the reasons why 18-year-olds ought to be allowed to vote in all elections.

What is important is that this consensus has been reached.

I think it is a tribute to our beloved chairman, the gentleman from New York, that this came through the Committee on the Judiciary almost without dissent.

I think it is a tribute to our Speaker that this is being put before this Chamber at a time when most of the States will have an opportunity to ratify it or to decide not to ratify it in time for the 1972 election.

Perhaps it is premature for us to congratulate ourselves for finally achieving that which justice and equity require, but the fact remains that by approving the proposed constitutional amendment and guaranteeing the right to vote to all citizens in all elections to people who are over 18 years of age, the Congress will have carried out its responsibility; from here on in, it is up to the States to make the final decision, which would determine whether or not those 18 years of age and older will be voting in all elections.

To those who complain that it was improper for the Federal Government to reach for this decision on its own, I would point out that only if three-fourths of the States agree will this decision be binding upon the entire country.

I would suggest to those who would argue that it is not right to impose this decision on those States that may not agree, or to impose this decision on those people who might not agree, that the means by which we choose an electorate are the most difficult problems for any democracy.

I know of no other way than by making it a part of the basic law of the country, to once and for all resolve this dispute which has been before the country for so long.

Mr. Chairman, I think it will lend credibility to the notion that 200 million people can rule themselves in a democratic and equitable manner when the House today gives its approval to what we hope will be the 26th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the vote on the House floor on the question whether 18-year-olds can vote in the next national election is truly a historic and brave decision on the part of my colleagues in the House.

This is one of the major steps that could mean 11 million young Americans will be able to have a voice in the presidential, congressional, and State and local elections a year from next November.

I consider it an honor to be a member of the Judiciary Committee which voted this bill favorably to the floor of the House.

Aside from the election administrative nightmare which must be remedied as quickly as possible, I would like to make some observations on the importance of this issue.

The latest figures show there are 11.5 million persons between the age of 18 and 24; 4.1 million are in the labor force; 800,000 are in the Armed Forces; 4.9 million are in high school and college; 1 million are housewives; 80 percent of the total are high school graduates; 46 percent are college students. These younger voters should be given the right to full participation in our political system because they will contribute a great deal of knowledge to our society.

It is a simple fact that our young citizens of today are mentally and emotionally capable of full participation in our democratic form of government.

Under the criminal laws of more than 49 States, 18-year-olds are treated as adults. They are also subject to military induction. I might add insurance companies and the Federal Civil Service also treat them as adults.

I welcome this new potential group of voters. They must have a voice as to who is to be elected as their city councilmen, city judge, State representatives, county commissioner, Congressman, Senator, and Governor and most importantly the President and Vice President.

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

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Chairman, you have all heard many reasons for voting "no" on this proposed constitutional amendment, and I am convinced that they are worth abiding by, and I am not going to gild the lily at this point. What I am going to do is to address myself to the so far unmentionable option, and that is repeal of title III of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Of course, passage of the constitutional amendment would definitely prejudice my legislation which has been introduced as H.R. 2633, and, therefore, I am going to speak of the unmentionable option.

When I appeared before the Rules Committee to speak on behalf of repeal of the statute lowering the voting age to 18, I appeared on behalf of St. Jude, who is the patron saint of lost causes. But after giving more thought to the subject, and in view of the fact that I have been a Marine jet pilot, I am aware that this may be the only time and opportunity I shall have for kamikaze. Nevertheless, those who have spoken against this amendment on the ground that they are for the right of 18-year-old youths to vote but have some constitutional questions about it will at least feel they will now be considered in a more moderate position after I have given my pitch for the unmentionable option, which is repeal of the former legislation.

Mao Tse Tung and I have one thing in common: Both of us think favorably of Sun Soon Loo, the ancient Chinese writer, who is quoted as saying that supreme success in warfare is not winning all your battles, but in having an enemy surrender before going into battle. Let it be said that I surrendered here before going into battle. I should like to ask why, as some speakers have said, it is inconceivable to repeal this section; name-

ly, the act lowering the voting age to 18? Why is it absolutely unrealistic? This is what the people want. In poll after poll and in election after election they have expressed their wishes. They do not want the voting age lowered to 18. The Supreme Court in its decision last December did not find that 18-year-olds had a constitutional right to vote. What they found—and I disagree with their decision—but what they found is that this body or this Legislature has a constitutional right to set the voting age by statute for Federal elections. The Supreme Court did not say we had to set it at 18 years of age.

In the light of the election since the passage of that statute, five States, when given a chance to express their opinion, turned it down. Is it not quite obvious that the people do not want it?

Also, we in this body have never had an opportunity to vote on the question of lowering the voting age to 18 as a simple, clear-cut issue. It was an amendment added by the other body to a Civil Rights Act. Even now we are not voting on the question as a clear-cut issue. We have the problem of acceptance of dual questions.

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

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

Mr. MIKVA. Are you concerned that the legislatures of the 38 States that are needed to ratify this amendment will be speaking the wishes of their own people in ratifying the amendment?

Mr. SCHMITZ. I am not concerned with that question at this time. There is an organization, for example, the Committee for Constitutional Integrity, which has started a campaign to fight this battle in the State legislatures. Let me point out how simple it would be if we should allow the States to do this on their own, each State deciding for itself through its legislators. I am sure most of the States, as in the case of California, bring about changes in their State constitutions by submitting the question to the people for a vote. But they do not have to submit an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to the people for a vote. There is the difference.

Mr. MIKVA. I realize that. But that was also true when women were granted the right to vote. Would you like to repeal that amendment, also?

Mr. SCHMITZ. Do not put me on the spot on that one. I might give you an answer you did not expect.

Getting down to this resolution, we have heard many arguments that if they are old enough to fight, they are old enough to vote, but I have not seen anyone take the viewpoint or ask for the vote only for those in the combat zone.

People have said there is nothing magic about the age 21, but there is also nothing magic about the age of 18.

One of the arguments many have given for lowering the voting age is that young people are in school longer nowadays. But as a former college instructor, I would like to say that maturity, which ought to be one of the reasons for giving the right to vote, is not attained by those who have

never left the ivory tower. Maturity comes from getting out in the world and cutting one's own path.

I see no reason for lowering the voting age. There is a legend that Harry Truman used to say, when he was asked if he was in favor of lowering the voting age to 18, "Heck no"—or as close to "heck" as Harry Truman got—"It ought to be raised to 24." Now, I am a moderate on this position, and I am neither in favor of lowering the voting age to 18 nor raising it to 24. I think we ought to keep it at 21.

I believe we ought to vote down this resolution. We can do it. I hope next year or the year after, when the States do turn down this constitutional amendment—if it is passed, and I hope it is not—that we will come back and give some consideration at that time to the question of whether the people want to lower the voting age to 18. It is not inconceivable or impossible—in fact, it is the will of the people that we not do so. If we fail as legislators to consider the will of the people, we are acting in an absolutely unreasonable and unrealistic manner. I maintain then we are in pretty bad shape.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Supreme Court has upheld the constitutionality of allowing 18-year-olds to vote in national elections. Now it is only logical and right that we make 18-year-olds eligible to vote in State and local elections as well.

Last year when the Congress was considering legislating the 18-year-old vote by statute I favored that legislation although I also favored a constitutional amendment to accomplish that purpose. What I feared would happen if we took the statutory route came to pass. The Supreme Court decision permitting 18-year-old voting only in national elections has produced a chaotic situation.

We now must remedy that situation. We must move to bring order out of chaos by quickly—and overwhelmingly—approving a constitutional amendment lowering the voting age to 18 in all elections. In 1966 and again in 1970, I favored the State constitutional amendment in Michigan for the 18-year-old vote.

I am a cosponsor of the House resolution which would amend the constitution to lower the voting age to 18 in State and local as well as national elections.

The constitutional amendment before us affords today's youth a great opportunity to exercise its influence, to make its voice heard at all levels of Government. Our young people deserve that opportunity.

Today's young people are better educated and better informed than the generations that have gone before them through the same age span. I believe the vast majority of them are looking for a chance to work through the system to improve the quality of life in America.

Passage of this resolution will give our young people an opportunity and an obligation to take part in the political process. It is not enough to allow them to

vote in national elections. They must be fully enfranchised.

Passage of this resolution is one of the most important legislative acts we will take this year. It is an act of faith in the local political process.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MIZELL).

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I rise at this time to express my strong support for the proposed constitutional amendment to extend voting rights to young Americans between the ages of 18 and 21.

Last year, I was concerned that legislation by the Congress, giving the vote to 18-year-olds in all elections, might go beyond our constitutional limits.

The Supreme Court decided that this was indeed the case when it ruled last December that such legislation could be enforced in Federal elections, but that State governments still reserved the right to grant or deny voting rights to the under-21 age group in State and local elections.

Since that time, local election commissions have been in constant turmoil. Forty-eight of the fifty States under present conditions would be forced to compile two separate registration rolls and perhaps even two separate kinds of voting apparatus.

For this reason, I am glad to see we have finally decided to apply a constitutional remedy to a constitutional problem.

The young people of the Fifth District of North Carolina, which I am honored to represent, have proven themselves to be greatly concerned with the issues facing the Nation today, and just as concerned with finding reasonable and effective solutions to our problems. They believe, as I do and as the majority of young people throughout America do, that violent demonstrations are not only illegal—they are pointless and detrimental to constructive efforts that must be made to improve our national life.

I find it tragic that this fine generation of young people is too many times overshadowed by the misled and irresponsible minority that claims the headlines in our newspapers and the lead stories on our television news shows.

We are constantly exposed to drug addiction among the young, to juvenile delinquency and to the thousands of young people who march behind a Vietcong flag. But rarely do we hear about the young people who have excelled in sports or in scholastics or of those who are actively trying to do something about the Nation's social ills through the thousands of service organizations in our schools and churches.

I believe it is time to recognize that these young people are fully capable, by reason of education and improved mass communications, of casting well-informed and valuable expressions of opinions through the ballot box.

I am looking forward to election day, 1972, Mr. Chairman, when the vast majority of young people will prove that they are responsible and thoughtful individuals, and not radical in the least.

I welcome the opportunity to vote for

this constitutional amendment, and I hope State governments will join as quickly as possible in this movement to enfranchise 18-year-olds in Federal, State, and local elections by 1972.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I have considerable reservations about permitting 18-year-olds to vote and as the record will show, did vote against the provision in the Voting Rights Act last year to permit those between 18 to 21 to vote in Federal, State, and local elections. One basis for the vote at that time is a belief that voting age is a matter to be determined by the State rather than the Federal Government. In my opinion, the Constitution so provides. However, the Supreme Court has now decided that Congress by general legislation can regulate the voting age in Federal elections but not in State and local elections. The result of the recent decision of our highest Federal court is that there are two classes of voters and, apparently, those States which have not reduced the voting age to 18 must keep separate voting lists. Moreover, the counting of ballots would be complicated if the present condition of the law continues to exist. Therefore, I intend to support the present resolution which, when ratified by 38 States of the Union, will make uniform the voting age for citizens within our States as well as throughout the country. The action of the Supreme Court, in my opinion, has deprived us, as well as the individual States, of the opportunity to decide the question of whether 18-year-olds should vote on its merits. We have to approve the resolution to obtain orderly electoral procedure.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the passage of this resolution and its ratification by the State legislatures will provide a new dimension in the electoral process. The youth vote is an unknown factor to be dealt with. I believe it imposes an additional challenge on older adults and added responsibility upon them for the guidance and the direction of our youth. I understand that when this measure becomes effective the young people 18 to 21 will constitute approximately 8½ percent of the entire electorate. I would hope that they will be prepared to cast an intelligent and an informed vote—that they will study the issues—learn about the candidates and thereby will be able to vote responsibly. Older people have a responsibility to guide and direct our young people to assume this added responsibility, being mindful of the admonition to train up a child in the way he should go.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise to ask two questions. I think it is seldom that any constituency gives such a clear-cut mandate on any legislative issue as my State did on the 19-year-old vote when they voted better

than 2 to 1 in defeating that proposal last year when it was on the Oregon ballot.

The question I would like to direct to the gentleman from New York or to whomever wants to answer it is, first, we have a 30-day residency requirement for Federal elections. I presume any State would be able to establish any residency requirement it wishes for the State and local elections.

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MIKVA. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I believe that she is correct. Recent amendments to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 establish a 30-day ceiling on residency requirements for voting for President or Vice President.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, we are certainly in a hopeless mess, because the States will have dual election sheets and machinery and everything else for the Federal elections and for the local elections. It would be inconceivable to me that most States would have just a 30-day residency requirement for State and local elections. So, in fact, are we not still going to have dual or double election machinery for the Federal and the local elections whether or not we pass this amendment? My question goes not to the pros or cons of granting 18-year-olds the vote, but rather to the argument made that this amendment will eliminate dual election procedures at the polling booths.

Mr. MIKVA. If the gentlewoman will yield, there are several reasons why dual-voting-age requirements present more complex problems than dual residency requirements:

First, fewer local voters will be affected by the special presidential election residency requirements; approximately 2 million as compared to 10 million affected by this 18-to-21-year-old dichotomy.

Second, special residence requirements apply only every 4 years in presidential elections, whereas dual age qualifications apply every 2 years.

Third, 31 States already have special residency laws on elections for President and Vice President. Therefore, fewer States will have to revise their procedures to implement the new Federal requirements.

Finally, only one special ballot need be printed for statewide purposes to comply with special residence requirements for voting for President, but under a dual-age voting system, each congressional district would need a separate ballot.

What we are talking about here is actually running an election for two separate sets of voters, in effect two separate sets of elections, in every congressional district in the country, not just in States which have not adopted a 30-day residence requirement for voting for President and Vice President.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I accept the distinction between 2-year and the 4-year presidential elections. The gentleman is right there. But in terms of the 4-year elections it seems to me it would

require more than a dual registration list. As people come in to vote, would there not have to be dual procedures? Would they not have to maintain separate markoffs and everything else? Would they not need procedures for Federal elections requiring only 30-day residency separate from procedures for State and local elections requiring 3 or 6 months' residency?

Mr. MIKVA. I would say that 31 States have previously adopted a special residency requirement for voting in presidential elections and have been functioning under it with very little difficulty. My own State of Illinois had that in the 1968 election and had no difficulty with it whatsoever. However, county officials in Illinois estimate if we do not correct the present age dichotomy there would be some \$6 million in additional cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. My second question pertains to college towns. I wonder if the committee discussed this. We have many towns in the United States that have populations of a few thousand and have student bodies of 15,000 or 20,000 population or even more. If the vote is extended to the 18-year-olds then it is conceivable that the student body composed largely of 18- to 21-year-olds, could outvote the permanent residents who own the property and are left with the responsibility to pay the taxes and assume all other responsibilities required by the vote. I am not saying they are going to be irresponsible, but there is this possibility, is there not; and has that been discussed?

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MIKVA. There was discussion on this question earlier in the debate; that is, what the States and local governments will decide to do about college students. There is nothing in this proposed new article of amendment which requires States to pass any residency requirement whatever.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. But if it is lowered to 18 these are very special problems for small college towns.

Mr. MIKVA. We do not affect residency requirements. That issue is left to the States and local governments, as it is now.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I understand that. Regardless of the residency, whether it is 30 days or 6 months, if the vote age is now lowered to 18, we would find that the college voting population of X college in many places, many towns, would have far more votes than the people who live in the town and own the property and carry the burden.

Mr. MIKVA. If they satisfy the residency requirement of that town obviously they would be entitled to vote. I would point out to the gentlewoman that at present if they satisfy the residency requirement those over the age of 21 are allowed to vote and in many college towns that group also is a majority.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. To change the voting age from 21 to 18 would change the composition of the voting group immeasurably.

Mr. MIKVA. It is up to the residency requirement established by local governments and State governments. They make that decision.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The Baker amendment would help by requiring 18-year-olds at the same time that they receive the vote to assume all the responsibilities required of other adult citizens. I hope the Baker amendment will be approved. It just makes sense to me that the vote is a right that must be associated with responsibilities. I believe that the Baker amendment would be a significant help to Oregonians, and to the Oregon Legislature in particular, in deciding whether to ratify in the face of last year's rejection of the 19-year-old vote by such a large majority.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH).

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this proposed constitutional amendment.

I have supported the concept of extending the franchise to 18-year-olds for a number of years. I supported the Voting Rights Act of 1970, which included a provision to legalize this concept. I voted with the majority of the House Committee on the Judiciary to favorably report this amendment to the floor.

The history of America has been one of a steady broadening and deepening of the franchise. Over the years, more and more of our people have been given the rights and responsibilities of self-government through the ballot. I feel the good which over the years will flow from passage of this amendment will enrich our land quite as much as our society has been enriched by the energy, ability, and public awareness of women which flowed from passage of the 19th amendment after which House Joint Resolution 223 was modeled.

In my view, passage of the amendment is also essential to clear up a number of problems which have arisen from last year's passage of the Voting Rights Act. The intent of that act was to give the vote to 18-year-olds in all States in all elections. The problem arose when the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that the voting age provisions of this act could constitutionally apply only to Federal elections while States would continue to set voting age requirements for State and local elections. Thus for the first time, a dual election system has been created in this country.

The complications arising from the creation of such a dual system are many. The cost to States and localities to create dual voting procedures is staggering. Yet, even should every State move at maximum speed to adjust their State constitutions to fit the new Federal voting age standard established by the 1970 Voting Rights Act and the Supreme Court decision, some 22 States could not legally make such a change prior to the 1972 Federal elections, the first time 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds will vote and the earliest the problems caused by the creation

of this dual standard will affect the 50 States.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that passage of House Joint Resolution 223 is the correct method to do two things: First, clear up the problems arising from the present dual voting system; and, second, properly and legally enfranchise all 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds in our country. If this amendment is passed by a two-thirds majority of both Houses of Congress, and is then passed by three-quarters of the State legislatures, every American in any State when he or she reaches 18 will have a voice in his government, not only on the Federal level as provided by the Voting Rights Act of 1970, but on the important State and local levels also.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. TIERNAN).

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON).

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, the time has come for this Congress and the States to grant to 18-year-olds the right to vote in all Federal, State, and local elections. Enactment of the proposed constitutional amendment now before the House will complete the job begun by the 91st Congress when it established, through the Voting Rights Act of 1970, the 18-year-old vote in Federal elections.

To grant 18-year-olds the right to vote in State and local elections is a matter of simple justice. In our country today young people have adult responsibilities in almost all aspects of life. Many of them are married and raising families, working for a living, paying taxes, and serving in the Armed Forces. In fact, over 3 million people of age 18 to 21 are full time employees and taxpayers. Because they are so active and involved in the affairs of our society, the decisions of Government have a great impact upon their lives. They ought logically to have a role in the making of these decisions.

There is not, I believe, any question about the maturity or competence of these young people. Surely they could not shoulder all of the responsibilities I have mentioned if they did not possess sound judgment. Those of age 18 to 21 are also better educated now than they have ever been before. Nearly 80 percent of them have high school diplomas, and more than half are receiving some form of higher education. And so it is clear that young people deserve the vote, and are able to exercise this right with judgment and intelligence.

Another major reason for adopting this amendment is a very practical one. If the States are forced to establish dual registration and voting systems, the costs both in financial terms and in terms of added confusion and paperwork will be tremendous. Under present law, separate procedures for those 18 to 21 would be needed, as they are eligible to

vote only for President, U.S. Senator, and Congressman. It has been estimated that the extra cost to the States will be \$20 million per year, and Governor Gilligan has stated that Ohio will have to spend \$750,000 to comply with the new law. But more important than the extra cost is the fact that such complications in the voting process will inevitably discourage from voting many who otherwise would have cast a ballot. We in Congress ought to now rectify this situation before any harmful effects are felt.

For the above reasons, I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting for the amendment to lower the voting age to 18.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to offer my support to the joint resolution which will submit to the States a constitutional amendment extending the right to vote in all elections to citizens 18 years of age or older.

A constitutional amendment ought to be neither frivolous nor marginal in its scope and consequences. An amendment ought, moreover, to be neither impulsive nor fadish. In this instance we are considering an amendment which is broad in its reach, integral to the very conceptions of citizenship and the public interest, and deeply pondered and thoroughly debated over a number of years. And it comes at a moment of history when the extension of the vote to age 18 is fully commensurate with the responsibilities and obligations undertaken by those aged 18 to 21. By every measure an 18-year-old is entitled to the right to vote. I support it unreservedly.

Apart from the powerful arguments inherently favoring this constitutional updating, there are strong practical reasons for action now. The 18-year-old vote in Federal elections is an established fact, reinforced by the recent decision of the Supreme Court. To have now dual systems of voting whereby there are different voting lists for national and local elections makes no sense. Such a system is expensive, cumbersome, and disruptive. In the next Federal election alone, the additional cost in Iowa would run as much as \$150,000 in addition to much higher registration costs. Nor could action by the State alone remedy the two-track system earlier than the 1976 election.

In these circumstances, we owe over 130,000 Iowa citizens newly eligible to vote in Federal elections an equal opportunity to vote in State and local contests.

All of us know that 21 is not a magical formula. Its origins as a cutoff point are obsolescent. No one today seriously believes that we should continue to adhere to an 11th century standard that a young man cannot become a participating member of society until he is strong enough to wear a suit of armor, a strength generally not attained until the age of 21. Today, the large majority of 18-year-olds are high school graduates, more than half are in or soon to enter college, and all are potentially eligible for military service. Of the 11 million 18- to 21-year-olds, almost 1½ million are serving in the Armed Forces, more than 3 million hold full-time jobs,

more than 8 million pay taxes. Practically all are considered adult in the eyes of the law; the vast majority are contributing to and participating actively in our society. And no one who visits our schools and colleges can doubt the depth and breadth of interest which an unprecedented large number of students have in public affairs and the issue which elections help to decide. I have no question in my mind that the vote beginning at 18 will add vitality to the political process and stimulate those of us in public office to higher and wider standards of accountability and performance.

We know from some of our States and from some countries abroad that a lowered voting age fully accords with the realities of our contemporary society. We know too that the energies and idealism of young people find new channels of constructive expression and participation and that the common interest is enlarged. We know finally the reservoir of ability and public vision which is ready for release. We have this opportunity today. Let us act upon it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment giving 18-year-olds the right to vote in State and local elections. I support it, because I believe it is right. It is a goal that I have worked for over a great number of years. We need the energy, vision, dedication, and commitment of young people if we are to continue to build a viable democratic society in America. There is ample justification for allowing the nearly 11.5 million young Americans to vote in State and local elections, particularly since Congress gave them the right to vote for Federal officials under terms of the Voting Rights Act of 1970.

The great majority of our young people are mature and responsible citizens. They are the most highly educated of any generation in our Nation's history. Nearly 1 million young men and women from 18 through 20 are serving with honor in the Armed Forces of our Nation. More than 3 million work at full-time jobs, and countless others serve as part-time employees. They are considered adults by State penal codes.

While we do not have voting with us today our distinguished Speaker John McCormack, I am sure that he would be a strong advocate of this legislation. He was one of the most outspoken leaders for voting reform during his years here in Congress. I remember well his articulate support of a similar measure last year. I know that he still maintains this conviction. The gentleman from Massachusetts may have retired but he is young at heart and in spirit and is concerned for those young in years.

I am honored to be able to align myself with this great American on this issue of such importance to so many of our young people.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, our Nation teaches in its schools and professes to believe that Americans are a people who know freedom, opportunity, equality, and justice under the law. To deny to 11.5 million Americans between the ages of 18 and 21 the full right to

vote is to be inconsistent with these cherished beliefs.

I stand in support of the amendment to lower the voting age.

The distinction our society makes between its citizens before and after their 21st birthday is at best an arbitrary one, based on irrational medieval practices. It has no true place in a modern society. The retention of 21 as the standard voting age without contemporary justification of any sort, serves only to underscore the lack of faith in our institutions so prevalent among the young.

To those of you who ask "Why 18?" we say that 18 is the year that many Americans truly come of age. It is the year in which 4.1 million Americans enter the full-time labor force, being taxed regularly without representation. At 18, 800,000 Americans become eligible for conscription into the armed services, without a voice representing them in every avenue of government. The 18-year-olds are subject to the full criminal law of 49 States, without an opportunity to shape that law.

Recognized as adults by the military, the Federal Civil Service, and insurance companies, among others, 11.5 million Americans between 18 and 21 can no longer be told that they are ineligible for what the Constitution mandates for those with whom they share equal social, economic, and legal status.

We are concerned here with a unique generation. Today 18-year-olds are far better prepared for the tasks and responsibilities of citizenship than any past generation of any nation. They are better equipped physically and intellectually. They are politically aware to a remarkable degree. It is the young of this Nation who are challenging the practices and the empty rhetoric of Government; our young people who have manned the Peace Corps and VISTA programs; who have galvanized the civil rights movement; who have brought the disaster of Vietnam to the forefront of national debate; who, last April 22, dramatically warned us that there is precious little time remaining to save our environment.

Their ideas and actions, their maturity and compassion have represented the best in us. Their desire to influence the system is deeply held and utterly sincere. We must not, through an inability to relate to the urgent needs and demands of the times, force them to seek alternative means to this legitimate influence on institutions and events. They must not be denied the most equitable, rational way for their voice and commitments to be heard, at the polls. While their interests, ideals, and energies are at their very peak, they must be allowed to express their views, at the polls, in local, State, and national political contests and debate.

We recognize that there exists, as evidenced by the actions of the 91st Congress, a broad-based consensus of support for the extension of voting rights to 18-year-olds. In the last session, by amendment to the 1970 Voting Rights Act, the franchise was granted to all citizens of 18 years of age in all elections.

On December 10, 1970, the Supreme Court, in Oregon against Mitchell, sustained the act, insofar as it applied to national elections, but ruled that Congress could not legislate the voting standards for State and local elections.

The Court's ruling left this Nation with a choice between two distinct courses of action: Separate measures by the individual States to lower the voting age, or an amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

To leave this issue to the hands of the individual States is to invite chaos, confusion, delay, and added expense, which few States, confronted by fiscal crisis, can afford. A significant segment of the 18- to 21-year-old citizens might not be granted the franchise for some time to come. More than 20 States could not amend their constitutions prior to November 1972. Separate absentee ballots, registration list, and voting rolls would be required. Additional staff personnel, new voting machines, separate voting booths or polling places for 18-year-olds would also have to be provided. This wasteful and confusing duplication would be expensive as well. It is estimated that the procedures would cost Connecticut \$1.3 million, New Jersey \$1.5 million, St. Louis \$2.5 million, New York City \$5 million. Similar costs would be incurred across the Nation. For at least these States and probably more, 1972 election procedures would be chaotic as well as expensive.

Moreover, if some States lowered the voting age to 18 while others did not, the basic democratic right to vote in all elections would be determined by where the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds lived. A young person in one State would be able to vote in all elections, while his counterpart of equal age in a neighboring State could participate only in national elections, fully qualified to elect a President and a Vice President, but not a mayor or a city councilman. The cost, the chaos, and the confusion of this course of action, coupled with its inequities make it clearly unacceptable. For this to take place in America would be a clear mockery of our democratic principles.

A constitutional amendment is the only viable solution. It would apply the 18-year-old voting standard to every State. Passage now, while there is still time for three-fourths of the State legislatures to insure ratification before the 1972 elections is the simplest procedure for establishing uniform voting rights throughout this Nation, and for signaling to all of America that indeed we in the Congress are beginning to listen. I urge my colleagues to support passage of this amendment.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 223, the constitutional amendment to allow 18-year-olds to vote in State and local elections.

I know that some Members have and will focus on the additional costs of not allowing 18-year-olds to vote in State and local elections. The costs of separate voting booths or paper ballots for 18-year-olds permitted to vote in Federal, but not State and local elections is admittedly

high; but the issue for me goes beyond these costly mechanical problems. I believe that our Nation will be strengthened by the extension of the 18-year-old vote.

It is this belief that convinced me that my first legislative act in Congress would be to introduce a bill to extend the vote for 18-year-olds in State and local elections. At this point in my statement, I include my speech made when I introduced my bill:

A JOINT RESOLUTION ALLOWING 18-YEAR-OLD CITIZENS TO VOTE IN LOCAL AND STATE ELECTIONS

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, today with a number of my colleagues, I am introducing a joint resolution that will enfranchise our 18-year-old citizens for local and State elections.

I am aware that reasonable men have honest differences over the advisability of allowing our younger citizens to vote. The Congress in the last session passed a bill which was upheld by the Supreme Court that enfranchised our young citizens for Federal and State elections.

The Supreme Court taking a narrow view of the Constitution limitations struck down the provision of that part of the act that enfranchised the young voters for State and local elections. I do not question the authority of the High Court to strike down this section of the Voting Rights Act, but I do feel that the Congress has the obligation to place this crucial subject before the American people again. This time, the means will be a constitutional amendment.

The State and local governmental units are the most readily accessible to our citizens. It seems to be contradictory to allow these young citizens to vote for national elections and deny them the ballot for State and local elections. A responsible Government must have the participation of all the citizens.

By 1972, it is estimated that 11.5 million citizens will be between 18 and 21. This is 8 percent of the voting population. The influx of young voters has been treated by some people as a plague that must be stopped. I disagree.

The concept of participatory democracy—which has served us so well for almost 200 years—will be strengthened by the addition of young voters. My contact with young people has convinced me that on balance their idealism and concern will be beneficial to the myriad of problems that now confront our local governmental institutions.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, this body has officially gone on record in support of the right of 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds to vote in Federal elections. That right now must be extended to all elections through the constitutional amendment procedure.

There is little doubt that this group of young people today are quite capable of handling the obligations of citizenship. They have fought honorably and well in a difficult war in Southeast Asia. The vast majority have worked for responsible change in our society within the framework provided by law.

Now we must extend their ability to contribute to building a better America by permitting them to participate in State and local elections.

The passage of the 18-year-old voting law last year and its subsequent approval by the Supreme Court for Federal elections caused tremendous havoc for State election officials. Most States are faced

with setting up dual election rolls—one for Federal elections and one for State elections. Also separate polling booths will probably be needed in many locations.

Several States are now seeking approval of 18-year-old voting rights under State law. However, in numerous cases the procedure is too cumbersome to assure action in time for the 1972 elections. The constitutional amendment route would still permit adequate protection of the rights of the States while at the same time speeding up the changeover process.

I have personally met with numerous young people in my district and have found them to be fully ready to handle the responsibilities of participatory democracy. In fact by extending this right to the local level, I would venture to say that the youth of America will see this avenue as a far more successful means to change our society for the better.

The resulting challenge by our young people and their ideas might even increase the participation in the political process by our more apathetic adults. In the final analysis, I am convinced that this amendment will result in an improvement in the quality of government and politics in America.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, in the United States the right to determine who shall represent the people and thus who shall make the policy decisions which effect the people is the keystone of our democracy. Since we do not have a direct democracy, the closest each citizen may come to shaping policy decisions is to vote for those candidates who most closely share his philosophy of government, his approach to solving problems, or his stated position on selected issues.

The issue before us today will not change our principles, only our application of those principles. What we seek is to establish a uniform, constructive, and just standard to determine who shall and shall not vote in relation to the age of the individual.

House Joint Resolution 223 would establish the age level at which all qualified citizens may vote at 18 years of age. By statute this has been established as the age requirement in all Federal elections. However, in the 50 States there is no uniform standard for age. Ratification of this constitutional amendment by the States would bring about a uniformity in this respect.

This constitutional amendment would also bring about another significant change in that it would bring into balance the age at which our citizens may responsibly participate in determining those laws. In recent years this argument has been put forward by those who have reasoned "If a young man is old enough to die for his country, he is old enough to vote." I do not reject this argument, but I feel that it does not lend itself to uniform application. It is similar to treating a symptom of disease and ignoring both the disease and its cause.

At 18 years of age each citizen is held to be responsible for his actions before the law and is treated as an adult. It is unimportant whether this is a draft law which affects only the male population,

or the income tax which pays for the system of priorities established by the people's elected representatives, or the criminal law which regulates the relation of the individual to society. What is important is that not just one, but every facet of the individual's life is regulated by his elected representatives and he is accountable for his observance of these standards at age 18.

To bring the age of responsibility into alignment with the age of accountability would go a long way in making our present system more just and more productive. We must give those individuals who are affected by a governmental decision a chance to participate in the making of that decision. We must do this not simply because it is just, although it is, but because it provides those who must make the decision with the most comprehensive view of the ramifications of their decision.

An example where this has proven to be a workable approach to decisionmaking may be seen on the college campuses of the Nation. It is ironical that this is also the place where the opponents of the 18-year-old vote choose to point. However, both sides look at different results of the same overall picture. In those universities where students have little or no say in the policy development of the university there has been a significantly greater incidence of violence than in those universities where the students have an effective means to communicate their viewpoints to those who make policy.

There is a great similarity between a college where the student does not make the decision but knows his viewpoint has been fully considered and a State or Federal Government where an elected representative makes the decision on the basis of the views expressed by his constituents at the ballot box. The ratification of this constitutional amendment has the potential to greatly lessen the tension of the younger members of our society which has resulted from the practice of holding them accountable without allowing them responsible participation. At present there is no effective way for those individuals between the age of 18 and 21 to directly relate to the Government officers who make the decisions which affect them. In the past this has led to indifference, alienation, and rebellion. It has led to demonstrations as a means of communication, because it was the only means available.

The desire to be heard, the desire to participate in a meaningful way, and the desire to share responsibilities are not something new that has come from those seeking the vote at age 18. It is a phenomenon that has occurred repeatedly throughout our history each time a minority of citizens has been excluded from participation in their government. It has appeared in the past in terms of religion, race, and sex. It appears now as a matter of justice and good sound government in the form of age. I urge all my colleagues to join me in setting aside this unjust barrier to participation in our Government as we turned aside other barriers in the past.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman,

the House this week has the opportunity to vote on a constitutional amendment of major importance—the enfranchisement of 18-year-olds for all elections.

On January 14, 1971, I joined with three other House colleagues in asking for cosponsors to this amendment. More than 90 House Members put their names on the amendment during the first few weeks of the year. The Congress has acted quickly, and, if the amendment passes the House, the States will be able to ratify it in time for the 1972 elections. As we all know, the Senate voted unanimously last week to pass this measure. I am confident that the House will demonstrate its overwhelming approval this week.

There should be no argument against the 18-year-old vote. The 18-year-olds are mature enough to vote. Our choice of age 21 is the result of an 11th century edict that 21 was the age at which most males were capable of carrying armor. We are sending men far younger to fight an unconscionable war in Southeast Asia. Their armor is more modern, but the principle is the same.

There are more than 11 million 18- to 21-year-olds in this country today. About half of these are married and more than 1 million are raising families. An additional 1,400,000 are in the Armed Forces and thousands have died so far in Indochina.

Today, more than 3 million people ages 18 to 21 are full-time employees and taxpayers. As former Attorney General Ramsey Clark has stated:

We subject 10-12 million young citizens between 17 and 21 years of age to taxation without representation. This is four times the population of the Colonies the night the tea was dumped in Boston harbor. . . . It exceeds the population of all but several of the States of the Union.

If we believe that we have the right to ask those between 18 and 21 to pay taxes, support the Government, and die in an undeclared war, then we owe them the right to a direct, constructive, and democratic channel for making their views felt and for giving them a stake in the future of the country.

The fight for the 18-year-old vote is not a recent phenomenon. In my State of Massachusetts a constitutional amendment was introduced in the general court in 1943 to lower the age to 18. It died in committee. Similar proposals were reported favorably, but did not come to the floor vote in 1951, failed in committee in 1952, and were again favorably reported, but did not come to the floor in 1953.

In his annual message of January 6, 1954, Gov. Christian Herter endorsed the move to extend the vote to 18-year-olds. In the same year, the proposal reached the floor of the State senate, but was defeated. In 1955, a similar measure was taken as far as the joint session of the general court only to fail. Similar attempts were made in years following, but with no success until 1970.

In 1970, the general court acted favorably for the required second time on a proposed amendment for 19-year-olds and the citizens of the State ratified the amendment at the polls. Thus, Massa-

chusetts has a 19-year-old vote in all elections, and an 18-year-old vote in national elections. The general court also last year gave first approval to the 18-year-old vote. They must approve it again, and again set it before the voters. Such a procedure is expensive, unnecessary and complicated. Even if it succeeds, 18-year-olds will not be allowed to vote until January 1, 1973. We can solve part of the problem today by passing the constitutional amendment.

The Supreme Court decision declaring that 18-year-olds have the right to vote in national, but not State elections has created a chaotic and expensive problem. For instance, it has been estimated that it will cost New York City an additional \$5 million to print, distribute, and count the separate ballots which will be needed in the 1972 election if the constitutional amendment before us today is not passed and ratified by the necessary number of States.

Even with its 19-year-old voting age, Massachusetts still has almost 100,000 voters who are 18 and would thus be precluded from voting on the State level. It has been estimated that new ballots for younger voters should not cost more than \$40,000. But Massachusetts is one of the luckier States. Nevertheless, unless we pass the amendment before us today, Massachusetts 18-year-olds will have no chance of voting on the State level in 1972.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the time has come now to extend the franchise to 18-year-olds in all elections. They are mature enough. They have earned the right to vote by the fact that they are responsible citizens. Our society has much to gain by bringing the force of the idealism and concern and energy of the 18-year-olds into the constructive mechanism of elective government. I look forward to voting for this amendment.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the proposal before us today for a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age nationwide to 18 for all elections.

It is vital that the House favorably pass on this measure in hopes that States will have sufficient time to ratify the proposed amendment in time for the 1972 elections. As we all know, the last Congress extended the franchise to citizens 18 years of age and older in both Federal and State elections with passage of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970. However, the Supreme Court held this legislation to be unconstitutional as it applied to State elections, necessitating a constitutional change to fulfill Congress' original intent.

In the meantime, the Court decision has presented most of the State with a dilemma. The constitutional amendment proposal is essential for my State of Connecticut, even though the State's electorate turned down by a small margin a State referendum on the issue this past November, as we must now consider the utter confusion and substantial cost of maintaining dual balloting procedures resulting from the Court decision. The Connecticut General Assembly substan-

tiated its concern for passage of this amendment proposal on March 3 by becoming the first legislature in the Nation to approve a resolution memorializing the Congress to amend the Constitution to lower the voting age to 18.

I have watched with great pride the development of the 18-year-old vote issue through the continuing efforts of many young people in my State as well as throughout the country. The cogent arguments which to me have long established the validity and justice of enfranchising 18- to 20-year-olds still apply. However, at this time the crucial need for successful passage of this amendment proposal must go beyond the ideal to the reality of unnecessary additional State government spending and impending confusion at the polls if the Constitution is not amended on the 18-year-old vote issue before the 1972 elections.

The young people of America are looking with hope to the House of Representatives today to register a vote of confidence in the ability of our Nation's youth to meaningfully participate in the decision-making process in our democracy which affects all our lives. I am sure they will not be disappointed.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18 in State, local, and Federal elections.

I have long favored granting the vote to 18-year-olds across the country, and in light of the recent Supreme Court decision, the action we are taking today, in amending the Constitution, is clearly necessary and germane.

There is a lot to be said for extending the vote to 18-year-olds. Their qualifications, in my view, are as strong as 21-year-olds; they are knowledgeable, they are deeply concerned, they are just as interested in, and more willing to directly participate in, the political processes, than many of their elders.

Above all, 18-year-olds are just as closely affected by the policies of their Government as are their parents and their grandparents. "Old Enough to Fight: Old Enough to Vote" still holds—perhaps poignantly, when viewed in relation to many of the 50,000 Americans who have died in Southeast Asia but who have never cast a ballot for the country they gave their life for.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to pass this amendment, and to grant 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds the rights that have been too long denied them.

The 18-year-old vote can start to make our system of Government truly responsive and it will help dissolve the distrust many hold.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, in the wake of the Supreme Court decision affirming the right of 18-year-olds to vote in Federal, but not State or local elections, it is imperative that Congress act quickly to pass a constitutional amendment granting them suffrage in all elections. President Johnson proposed such an amendment in 1968. I was proud to give it my strong support then, and

I am happy to be the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 195, identical to the bill now before the House.

There are basically two crucially important reasons behind the urgent need for granting the vote to our 18-year-old citizens. One is philosophical or moral; the other practical.

First, our democratic society is committed to the notion that government must be as representative of, and responsive to, its citizens as possible. Thus we have seen the extension of the franchise during our history to the unpropertied, to women, and to minority groups.

It is a simple fact that our young citizens today are mentally and emotionally capable of full participation in our democratic form of government. Today, more than half of the 18-to-21-year-olds are receiving some type of higher education. Nearly 80 percent of these young people are high school graduates. They are more knowledgeable and aware of the issues and processes of government than any previous generation.

Furthermore, today's 18-to-21-year-olds already bear all or most of an adult citizen's responsibilities. About half are married, and more than a million of them have children. Another 1,400,000 are serving their country—serving all of us—in the Armed Forces.

More than 3,000,000 are full-time employees and taxpayers, subjected to taxation without representation. In 26 States persons of 18 years can make wills. In every State except California, they are treated as adults in criminal courts.

Surely, a citizen's rights in our society ought to be commensurate with his responsibilities. By their willingness to shoulder adult responsibilities, our young citizens between the ages of 18 and 21 have clearly earned the right to vote in all elections. Furthermore, they have a great deal to contribute to our society. We must channel their idealism and concern for the important issues of our time into our political system and give young people real opportunities to influence our society in a peaceful and constructive manner.

Practically speaking, it is absurd to maintain that young people are mature enough to vote in Federal elections, but not in State or local elections. All of the arguments advanced in favor of lowering the voting age apply with equal force to State and local elections. Indeed, many of the areas in which young people have expressed the greatest interest—for example, the quality of education and the state of the environment—are primarily matters of local concern.

Second, the administrative problems of creating and maintaining a dual system of voting raise the danger of profound confusion, delay, and added expense in the electoral process. In the 47 States which have not yet extended the franchise to 18-year-olds, separate systems of registration and voting must be established for nearly 10 percent of the previous voting-age population—more than 10 million young people. Many State legislatures have already begun

action to lower their voting age to 18 years, but only eight expect to complete action in time for the 1972 elections. Thus, a Federal constitutional amendment offers the only realistic hope for 18-year-olds voting in the State and local elections of 1972.

I am convinced that the time has come to lower the voting age to 18 in every election across the land—because it is right to do so. And, if the many problems of dual-age voting force us to confront the question more promptly, so much the better. I urge my colleagues to complete action on this bill at the earliest possible date, so that the amendment may soon be sent to the States for early ratification.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support House Joint Resolution 223 to lower the voting age to 18 for all elections. As the sponsor of a similar resolution, House Joint Resolution 146, I have long held the opinion that our antiquated and arbitrary 21-year-old limit should be changed.

Today, thanks to what the Supreme Court left of the Voting Rights Act of 1970, all 18-year-olds can vote in elections for Federal office. Now, in order to extend this privilege to all elections—local and State—and in order to avoid the costly and inevitably confusing dual system of voting in 1972, we must adopt this resolution calling for a constitutional amendment.

The young people of our country certainly possess the maturity to vote. They also possess the mental and emotional capabilities to exercise their voting privilege. Presently, over half of the 18- to 21-year-olds are receiving some form of higher education. Over 75 percent of them are high school graduates. This contrasts with 1920 figures when only 20 percent were high school graduates.

Eighteen-year-olds bear most of the adult responsibilities today. Of the 11 million young citizens we are discussing today, over half are married. A million and a half are serving in the Armed Forces. In the majority of States, 18-year-olds can make wills. In 49 States, they are treated as adults by criminal courts. The inconsistency of the logic that a young person is an adult when he may commit a crime but he is not to be considered an adult in the electoral process is patently obvious.

Most importantly, Mr. Chairman, these young people can make a great contribution to our political system and society. The headlines are grabbed by some violent, troublemaking youths—who comprise such a very small percentage of the young population. The overwhelming majority of these people are engaged in peaceful, thoughtful attempts to better our society. They are striving for the ideals of peace, understanding and a perfect environment. We need these people and their ideals and we need them in our system. We must let them know that their voices can and are being heard. We cannot afford to shut them out.

Aside from the merits of letting 18-year-olds vote, we have the problem of establishing a dual system of voting. Pragmatically, how can we expect the

States of the Union to run a dual system in 1972. Eighteen-year-olds will be able to line up for President but not for Governor. It is estimated that the costs involved may run up to \$20 million. As it is now, election officials have a difficult time handling the voters during the peak hours in the morning and late afternoon. Without the adoption of this resolution, I see long lines of people waiting at the polling places all day long—confused, tired, and upset.

I trust that the 50 State legislatures will act promptly to correct this inconsistency in voting rights and by 1972, 18-year-olds will be able to vote in all elections.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the constitutional amendment which will extend the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older.

As you may recall, I opposed legislation in the 91st Congress which would have allowed the 18-year-old vote. I argued at that time that the Congress lacked power to accomplish this change by statute and that it was taking a short-sighted detour by trying to lower the voting age by legislation. I opposed the legislation because it would have forced the various States to maintain dual registrations and imposed additional complications and expenses of the States in the conduct and holding of elections.

A constitutional amendment is the proper legal procedure, however, under which the several States still maintain the right to ratify the change while eliminating substantial administrative burdens and costs which would otherwise be incurred by the States and avoiding the dangers of uncertainty, delay, and confusion inherent in such a system.

Would that the Congress had approved this constitutional approach last year.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, last year the Congress saw fit to give the vote to those citizens between the ages of 18 and 21. The Supreme Court interpreted this right of the franchise to apply in Federal but not State and local elections because, the Court said, Congress could not establish a voting age for the States except by constitutional amendment.

That decision has posed what could become a confusing and expensive problem for many States and localities. A solution to that problem is the proposed amendment we are considering in the House today which would amend the Constitution to give the franchise to those 18 years or older in all elections. In the interest of ending the confusion and warding off the probability of separate elections for Federal, State, and local officials, it is important that this amendment be acted upon soon by the Congress, and ratified by the State legislatures.

Officials have estimated that the cost of conducting separate elections would be in the neighborhood of \$10-\$20 million. This burden would have to be assumed by the States, with no guarantee that it could not be greater.

These enormous costs result largely from the large amount of paperwork involved. Some State officials also say that along with the added paperwork, they might have to add new voting machines,

or else use other voting methods such as paper ballots.

If we do not act to correct this confusion, 47 of our States would require special procedures for the voters between the ages of 18 and 21, who make up 10 percent of these States' previous voting age population.

Among these procedures are the mixed use of paper ballots and voting machines for different age groups, or special "lock out" systems which would allow for the polling place to adjust the voting machine to the qualifications of the voter. Unfortunately these systems have a drawback which is inherent when standard voting systems are tampered with—the possibility of voting error and election fraud.

Even if we overlook these potential problems we cannot ignore the fact that in registering and taking ballots from an electorate which has two different sets of qualifications, voters could face delays of a major sort, delays which in the end could reduce the number of our citizens who exercise their right to vote.

That is the exact opposite of what democracy is all about.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, lowering the voting age to 18 has, in recent years, gained broad, national support from all segments of the political and ideological spectrum. Responding and participating in the emerging consensus, the 91st Congress enacted title III of the Voting Rights Act of 1970, lowering the voting age to 18 in all Federal, State, and local elections, primary and general. However, on December 21, 1970, under the constitutional interpretation that Congress lacks power to lower the voting age by Federal statute in State and local elections, the Supreme Court, in *Oregon against Mitchell*, ruled that the Voting Rights Act is constitutional only insofar as it applies to Federal election. Since December, the decision has been considered a grave obstacle to the reality of 18-year-old vote.

However, the *Oregon against Mitchell* court decision must not be misinterpreted. The decision was a block to the extension of congressional power into the States—it was not meant to be a block against the general principle of lowering the voting age to 18. Consequently, today the question of allowing 18-year-olds to vote is no longer a question of whether, but of when and how.

Very few will contend that people who may already vote for the President should not have the power to vote for county sheriff or State assemblyman. All of the arguments in favor of lowering the voting age are equally as applicable to State and local elections as to Federal elections.

If young people are mature enough to vote on Federal issues, they are no less mature in State and local issues. If young people have earned the right to vote by bearing the Federal responsibilities of citizenship, they have borne no less of State and local responsibilities. If we need the energy and idealism of the young channeled into elective politics, we need it no less at the State and local level. Many feel that the young people's concerns of environment, civil rights,

and education are in fact more relevant to the local and State levels.

Thus, the problem is no longer one of philosophical preferences, but only of the mechanism needed to insure a uniform voting age by 1972. Since the Supreme Court determined the Voting Rights Act to be applicable only to Federal elections, a prodigious burden has been placed on State and local officials due to the dual-age system of registration and voting. The system will be "confusing, expensive, and subject to other serious problems." First of all, special, separate facilities and procedures will have to be developed for younger voters who are eligible only to vote in Federal elections. This will not be a small task—47 States will have to deal specially with at least 10 million potential voters. This separation of voters into two classes will have to be done in at least two different stages—at registration and each time the voters come to the polls. Thus, this dual system of voting will cause much confusion for poll workers, cause deficiencies in the use of voting machines and cause an increase in the time it takes to vote.

Adding to this burden of confusion and work, put upon the States, will be the burden of increased expense. Oregon Attorney General Lee Johnson assessed the expense to be basically of two types:

Initial expenses for new physical equipment required to handle two classes of voters, and the ongoing expenses of sustaining and maintaining two sets of registration books, election supervisors, and the like.

The costs will naturally vary from State to State, but election officials now suggest that the nationwide cost involved is no less than \$10 to \$20 million. In California alone, it is estimated that the cost to keep separate files for under-21 voters and over-21 voters will be an additional \$5 million.

Obviously, this chaotic and expensive situation in the States must be alleviated. The dual-age system must be terminated before the 1972 election. Presently, such termination is being left up to the States. In almost all the States, it would take a State constitutional amendment to lower the voting age. However, very few of the 47 States consider it possible to complete such action in time for the 1972 elections. Only eight States reported that it would be possible to lower their voting age by amending the State constitution before the 1972 elections. Only eight States reported that it would be possible to lower their voting age by amending the State constitution before the 1972 election without resorting to some extraordinary procedure such as a specially called election.

As I see it, an amendment to the Federal Constitution remains the only realistic possibility of lowering the voting age to 18 for all elections before 1972. Currently, it appears that at least 35 State legislatures are required by law to meet in 1972; and another five legislatures could easily meet without the calling of a special session. The time is late—very late—but there is still enough time to accomplish the necessary amendment

procedures prior to State and Federal elections in 1972. In the past, constitutional amendments have often been ratified in a year or less. For example, the 12th amendment was ratified in 8 months and the 23d amendment was ratified in 9 months.

As a matter of constitutional law, the Supreme Court's decision may have been correct; however, the result is morally indefensible. There is no basis whatsoever in policy or in logic for denying young citizens the right to vote in State and local elections. As Theodore Sorensen so aptly stated:

The very essence of democracy requires that its electoral base be as broad as the standards of fairness and logic permit.

In all fairness and logic, the U.S. Constitution must be amended in order to assure the equality of 18-year vote in local, State, and Federal elections.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering a question vital to the growth and expanded participation in our national life by a knowledgeable, thoughtful, concerned group of citizens—those 18 to 21 years old.

As part of my experience as a Member of Congress, I have had the pleasure of meeting, talking with, and answering the questions of hundreds of young people in this age group. These conversations have reinforced my belief that the majority of today's 18-year-olds are equally, or more, constructively aware, concerned, and serious about the state of their community, Nation, and world as the 21-year-olds of even two decades ago were.

The voting age was established at 21 many years ago—for reasons that no longer exist. It is my feeling that when the reason for the rule no longer exists, then the rule should be changed. That is why I rise today in support of the proposal that the Constitution of this great Nation be amended to give the right, privilege, and responsibility of the ballot in all elections to those persons who have reached their 18th birthday.

Young people are drafted into our military services today at 18 and expected to be willing to make the final sacrifice for the freedom of our country.

Eighteen-year-olds are allowed to marry and take on the extensive responsibilities of a family. They may take independent legal actions at the age of 18. And they are held responsible in court at the age of 18.

It is to me untenable that these same 18-year-olds should be held not sufficiently mature to make their wishes known at the ballot box on the officials and the policies which will represent them at all levels of government.

On January 22, I introduced a resolution calling for the amendment of the Constitution giving the right of the ballot in elections at all levels of government to citizens who have reached their 18th birthday.

Since that time I have talked with many young persons who are at this age, or who will be 18 within the next 3 years. Their interest in the course being charted through history by this Nation and their constructive attitude in this area has

strengthened my resolve to support this change in our Nation's Constitution.

I urge and implore those of my colleagues who have not joined me in recognizing the maturity and value of the contributions these young people can make, to do so at this time. Vote to give them the privilege of the ballot.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the Senate has passed a constitutional amendment to grant 18-year-olds the right to vote in any election. The need for this amendment is clear.

When the U.S. Supreme Court decided in December that 18-year-olds are eligible to vote in national elections, the Court declined to accept a lower voting age for State and local elections. This decision, while proper, has created a good amount of confusion for election officials and young people alike. The Court action has clearly demonstrated the need for Congress to approve a constitutional amendment which can be submitted to the States for ratification.

Last June when this body approved the statutory lowering of the voting age, I urged that we act not by statute of Congress but by amendment to the Constitution. This is the right way to achieve our goal. Constitutional integrity requires an amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The merits of the proposal are also evident. Throughout our Nation's history we have enlarged the number of citizens eligible to vote.

I believe that the voting age should be lowered to 18 because young people can intelligently participate as voters. In the United States 18-year-olds are considered adults. They are accountable for their actions. Most may sue and be sued. Many of those in the age group 18 to 21 are working, raising families, paying taxes, and leading productive lives. Most are keenly aware and interested in the world around them and are anxious to participate in the formulation of governmental policy through the traditional vehicle of the ballot box.

Mr. Chairman I support the constitutional amendment, and I hope it is promptly approved by the House of Representatives and the 38 States needed for ratification.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution, which I was proud to cosponsor on the first day of the 92d Congress. Speedy enactment of this legislation represents not only a reiteration of the principle embodied in last year's voting rights legislation but also a recognition that a dual voting age system would be an unwarranted and costly administrative burden for our States to assume.

The resolution before us today is one of the last steps in what has been an unduly prolonged effort to give full voting rights to Americans 18 years and older. It was my privilege, as a delegate to New York State's constitutional convention in 1967 to support an 18-year-old vote provision to the proposed constitution which unfortunately was defeated at the polls.

As cochairman of a newly launched registration drive aimed at promoting full electoral participation of our younger voters in New York, I am convinced that

by enacting this legislation we can make great strides toward healing the wounds and closing the divisions which has appeared within our society in recent years.

Only by correcting the injustice in our present electoral system can we give millions of our younger citizens the realistic hope that governmental institutions can respond to the needs and desires of the people.

The overwhelming majorities in both House and Senate last year for the 18-year-old vote provision is sufficient evidence that at long last the Congress acknowledges the ability of these young people to exercise the franchise privilege. Our action here today will not only reaffirm that recognition but enable it to become an integral part of our political system by the next general election.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution deserves the strong support I am confident our colleagues will give it.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the passage of House Joint Resolution 223, proposing a constitutional amendment to extend voting rights to Americans 18 years of age and older. I have been a cosponsor of this proposal in this and in the previous Congress.

The House has already expressed its support for the 18-year-old vote with the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1970. At the time this legislation was agreed to here last year, I felt strongly that there was inadequate time for full debate. I also believed that there was a serious constitutional question involved and that this was a matter requiring a constitutional amendment.

The Supreme Court decision in which this law was tested has resulted in the approval of the 18-year-old vote for Federal elections and the retention of existing State requirements for State and local elections. This is an inequitable situation, indeed, and places a burden on the States who have not adopted the 18-year-old vote which will be both costly and confusing.

First, the present situation presents an inequity for young voters. If 18-year-olds have been adjudged mature and responsible enough to vote in Federal elections, should not these same qualifications entitle them to vote in State and local elections? As a result, we have an absurd situation where the 18-year-old citizen now may cast his vote for presidential candidates, but is denied a vote in a local sheriff's race. He may participate in selecting who represents him in the U.S. Senate, but he may not participate in choosing a Governor of his State.

Among the elements of confusion which the States now face in conducting elections is the cost of maintaining a dual system of voting. At the present time, only three States permit 18-year-olds to vote. For the other 47 States, dual-age voting would be required as a result of the existing Federal law and the Supreme Court's decision regarding it. This would entail the establishment of broad new procedures, additional election officials and costly voting machines. Additional costs of establishing separate

procedures and facilities for Federal and State and local voting have been estimated as high as \$5 million in New York City, \$2.5 million for St. Louis, and \$1.5 million for the State of New Jersey. No State or municipality can afford such a tremendous increase in expenses.

It is this reason which imposes an urgency in enacting this change before the 1972 general election. The only realistic way in which this can be accomplished is by amending the Constitution. Most State legislatures are meeting this year and could act on this proposal without delay.

As you know, the Senate last week passed this resolution without a dissenting vote. I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution just as conclusively so that its consideration by the State legislatures can begin at the earliest possible time.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, the Constitutional amendment which would give 18-year-olds the right to vote in State and local elections as well as in national elections for Federal officeholders is an important one.

The 91st Congress, by extraordinary majorities in each Chamber, approved a Federal statute designed to lower the minimum voting age to 18 in Federal, State, and local elections. This action expressed a congressional judgment that the educational level reached by 18-year-olds, their civic and military obligations, and their readiness and capacity to participate in the political process rendered unreasonable a minimum voting age classification above 18.

Congressional action with regard to Federal elections has been upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court, but this has not been the case with provisions concerning State and local elections.

At this time nine States permit persons under 21 years of age to vote, but only three—Alaska, Georgia, and Kentucky—permit 18-year-olds to vote. As a result, 47 States now confront a dual voting age system wherein 18-year-olds may vote in Federal elections but not in State elections.

Recently, a nationwide survey among election officials indicated that a dual system would be expensive and administratively burdensome to operate. In addition, it carries with it the potential for confusion in the tabulation of election results and the possibility that separate election facilities and procedures will have to be developed.

Whatever new separate procedures and facilities are ultimately established, election officials expect that substantial added costs to State and local governments will be involved. Estimates of these additional expenses are as follows: Connecticut, \$1.3 million; New York City, \$5 million; St. Louis, \$2.5 million; New Jersey, \$1.5 million; Dade County, Fla., \$400,000; Washington State, \$200,000; Chicago, \$200,000.

At this time many State legislatures are currently attempting to bring their voting age qualifications into line with the Federal standards in time for the 1972 elections. In my own State of New

York, for example, a proposal to lower the voting age has already been passed by the State legislature and is scheduled to be voted on in a popular referendum later this year. Similar referendums on the question appear also to be scheduled later this year in the States of Kansas, Maine, and New Mexico. In other States, however, such efforts may fail to produce the desired voting age uniformity in time.

Revision of the State voting age qualifications seems to require an amendment to the State constitution in every State. Processing such an amendment differs from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, but at least 16 States make provision for the submission of a proposed amendment to two separate sessions of the legislature, to be followed by a referendum. Because not all State legislatures meet annually, and for related reasons of procedure, it appears that more than 20 States will be unable to lower the State voting age prior to November 1972.

Although individual State efforts to achieve national voting age uniformity by 1972 by State constitutional amendment seem futile, ratification of the proposed new article embodied in House Joint Resolution 223 seems to be a realistic possibility by the next national election.

Since more than 45 State legislatures are meeting this year—and approximately half that number are scheduled to meet in 1972 and special sessions in the fall of 1971 and in the spring of 1972—and will probably deal with the issue of reapportionment, a reasonable period exists within which the State legislatures may act to ratify the proposed new article of amendment.

This proposed amendment seeks to accomplish a very important national purpose; namely, the extension of the franchise in all elections to millions of American citizens fully qualified to participate in the political processes of the Nation and the States.

It is my belief that young Americans between the ages of 18 and 21 have proven their own ability to participate in our political processes. To some it may appear a fairly new trend, but in my own district, in the city of Buffalo, the idea of involving young people in politics began more than 16 years ago when school superintendent Joseph Manch was an assistant superintendent for pupil personnel services.

It was Dr. Manch's belief then and now that young people should be provided with a forum where they could exchange ideas, develop student-initiated codes, and encourage active participation in school affairs.

This belief gave birth to the inter-high school student council in 1954 which gained nationwide attention almost overnight with its "Dress Right" code. The code, initiated and approved by students, was initiated throughout the country.

Student involvement has grown steadily over these 16 years in Buffalo. In 1967, Dr. Manch first proposed student involvement in curriculum planning. It began work in the summer of 1968 and by last July more than 50

students were working with the faculty-student curriculum committees at Fillmore Middle School. Thirty-three separate committees worked on different areas of the curriculum, one of them on a reference guide dealing with the problems of drug abuse, alcohol, and tobacco.

Today there are six distinct programs that involve Buffalo public school students in the operation of their schools. In addition to the student council and faculty-student curriculum committees, students participate in interracial clubs, the school-community advisory committee, student-teacher career guidance committees, and student-teacher textbook and supply review committees.

Writing about this program, Paul Price said the following in a recent article in the Buffalo Evening News:

Whatever the program, it reflects a basic philosophy held by Dr. Manch: Give students a chance to make decisions that affect them and they will act responsibly.

Dr. Manch himself stated that—

We have witnessed a responsible—though increasingly vocal—demand for a more active role in school affairs. The easy and dangerous solution to these demands is to promise everything and deliver nothing, a pattern sometimes followed with disastrous results. Once you recognize that students will be inventive, responsible members of the school community, you begin to deal with problems effectively, drawing youngsters into the mainstream of education.

I believe in the young people of this Nation. They have shown themselves to be brave soldiers in Vietnam and idealistic crusaders for a better society here at home. As with those in all other age groups, there are responsible young people and irresponsible ones. It is unfair to criticize the majority of the young people for the sins of a few, and as long as our society makes demands upon those within the 18- to 21-year-age group, it has some obligation to give them a role in choosing their government. Anything else sounds dangerously like taxation without representation or, in the case of military service, of involuntary servitude.

Only when all of us, young and old together, join hands in working for a better, more equitable society can our goals be achieved. This amendment will see to it that all Americans have an equal stake in our society and will eliminate the possibility of dual voting lists, in which a citizen is deemed competent to elect his Congressman and Senator, but not his city councilman.

I am confident that young people will meet their responsibilities just as others in our society have done. For these reasons, I believe it essential that this amendment be passed.

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Chairman, I offer today a few thoughts on the proposed constitutional amendment which would allow 18-year-olds the right to vote in all elections. This is a matter on which I have had strong feelings for a long time.

I sincerely believe that the majority of young people between 18 and 21 years of age is mature enough and responsible enough to vote as wisely as their elders. In fact, in many instances they are probably more qualified.

We, as a society, demand much of our young people today, with the vast majority of those over 18 being highly productive citizens. Besides their contributions through the various trades and professions, these young people are also called upon to serve in many other ways.

A case in point is their contribution to the defense of our country through their service in the Armed Forces. According to Defense Department statistics of June 1968, persons under 21 years of age accounted for 983,000 members of our total defense force of 3,510,000.

Just for the record it should also be pointed out that of those who have given their lives in service to their country, again a sizable percentage were under 21.

Another point to consider as we act upon the amendment before us is that the Voting Rights Act of 1970 did in fact permit those 18 or older to vote in national elections. This right has been confined to the national elections because the Supreme Court last December ruled that the States would have to make their own lowered age requirements for State and local elections.

Because of this Supreme Court ruling, it has been recently discovered that it could cost between \$10 and \$20 million if the various States were forced to conduct the 1972 elections under a system of dual-age voting; that is, 18-year-olds voting for Federal but not State offices.

The complications and confusion that could come about from such a dual system of voting would in all probability contribute to much havoc and many irregularities in next year's elections. We have had enough voting irregularities in my own State of New Mexico, in years past, and I shudder to think what could happen if the voting process were further complicated.

There are many arguments for extending the right to vote to 18-year-olds, but the most compelling one, as I see it, is that the majority of this age group works, pays taxes, raises families, and is subject to military service. They are most deserving of a voice in the affairs of government, whether it be National, State, or local.

I was cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 256, which also provided for an amendment to the Constitution extending the right to vote to 18-year-olds. Therefore, I must cast my vote in support of the measure—House Joint Resolution 223—which is before us today.

The earlier this matter is passed by the Congress, and submitted to the States for ratification, the earlier the right to vote for 18-year-olds will become a reality. It is a deserved right and privilege which is long overdue.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, as a result of the recent Supreme Court ruling we in the legislative branch are, in effect, forced to adopt this constitutional amendment. In turn, three-fourths of the State legislatures will be forced to ratify it. I have consistently favored 18-year-old voting, but regret that we are achieving a good end through clearly improper means.

Believing very strongly in legitimate States' rights, I feel the decision to lower

the voting age should have been reserved to each of the 50 State legislatures. Over a period of time, I am convinced there would have been a constant trend of lowering the voting age.

In my opinion, the voting pattern of the 18- through 21-year-old group will be comparable to that of the public as a whole. Contrary to the fears or visions of many political officials, I do not believe it will produce dramatic changes in election results.

However, Mr. Chairman, I reemphasize my view that the Supreme Court decision forces us to take this action and that the State legislatures will, under duress, process it and 18-year-olds will have the right to vote in the 1972 elections.

I believe they will make a positive contribution to political decisions and, hopefully, along with the responsibility of voting, their contributions will also reflect appreciation and knowledge of our governmental system.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman the 91st Congress showed its clear intent to lower the voting age to 18 when it passed H.R. 4249 last June. Section III established the voting age at 18 in Federal, State, and local elections, except as required by the Constitution.

The Supreme Court ruled the constitutional requirements prohibited lowering the voting age for State and local elections.

We are, therefore, faced with the prospect of every State, except Georgia, Hawaii, and Kentucky, having to establish separate ballots, records, and voting procedures for the 18- to 20-year-old voters. Few States are in a position to pass constitutional amendments of their own prior to the general election of 1972.

My own State of Minnesota is one in which the costs of a bilevel election would be prohibitive, and, without a special election, also costly, no referendum is possible until 1972.

The need is obvious. The responsibility lies with the Congress. By passing House Joint Resolution 223 we can do properly what was intended last June. We can help deliver the equity of the 18-year-old franchise, and we can give the States a way to choose economy, a way to avoid the costs of a two-level voting system.

We are taking nothing away from the States. On the contrary, we are giving them the opportunity to ratify, if they will, the lowered voting age.

As the proud author of a successful State constitutional amendment lowering the voting age in Minnesota, I urge an affirmative vote on this constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, the proposed constitutional amendment which we are considering today is intended to make uniform the voting age requirements. These were altered by the provisions of the Voting Rights Act which lowered the voting age to 18.

I sponsored and supported that legislation, and I believe it was the intention of those who voted for the provision that the lowering of the voting age would apply to all elections.

As we are well aware, the Supreme Court has interpreted the law to apply only to Federal elections. While this decision is undoubtedly sound legally, its practical effect is to create a dual system of elections and a different constituency for Federal as opposed to State and local elections.

The course of action which most of our colleagues would have preferred is the one we are considering today—amending the Constitution of the United States. I sponsored legislation for that purpose in the last two Congresses.

In our desire to respond more directly to the need to enfranchise our young citizens, we chose the more expedient route of amending the extension of the Voting Rights Act.

Now that we have the benefit of the decision by the Supreme Court, the necessary action should be apparent. Besides being logically questionable, the maintenance of a dual system of elections would be costly and burdensome to administer.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States has made its position clear in the matter of enfranchising 18-year-olds in all elections. The merits of the issue are equally persuasive today.

Our early action on this proposed amendment would mean that our original intent would be legally realized as soon as possible. It is my hope that we can avoid the experience of a national election under the dual system which presently exists.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, with the passage of House Joint Resolution 223 in this body today, the Congress has completed its half of the constitutional amendment process to enfranchise 18-year-olds in all elections. It is now up to three-fourths of the State legislatures to ratify this resolution before it can become an amendment to our Constitution.

I am hopeful that the States will act favorably on this though I am aware that this proposition has not fared well at the State level in recent times. In my own State of Illinois last December voters rejected an 18-year-old vote amendment to the new State constitution by a 6-to-5 margin. Washington and Oregon have had similar experiences. These setbacks to the youth vote run contrary to the Gallup findings in December of 1969 that 63 percent of the American people favor granting the vote to 18- to 20-year-olds while only 34 percent oppose it.

Many observers have suggested that these referendum defeats are in reaction to campus riots and war protest demonstrations. Judging from some of the mail I have received on this issue, I would have to agree that there is an element of truth in that observation. In fact, the mistaken notion that the vast majority of our young people are radicals, revolutionaries or hippies may be the major obstacle to overcome in the ensuing campaign to sell the 18-year-old vote at the State level. And I would suggest to my colleagues that while our constitutional responsibilities in this amendment process have been fulfilled by our action today, our leadership responsibilities have

just begun if we are truly committed to the youth franchise. I think we can offer a great assist to our counterparts in the State legislatures by continuing to run with the ball rather than dropping it like a hot potato.

I think it is incumbent upon us to educate the people on this issue and to dispel some of the myths which have contributed to the youth backlash. I like to begin by reminding my own constituents that of the 11 million young people, 18 to 20, over half are already part of the civilian labor force, another 800,000 are in the military, 1.1 million are housewives, and about one-fourth are enrolled in various schools. I am amazed at how many people think that most young adults between ages of 18 and 20 are college students, and of the radical variety at that.

The second myth which we must explode is that college students are committed to extremist causes. A recent Gallup poll compared student and adult attitudes toward various extremist groups and concluded that with both students and adults extremist groups on the right and left have very little appeal. In the case of the John Birch Society and the Ku Klux Klan, less than 5 percent of both the students and adults polled gave "highly favorable" ratings; and in the case of the SDS, Black Panthers, and Weathermen, less than 10 percent of both groups gave favorable ratings. I think it is fair to conclude that the overwhelming majority of Americans both students and their elders, reject extremism on both the left and the right. I call the attention of my colleagues to the published report of the Gallup survey which will appear at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD.

One must ask how it is such a small band of extremists can give their entire peer group a bad image in the public mind. One possible and plausible answer has been suggested by Dr. William J. McGill, president of Columbia University, who maintains that outbreaks on campuses were "artificially contrived" and were "phenomena of mass communication." Student unrest, according to Dr. McGill, is "a shimmering image conjured up by very able and astute student leaders who seek to capitalize on techniques of mass communication to generate the appearance of a mass movement."

Mr. Chairman, there was a time when the common expression was, "I only know what I read in the newspapers." Now it is more common to hear, "I only know what I see on the television," and I think Dr. McGill does make a valid point of distinguishing between mass movements and techniques of mass communication designed to generate the "appearance" of a mass movement. When campus demonstrations are the only campus happenings carried by the television networks, it is not long before people begin to think that college life is nothing more than a series of demonstrations and college students are all full-time demonstrators. I am not saying this in criticism of the networks; they have to make the decision as to

what is newsworthy, and the sensational will always attract the cameras and the ratings. What I am saying is that it is not difficult to understand why so many of the general public have become anti-youth and antistudent, and, therefore, why there has been a reluctance to grant young people the vote.

The point I am trying to make is that we will have to explode some of the popular myths about young people if we are to succeed in amending the Constitution to lower the voting age. And I would urge my colleagues to assist their counterparts at the State level in dispelling these myths and selling the youth vote.

At this point in the RECORD I include several items relating to my remarks including the Gallup survey on extremists, a Gallup analysis of the 18 to 20 age group, a New York Times report on Dr. McGill's speech, and a Times article on the youth vote and the States. The material follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 1971]

COLLEGE STUDENTS SHUN EXTREMISTS: GALLUP SURVEY FINDS MOST AVOID THE RIGHT AND LEFT

Extremist groups in America, on the far right and the far left, have almost as little appeal among the nation's college students as they do among the adult population as a whole, according to the Gallup Poll. Students, however, lean slightly more to the left in their ratings of these groups than do the rest of the nation.

Less than 5 per cent of both students and adults give two rightist organizations—the John Birch Society and the Ku Klux Klan—a "highly favorable" rating. At the same time, less than 10 per cent of both students and adults give a "highly favorable" rating to two leftist organizations—Students for a Democratic Society and the Black Panthers.

Some slight divergence in views is found in the case of the Black Panthers. Fewer students proportionately give this organization a "highly unfavorable" rating than is true among the rest of the general public. However, strongly negative views outweigh strongly favorable views among both groups surveyed.

Another leftist organization—the Weatherman—is given an overwhelmingly negative rating by students. No comparisons are available with views of the adult population as a whole.

Analysis of the ratings by background characteristics shows that the radical left groups tested are most likely to be favorably regarded by college seniors and graduate students, who are attending private institutions in the East and who come from upper-income homes.

To obtain the findings reported today a total of 1,063 students, representing 61 colleges and universities, were interviewed in a survey completed in late December. The views of the adult population as a whole were recorded in a national survey conducted last summer, in which a total of 1,513 adults 21 and older were reached in person.

The following tables compare the ratings given by students with those of the adult population as a whole:

JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY	
	Percent
Students	2
General public	4
Highly unfavorable	
Students	48
General public	38

K.K.K.	
Highly favorable	
Students	2
General public	3
Highly unfavorable	
Students	80
General public	76
S.D.S.	
Highly favorable	
Students	6
General public	7
Highly unfavorable	
Students	37
General public	42
BLACK PANTHERS	
Highly favorable	
Students	8
General public	2
Highly unfavorable	
Students	42
General public	75
WEATHERMEN	
Highly favorable	
Students	8
Highly unfavorable	
Students	47

One of the interesting findings in the survey is that among college radicals of the left and right, there is an apparent appeal in extremism for its own sake, among other factors.

For example, a significant proportion of students who describe their political philosophy as "far left" give a highly favorable rating to the John Birch Society and the K.K.K.

Similarly, a sizeable percentage of students who classify themselves as "far right" give a highly favorable rating to the S.D.S., the Weathermen and the Black Panthers.

IF 18, 19, 20 YEAR OLDS COULD VOTE . . . A PUBLIC OPINION ANALYSIS

(By George Gallup, Jr., Paul K. Perry)

If the 10.5 million Americans who are 18, 19, and 20-year olds obtain the right to vote in all 50 states they could easily change the result of close elections such as the 1968 Presidential election, when Richard Nixon and Hubert Humphrey were separated by only 514,155 votes, (1 per cent of the total vote) and the 1960 election when John Kennedy and Richard Nixon were separated by the bare margin of 118,550 votes (0.2 of 1 per cent of the total vote).

Much attention lately has been focused on the 18, 19, and 20-year olds in our population, many of whom are in the process of making crucial decisions in their lives regarding their occupation, marriage, the draft, religion, and politics. This raises the question as to what are the available facts about them.

About one in three civilians 18, 19, and 20 years old are currently enrolled in colleges and universities. Two persons in three (7 million or 66 per cent) have completed four years of high school; about 2.9 million (28 per cent) have completed one to three years of high school while 600,000 have had less education.

Data in a January, 1970 Bureau of Labor Statistics report indicated that about 5.9 million 18, 19, and 20-year olds were in the civilian labor force. Of this number about 5.2 million were employed and 600,000 unemployed. Another 800,000 were in the armed forces. Two million five hundred thousand were going to school, 1.1 million were young women keeping house; some 300,000 were otherwise classified. Males and females in this age group are approximately equal in

number: 5.3 million men and 5.2 million women. Whites outnumber nonwhites, but the ratio is somewhat smaller than for adults in the population 21 years of age and older. Whites number 9.1 million in this group, while blacks and other non-whites number 1.4 million.

Survey evidence suggests that lowering the voting age to 18 across the nation would have a negligible effect in any but a very close election. While this age group comprises 8 per cent of the total population 18 and older, they would unquestionably make up a smaller percentage of the vote in a national election.

Gallup survey data indicates that about half of the 21 to 24 year olds vote in a Presidential election as compared with the 70 per cent among those 25 and older. Assuming the proportion of 18, 19, and 20-year olds likely to vote is the same as among 21-24-year olds, then about 6 per cent of the popular vote in a Presidential election would be by 18, 19, and 20-year olds and 94 per cent would be those 21 and older.

A recent release of the Bureau of the Census reported voting participation based upon 18, 19, and 20-year olds in Georgia and Kentucky, 19 and 20-year olds in Alaska and 20-year olds in Hawaii, where they are already enfranchised. In this age group 33 per cent of those interviewed reported voting in the 1968 Presidential election. This compares with a 43 per cent voting rate among all those of voting age in these states in 1968.

The relatively poor voting record of young adults can be explained to some extent by their relatively high mobility and restrictive residence requirements for voting. In some 35 of the 50 states one year of residence is required before a person can register to vote. Yet survey data have indicated that more than one-third (37 per cent) of young adults have changed their place of residence during the last year.

While little survey evidence exists to show how 18, 19, and 20-year olds as a group would vote, some clue can be obtained by noting patterns of voting preferences by age groups among those 21 and older.

In the last five Presidential elections young voters voted in larger proportion for the Democratic candidate than did older voters. For example, in 1968 among those under 30 who voted, 47 per cent chose Mr. Humphrey as against 38 per cent who chose Mr. Nixon. Among persons 50 and older the pattern was reversed, with 41 per cent choosing Mr. Humphrey and 47 per cent choosing Mr. Nixon.

This Democratic pattern has also been observed in the vote for candidates in the House of Representatives in non-Presidential years.

Starting with the election of 1952 and considering both Presidential and Congressional elections, nine elections in all, the 21 to 29 age group has voted on the average about 7 percentage points more Democratic than has the 50 and older age group. If one were to make the assumption that this pattern would extend into the 18, 19, and 20-year old group then their inclusion in the electorate would tend to help the Democratic candidates in national elections.

Surveys show that voting participation increases with education so it is reasonable to assume that college students among the 18, 19, and 20-year olds will have a disproportionate effect on the vote in this age group. In view of this it is important to examine briefly some of the goals, interests, and habits of the important college group who comprise roughly a third of the civilians in the 18-20 age groups.

What is likely to be the impact of college students on society in the years ahead? The answer may be involved in the uncertainty of Vietnam. Gallup surveys have shown that most students are eager for change. They are unable to make plans for the future. It is the war to a great degree that has made

youth realize that they should be doing something about society and government, that they should have a say about what happens to them.

A growing tendency exists on campus to avoid identification with either major party. The proportion of college students who describe themselves as independent in politics has grown steadily since 1966 when 39 per cent put themselves into the category to 52 per cent today, the high point to date. Among the remaining 48 per cent who indicate a party preference, the weight of opinion slightly favors the Democrats.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 1971]

MCGILL SEES A NEW TIME OF FERMENT

(By Peter Kihss)

Columbia University's president declared last night that "Western society stands on the threshold of a new era filled with ferment, simplistic philosophy and rejections." But he held that many of the outbreaks on campuses had been "artificially contrived" and were "phenomena of mass communication."

Much of the student unrest over the last five years, Dr. William J. McGill, the Columbia leader, and a psychologist, asserted is "a shimmering image conjured up by very able and astute student leaders who seek to capitalize on techniques of mass communication to generate the appearance of a mass movement."

"That is why," he contended, "the effects of periodic excitement on campus build up and dissipate rapidly. Beneath it all there is unrest with a society grown too complex for understanding, but there is no commitment to violence."

The Columbia president offered his analysis in an address prepared for the 67th annual banquet of the New York chapter of the American Institute of Banking, held by the nonprofit educational institution for bank employees at the Americana Hotel.

The social forces now operating, he said, may cause future historians to describe these times "in terms similar to those we now use for the Renaissance and the Industrial Revolution."

The growth of "a technological superstate" since World War II, Dr. McGill said, has required longer and more complex training for ever-narrower careers. The stretching out of the educational process, he said, has been equivalent to extending the period of adolescence.

Students "have tried to find some meaning for their own lives," with no assurance that the future world will be worth living in, he said. Many, he added, "have formed themselves into an isolated youth culture that is clearly hostile to science and technology."

Many "construct simplistic ideologies" to remove themselves from a life-style of complexity, he said. He reported, "among other things, we are witnessing a remarkable growth of religious mysticism on university campuses."

Nevertheless, Dr. McGill said, he believes that the breaking out of campus strikes throughout the country, as occurred last May, could be ascribed to "clever manipulation of mass opinion by young people conditioned to think in terms of mass movements." He offered this view as a counter to a concept of the start of revolution with sustained violence.

"If we are dealing with manipulation of opinion through mass communication," Dr. McGill contended, "then violence used by society to put down campus disorders is not only unnecessary, it gives special advantages to campus revolutionaries who seek to foster violence."

Since last May's campus bids for marches on Washington to protest President Nixon's move into Cambodia and to denounce shooting of students at Kent State University, he

said, "political action has diminished and a cynical, almost somber mood" has developed.

Dr. McGill noted an "inconsistency implied in the ready use of techniques of public relations by students seeking to attack the hypocrisy of a social order based on public relations."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1971]

18-YEAR-OLD NATIONAL VOTE STALLED

(By David A. Andelman)

The 18-year-old vote, resolved for national elections by Federal legislation and a Supreme Court decision, is still a controversial and unresolved issue at the state level across the country.

The factors involved range across the entire field of American political fears and aspirations—the black vote in the South, violence on college campuses and the tax squeeze in the cities and suburbs.

The Supreme Court last Dec. 22 cleared the way for 11.5 million young Americans to vote for President and members of Congress when it upheld legislation providing for voting by persons 18 years old in up in Federal elections.

At the same time the Court said that Congress had acted unconstitutionally when it lowered the voting age to 18 for state and local elections. This left it up to each state to decide whether to permit voting at 18 in the state as well as Federal elections or to accept a system with different age groups voting in two separate election procedures.

Only Alaska, Georgia and Kentucky now allow 18-year-olds to vote and in only five other states does approval by the legislature appear certain to enfranchise these voters this year. In the remainder, the question is bottled up by complex procedures for state constitutional amendments and statewide referendums.

DELAYS BEYOND 1972

In at least 20 other states, the necessity of approval by two successive state legislative sessions and a subsequent statewide referendum make it virtually impossible for young voters to cast their ballots in 1972 for any local offices.

The question of the youth vote goes beyond mere partisan boundaries, although in no state do politicians believe that the Republican party will benefit from the votes cast by 18, 19, and 20-year-old voters. But in only a few states do these politicians believe that the vote will substantially benefit the Democrats.

"I don't know whether there will be any substantive change," commented State Representative Andrew Varley of Iowa, a Republican. "They are not going to vote as a bloc. They'll split loyalties like everyone else."

In the deep south, the concerns are racial. Jimmy Swan, who has never stopped running for Mississippi Governor since he finished a surprising third in the 1967 contest, opposes the lower voting age because it would add black voters.

"For the young whites, I don't think it would make much difference," he said. "I think they'd vote about like their mummies and pappies. They're not too concerned about the vote. But—and I'm talking to you as an ol' Mississippi redneck now—you know our problem is with the young militant blacks. That's where we'd have the troubles."

QUIET DEATH FORESEEN

It is Mr. Swan and scores of legislators in Mississippi who believe as he does that make the 18-year-old vote appear doomed to a quiet death in the state's House Constitution Committee.

In most states, legislators appear most anxious to leave the decision on voting at 18 up to the voters at large in referendum.

Where these voters have rejected lower voting age proposals in the past, the over-

riding reason seemed to be a reaction against violence on the campus.

In Wisconsin, the State Assembly floor leader, Representative Norman C. Anderson, a Democrat, said of the 18-year-old vote: "My guess is that it will win statewide approval if there are no student riots just before the voting."

Last November, Washington state voters rejected a referendum lowering the voting age from 21 to 19. The vote followed months of severe radical student outbreaks in Seattle and other cities.

Most politicians blamed these outbreaks for the outcome of the youth vote referendum last year and forecast continued difficulty in passage in the coming years, despite strong support by Gov. Daniel J. Evans, a Republican.

Politicians also fear large blocs of student voters in states where the election statutes provide for students to vote not in their own towns but where they attend college.

Madison, Wis., seat of the University of Wisconsin, with 35,000 students out of a total population of 172,000, is particularly concerned about students taking over the City Council.

Paul J. Sherwin, New Jersey's Secretary of State and a top political adviser to Gov. William T. Cahill, said, "They could be a real factor, especially if the courts uphold the rights of kids attending college to vote in the states where they are attending school. They could have a fantastic impact on the vote in Princeton (Princeton University) or New Brunswick (Rutgers University)."

Taxes are another problem, particularly in the more urbanized states with heavy property taxes supporting local school boards and other municipal services. Assemblyman John Stull of California, chairman of the Assembly Republican Caucus, said he expected a number of fellow Republican legislators to join him in opposing the 18-year-old vote because of property taxes.

"A lot of people would be making decisions on property owners that shouldn't be," he asserted.

In some states, the state political apparatus is already gearing up for the expected influx of the 18-year-old voter, if it may be as much as two to three years away.

Keith Whitely, chairman of the Oklahoma Young Democrats, said that new voters could "walk away" with local precinct elections if enough young people attended. Attendance at party precinct meetings is usually small. "It is not outside the realm of possibility that an 18-year-old could become chairman of the state party," he added.

In fact, four days after the Federal legislation went into effect last month, the Nassau County, L.I., Democratic party named its first 19-year-old, a Hofstra University student, Patrick W. Doherty, to the County Democratic Committee.

Regardless of what happens when the young voters first go to the polls in 1972 or later, the dual Federal-state standards expected to persist in many states for some years will cost the older voter a large sum of money.

"We're not worrying about it yet here in New York," said a spokesman for the New York City Board of Elections. "We're hoping 18-year-olds will be able to vote in the state by 1972. But if we do need two sets of voter lists, it will be expensive."

Most voting machines are not capable of handling two different sets of voters, and duplicate paper ballots for the two age brackets, as well as duplicate registration books will cost anywhere from \$50,000 in smaller states to hundreds of thousands of dollars in larger ones.

In an effort to get around this, Kansas is considering a special election to enfranchise the young voters. And that special election will cost \$500,000.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, a variety of excellent reasons have been advanced for lowering the voting age to 18 in all elections by means of a constitutional amendment. The most telling of these are, in my opinion: the unreasonable state of affairs stemming from the Supreme Court's decision in Oregon against Mitchell, in which 18- to 20-year-olds can vote for Senator but not sheriff, magistrate, or mayor; the burdens of citizenship, including taxation, criminal liability, and the draft, imposed on our young people without the redeeming privilege of the ballot; and the unappropriated and inappropriate expense of maintaining a dual system of voter registration and participation.

Since I believe that the points which have been made for the 18-year-old vote have been made well, I will not belabor the usual ones here. Instead, I would like to consider the view that 21 is a fit and proper, meet and just age for franchise. It has been held that no tampering should be done with the voting age, no matter what the election, because 21 is the age at which most young adults graduate from college, assume financial responsibility, and "fly from the nest" of their parents. Although Congress indicated by passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1970 that it collectively thought this view less than compelling, opposition to the proposed constitutional amendment may well be based in this attitude.

The idea that most young people graduate from college at the age of 21 is exceedingly optimistic. In fact, although America has the highest percentage of college graduates of any country in the world, "most young Americans—more than 55 percent—still do not go to college. Many of them enter the labor force or the Armed Forces upon graduation from high school, only to endure a legal and electoral limbo lasting upward of 3 years. Of those who do go to college, some leave before graduation and others continue their education far beyond their 21st year. Lowering the voting age to 18 would be much more consistent with present education patterns, for compulsory education has made high school graduates of 80 percent of our young, most of them being graduated at or near age 18.

As to financial responsibility, almost half of the young people between 18 and 21 are in the labor force, not including the 1 million women whose occupation is housewife. For many, the burden of self-support is carried well in advance of their 21st birthday, while for others financial dependency is a lifelong condition.

Testimonials abound to the influence that young Americans have had in bringing this Nation to believe that it has a conscience. Urged on by the abundant idealism of their offspring, it has often been parents who have left the nest for a first flight in citizen participation.

There can be little question that 18-year-olds today are better informed and more openly committed to a compassionate and just future for our country than at any previous time. They have become hooked on the American dream. I think

we should welcome these people, our children, into the electorate, and I urge passage of Congressman CELLER's House Joint Resolution 223.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform my colleagues that the State of Michigan eagerly awaits our approval of this joint resolution. We desire to be the first State in the Union to ratify this very important constitutional amendment and our State legislature is ready at this very moment to suspend all business in order to do so. The resolution of ratification introduced by Representative Jackie Vaughn III, has already gone through the appropriate committee and now lays on the speaker's desk for our word of approval. I wish to commend Michigan's secretary of State, Mr. Richard Austin, who, as our chief election official, issued a call to the State legislature urging that it be the first to ratify. I would hope that the several States will follow the lead of Michigan so that this constitutional amendment lowering the voting age to 18 years may go into effect before November of 1972.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, with the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1970, Congress announced loud and clear its conviction that young Americans between the ages of 18 and 21 possess the capabilities for making informed and intelligent decisions concerning the qualifications of candidates for the highest positions in the land. That these young Americans should be entrusted with the vote in elections of national and international consequence but be denied the opportunity to participate in State and local elections exceeds the bounds of commonsense. And yet, that is the situation which exists today.

Both reason and fairmindedness argue for the enfranchisement of 18-year-olds in local and State elections. The 18-year-old bears the responsibility of citizens, and in all but one of the States, 18-year-olds are considered to be legally capable of distinguishing right from wrong and are held responsible for their criminal acts. Then there are taxes. The circumstance of their youth does not exempt 18- to 21-year-olds from State taxation.

Granted that the pursuit of democratic ideals strongly speaks toward lowering the voting age to 18, the question that arises is what is the most expeditious way for this to be done. While in many States there are plans underway to implement the 18-year-old vote, in only 25 of the 47 States which do not grant suffrage to 18-year-olds could the voting age be lowered in time for the next general election. For those States which cannot meet the deadline the outlook is clouded by potential cost and confusion arising from the necessity of maintaining and administering a dual system for voting in Federal and State elections. The Wisconsin constitution, for example, requires any proposed amendment to be voted on by the electorate at the next general election which is scheduled for November 1972. Therefore, Wisconsin will be forced to deal separately with the 208,000 voters under 21 in the 1972 general election in the absence of

congressional passage and ratification by the States of an amendment to the Federal Constitution. Estimates of the additional cost for just the 1972 elections run from \$10 to \$20 million, these costs coming at a time when many States are being forced to decide between the curtailment of some essential services or bankruptcy.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that at this point the only practical way to effect the 18-year-old vote is by means of a constitutional amendment which I have proposed. I urge my fellow Congressmen to support our distinguished chairman of our House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), in voting for his proposed constitutional amendment, House Joint Resolution 223. Although the time is growing short, the chances are still good that the States could ratify an amendment lowering the voting age to 18, were the amendment acted upon now. Let us restore the faith of our young people in our political system by granting them full representation in it.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a cosponsor of two House Joint resolutions, Nos. 91 and 195, to amend the Constitution in order to extend the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older. Today, I wish to indicate my enthusiastic support of House Joint Resolution 223, which would accomplish the same thing and is the resolution under consideration by the House today. If action is accomplished today, then the proposed 26th amendment to the Constitution of the United States should be before the various State legislatures for ratification well before the Easter recess. The concept of extending the vote to the 18-year-olds is not something which needs extensive debate and discussion today. A few years back, this might have been the case, but suddenly the strong opposition seems to have disappeared and today hardly a voice of opposition can be heard. Today's favorable action by this House will complete the work begun last session. In fact, today's vote is more in the nature of unfinished business than anything else. As a result of last year's action, we are confronted with an intolerable situation on the State level where millions of potential voters will be permitted to vote for Federal officials, but not local officials. The chaos, confusion, and cost which looms over the next election as a result is something which requires immediate attention and solution. Those of us who have labored over the years on behalf of this concept are entitled to feel justifiably proud today as we witness the culmination of all our efforts.

Looking beyond today's vote, it only remains to say that hopefully all those that will be completely enfranchised as a result of today's actions will take advantage of this opportunity and register and then vote. It is only then that this great body of our citizenry will really cease to be second-class citizens.

Congress will have done its part today. What happens tomorrow is in the hands of the citizens themselves.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chair-

man, today, I am rising in support of Senate Joint Resolution 7, a constitutional amendment which would lower the voting age in all States and in all elections to 18. This amendment has become necessary for two main reasons, both resulting from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which held that the section of the Voting Rights Amendments of 1970 lowering the voting age in all elections to 18 was constitutional only insofar as it applied to Federal elections, but not State and local elections.

The first reason for my support of this amendment is that it is the only positive and efficacious manner by which we may enact into law the express judgment and will of Congress—that citizens 18 years of age and older should be allowed to vote in all elections, Federal, State, and local. The second reason is that a Federal constitutional amendment is the only method for extending the lower voting age to State and local elections which has a chance of being enacted across the United States by the 1972 elections, in time to avert the administrative confusion and fiscal nightmare of double registration and dual ballots. Estimates rendered by the States of the possible costs of such procedures have run into the millions of dollars across the country.

I would like to discuss each of these reasons in greater detail.

First, the will of Congress has been expressed that all citizens of age 18 should be allowed to vote in all elections, not just Federal elections. Reasons for allowing 18-year-olds to vote are many. For example, the freshness, enthusiasm, and idealism of youth would greatly enhance the overall quality of the electorate of our great Nation. How sorrowful it would be if we allowed these fine qualities, best exemplified by the Peace Corps and VISTA, to atrophy from disuse, or explode from the frustration of having no constructive outlet.

Next, young people receive far better education than our grandparents. Seventy-nine percent of our population graduates from high school at this time, as compared with 17 percent 50 years ago; 47 percent of these high school graduates go on to college, as opposed to only 8 percent 50 years ago. Radio, television, and newspaper coverage of every significant event in the world has improved so greatly in recent years that everyone, and especially the young, is much better informed than a generation ago, and the excuse that youth are not sufficiently informed to cast a responsible vote is no longer applicable.

Finally, young men between the ages of 18 and 21 are largely responsible for fighting this Nation's wars; they must pay income taxes; they lose the protection of child labor laws; and they may be tried as adults for felonies. These are sufficient indicia of maturity to warrant granting them the right to vote. Therefore, if these reasons provide ample justification for allowing 18-year-olds to vote for Federal officers—President, Vice President, Representative, and Senator—how little sense it makes to deny

them the right to vote for State and local officers.

But, the Supreme Court has said that Congress does not have the power to enact a lower voting age for State and local elections, except by constitutional amendment. This was my position when the House of Representatives was considering the Voting Rights Amendments of 1970, and the Supreme Court has now sustained it. Now we must get about the business of passing the amendment, and introducing it to the Senate for ratification.

My second main reason in support of this amendment is that Congress must act quickly to avoid the tremendous cost and confusion which will develop in the 47 States where the voting age is above 18 for State and local elections. These States will have to provide two separate types of registration, and two separate types of ballots, to accommodate both those who may vote in all elections and those who may vote only in Federal elections. This will affect more than 10 million voters across the Nation; it will necessitate the ordering of thousands of extra voting machines and altering existing voting machines, or providing special paper ballots; it will cause problems in counting, tallying, and canvassing the votes; it will cause delays in voting and in tabulating the results; it will introduce the possibility of fraud; and it will cost an estimated \$10 to \$20 million throughout the country. It has been speculated that the expected delays and confusion could discourage some potential voters from bothering to go to the polls. This is diametrically counterproductive to the orderly workings of a democracy.

The best way to avoid this dilemma is to provide a uniform voting age for all elections, and the constitutional amendment is not the only method which might be employed. Congress could allow the individual States to change their own voting age. But I would like to demonstrate that the constitutional amendment is the vastly superior procedure.

Individual action by each State is far too slow and unpredictable to guarantee that the problems caused by two voting ages will be solved by the 1972 elections. First, nearly every State has its voting age set in its Constitution. To change a State constitution is a ponderous process. Every State but Delaware requires a referendum after passage of the proposed amendment in the legislature. It is significant to note here, that out of the 30 referendums held since 1943 to lower the voting age in the States, only eight have passed. Sixteen States require passage of a proposed constitutional amendment in two separate sessions of the legislature. Many of these have only biennial sessions, and could not pass the proposal twice and conduct a referendum before 1972, or by a reasonable time before the 1972 elections so as to provide for registration of newly eligible voters.

On the other hand, a Federal constitutional amendment can proceed swiftly, and provide uniformity once ratified. For example, four out of the seven most recent amendments to the Constitution of the United States have been ratified by

three-fourths of the States within 1 year after introduction. An amendment lowering the voting age in all elections to 18 has an excellent chance of ratification before the 1972 elections, in time to avert a financial and administrative crisis in the States.

However, Congress must act swiftly to pass the proposal and introduce it to the States for ratification. There is little time to lose. Most State legislatures are in session right now and could vote on the question of ratification. By the end of March, however, at least 10 States, by law, must have completed their legislative sessions. Another three might have wound up their 1971 session by that time. It only takes a rejection by 13 States to doom a constitutional amendment. Further, another 11 States are likely to have completed their sessions by the end of August. Therefore, at least 24 States have early deadlines for closing out their legislative sessions, and about half of these might not reconvene, barring a special session, until 1973. Congress precipitated an unfortunate and unexpected situation in the States by attempting to lower the voting age by statute. Now Congress should recognize an obligation to act with speed to help the States avoid this situation.

I have thus explained why I support early congressional action on this amendment, because of what it will do to alleviate the potential confusion and cost to the States. Now I would like to express my disappointment over what the amendment will not do; namely, extend all forms of social and legal responsibility to 18-year-olds besides just the privilege of voting. I would propose not only lowering the voting age to 18, but also lowering to 18 the age of contractual capacity, the age at which a person may make a valid will, the age at which a male may get married without parental consent, and the age at which there is any remaining disability, restriction, or contractual protection, so that the right to vote is accompanied with each and every vestige of social and legal responsibility which characterizes full adulthood.

If we deem it proper that an 18-year-old contribute to the management of public affairs, we should also make sure that he has the same responsibility in handling his own private affairs. Further, I would be willing to bet that the youth of America agrees with me on this point. Young people have worked feverishly in the States to win the right to vote, so that they may demonstrate their concern and responsibility in the affairs of their country, their State, and their locality. I am sure that they would equally desire to have full responsibility in all their dealings, and we should bend every effort to grant them that desire.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the pending legislation, House Joint Resolution 223, to lower to 18 the voting age for citizens in State, local, and Federal elections.

As an original sponsor of similar legislation, and ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee which ap-

proved it, I believe it is essential that we act immediately to finish the half-completed task we accomplished with the enactment in the last Congress of this measure in the form of an amendment to the Voting Rights Act.

Late last year the Supreme Court ruled on the constitutionality of our action in the last Congress. It upheld the granting of the 18-year-old vote by statute in presidential and congressional elections, but denied those provisions lowering the age to 18 for voting in State and local elections.

The majority of Congress considered it wise and right to give the full right to vote to our young people at the age of 18, so I do not think it necessary to again detail all the meritorious reasons for doing so. They are as valid today as before, and even more so. We should approve this bill for rational and equitable reasons, and also because of the chaotic situation and the administrative and financial burdens that lack of such a constitutional amendment would create if the States have to maintain separate voter registration lists and establish separate election procedures.

I most strongly urge the House to act, as the Senate already has, to give the full right of franchise to our 18-year-old citizens.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, meaningful citizen participation in the political affairs of a society is a hallmark of a society that is democratic, dynamic—culturally, socially, politically, economically—and relatively stable, and that simultaneously promotes the growth of fundamental rights and social progress.

By passing the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970, Congress reflected the consensus in our country that the participation of 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds in our electoral process should include the right to vote. As we know, the Supreme Court subsequently ruled invalid the provisions of that law lowering the minimum voting age to 18 in State and local elections. Passage of House Joint Resolution 223 and ratification of it by three-fourths of the States will mean that all citizens who are 18 years of age or older will be able to vote in Federal, State, and local elections.

The administrative nightmare that has been forced upon State and local governments by the 1970 law and the Supreme Court's ruling is a strong argument for this constitutional amendment. Nationwide, "dual-age voting" will cost local governments an additional \$10 to \$20 million. Many States cannot revise their constitutions—even if they desire to—in time to eliminate "dual-age voting" in the 1972 elections. But, as wasteful as this age-qualification morass would be of our scarce national resources, it is not my primary reason for supporting this amendment.

Our action today will be primarily of symbolic importance. It will offer to our concerned youth the hope that they may make a difference in local and State policies.

There is grave danger in this action as well. We have already held out a similar

hope concerning national policies by providing for 18-year-old voting in Federal elections. The young people have witnessed and participated in peaceful assemblies and other aspects of our democratic process. But they have seen this protest, these activities and polls showing overwhelming public sentiment for withdrawal from Indochina produce only minor changes in our Southeast Asian policies.

The president of Stanford University, Richard W. Lyman, has written:

Eight years of war abroad have produced a marked deterioration in the political life of our own country. This deterioration is nowhere more marked than on the leading campuses, where the argument that only force counts is heard from young people whose cynicism in this regard is a deadly threat to the future of a democratic polity.

As a result, there are "ineradicable wounds" to our society.

The granting of universal 18-year-old franchise and the imminent exercise of that franchise by our youth in local, State, and Federal elections must result in changes in our policies at home and in Southeast Asia. If not, an already grievous social problem—alienated youth—will be severely aggravated.

Our action today must be seen not simply as approval of the 18-year-old vote in local and State elections. It also must be an expression of congressional support for new initiatives to make of our Nation what it has the resources and desire to become.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, one of my first acts as a Member of Congress 12 years ago was to introduce legislation providing for the right to vote at 18. I have testified repeatedly on various proposals and I have introduced similar bills in each subsequent session of Congress. I have always believed that the right to vote at the age of 21 represented an outmoded and wholly arbitrary limit which failed to encompass current reality.

We now see brave young Americans on the battlefield of Vietnam, and so I think that the argument about being old enough to vote if you are old enough to fight makes special sense at this time. In addition we all agree that this generation of young people is better educated and more aware of world problems than any previous one. I believe that by bringing the activism of youth into the mainstream of American politics we may well cut down on those who take such dreadful actions against politics and the so-called Establishment.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I fulfill an ambition I have had since I first entered this Chamber by voting for the constitutional amendment to allow all Americans to vote in all elections at the age of 18. It may well represent a coming of age of America herself.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, last year it was a matter of great pride for me to sponsor and vote for the bill which gave our young people the privilege of voting in national elections at the age of 18 years. I have not regretted my action, but I have been proud to see the response we received.

Each month in my district young people are going to the courthouses to show their credentials and to get their names on the rolls of qualified voters.

However, we must go a little further if these young people are allowed to vote on all issues that affect them and for candidates in every election. Thus, I urge passage of the bill that is before us today to amend the Constitution of the United States in order to insure the 18-year-olds the right to vote in State and local elections as well as in national elections.

From my personal observation from day to day and from my experience as a mayor and as a Congressman working with thousands of boys and girls, I know that they are better informed than my generation was at the end of our teenage years. We have in this country today the finest generation of young people ever.

Not only are they interested in the affairs of this Nation and our world, but they are willing to work for improvements. If we will listen, we can get some great ideas from these men and women.

Already we are changing our way of life under the influence of their numbers and buying power. Manufacturers have listened to these young people and continued profitably.

Without doubt the oncoming generations are changing the scope of our population so that an ever-rising percentage of our citizens are under 25 years. These men and women are very knowledgeable and their ideas are vital. One of the best ways for us to gather their opinions and to give them an active voice is to offer them the chance to vote in all elections.

I would like to point out that I am aware of the fact that a few make a lot of noise, but they do not speak for the majority. The downgraders of America try to say there is a serious moral gap between the young and their parents, but it is not so. There is, and always will be, the normal age gap, but this is no serious problem. In general, parents and the young people value and respect the opinions of each other.

I have great confidence in the 18-year-olds of this Nation. We trust them to carry out great responsibilities, even fighting our wars and protecting freedom around the world.

This measure to extend the privilege of voting to about 10 million citizens between 18 and 25 years of age has my wholehearted support, and once again I will count it an honor to cast a vote of confidence in America's youth by voting for this constitutional amendment.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, as the sponsor during the last session of Congress of a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18, I am pleased to support the resolution before the House today.

Campus unrest and student violence have upset and disturbed all of us and because of the irresponsible actions of the radical and militant few, we tend to lose sight of the high caliber of the majority of our young people. Better educated than most of us at their age, they are

vitaly concerned about the future of our Nation and desire to have a say in determining its course. I feel they deserve this privilege and trust and will use it responsibly.

The Supreme Court decision clarifying the legislation Congress approved last year to lower the voting age has served only to make the situation much more complex. It is important that we approve this constitutional amendment today and send the matter to the State legislatures for final determination. I urge the House to vote favorably on this matter.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor and advocator of similar legislation, as well as being a member of the House Judiciary Committee that thoroughly reviewed and favorably reported this bill, I most earnestly urge and hope that the House will overwhelmingly approve this pending resolution, House Joint Resolution 392, designed to prohibit the United States or any State from denying or abridging the right of citizens of the United States to vote because of age if such citizens are 18 years of age or older.

Legislative action in this manner and through this resolution is required in order to remove intolerable finance costs and administrative burdens that would otherwise be imposed upon the several States in trying to operate a dual voting system which would result because of the invalidation, by the Supreme Court, of those provisions of the Federal statute we adopted, in the last Congress, that lowered the minimum voting age in State and local elections to 18; at the same time, the court upheld the provisions lowering the minimum voting age to 18 in Federal elections. Certainly and obviously if our American youth is learned enough and sensible enough, from the age of 18 up, to vote in national elections they should be entitled to vote, at the same age, in State and local elections.

I personally and earnestly believe that the great preponderance of authoritative testimony and evidence, as well as my own observations, demonstrate that the average American youth of 18 years to 21, in this country today, is better educated and more mature and possesses a higher sense of personal responsibility, sound judgment and concerned involvement than ever before.

Through our ever-expanding educational institutions, libraries, public forums, news media and other information avenues, knowledge, with the opportunity to gain it, is increasing at an unparalleled rate.

Because of these factors American youth, today, is extraordinarily knowledgeable about national issues, exceptionally articulate in their convictions and predominantly committed to the betterment of our society.

From the age of 18 up they have been and are being called upon, in these times, to help to shoulder the tremendous burdens that plague our society; in the greatest majority, they have responded with sound judgment; they also are required to pay income and property tax

and to bear arms. Certainly, then, under these changing circumstances our youth should be extended every consideration in their right to participate in the decisions of Government that establish local, State, and National policy.

One of the most basic premises of our democracy is the assumption that all those who help to bear the burdens of our society have the inherent right to take part in the decisionmaking process of Government at all levels. In order to insure that our modern and exceptionally learned and dedicated youth are granted their rightful share in the decisionmaking of American government at all levels I again urge this House to resoundingly approve this resolution.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for this proposed constitutional amendment. The need for it is plain—indeed, so strikingly obvious that it hardly warrants mention here. The Supreme Court, as you know, has upheld the constitutionality of the Voting Rights Act provision granting the vote to 18-year-olds. But the Court, in a judicial decision that was not wholly unexpected, ruled that the 18-year-old vote is valid only for Federal elections. So America's young people now face this almost ludicrous irony: they can vote in elections for the highest Federal offices, but not in elections for State and local offices ranging from Governor to dog-catcher.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, this situation is eminently worthy of redress. And the constitutional amendment now before us—legislation that plainly and explicitly spells out any 18-year-old's right to vote in any election—provides just such redress.

If passed promptly today, House Joint Resolution 223 stands a remarkably good chance of being enacted into law in time for the 1972 elections.

It seems clear—almost beyond dispute, in fact—that today's 18-year-olds are far better educated and far more sophisticated than those of even a generation ago. It can be argued convincingly, I think, that contemporary American young people are more keenly aware of the problems confronting American society and more ardently committed to solving those problems than many of their elders. At the age of 18, young men and women have completed their secondary education. They are entering college, joining the Armed Forces, taking jobs. They are more intellectually mature and more politically responsible than any generation in this country's history. It was nearly two centuries ago—in a small, rural, agrarian society—that most States set the voting age at 21. It made sense then. It no longer makes sense today.

The overwhelming majority of American youth want to work within what is called "the system," seeking their political goals through the traditional institutions of our democracy. They are frustrated, however, merely because they are denied the right to vote. American young people are a powerful force for good in our society. Granted, a minority so small that it can be accurately termed "trivial" has embraced radicalism and

revolution. But—I cannot emphasize this point strongly enough—most young people border on exemplary citizens. They are bright. They are responsible. They are conscientious.

They deserve the right to vote.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, the recent Supreme Court ruling permitting 18-year-olds to vote in national elections was an important and necessary step. But it did not go far enough. It left the decision on State and local elections to the individual States. This structure creates the necessity for dual voting and registration procedures and will inevitably be costly and chaotic for most of the States.

There is no need to reiterate the reasons for the 18-year-old vote. The Supreme Court has recognized the maturity and intelligence of today's 18- to 20-year-olds by its decision. What we must look at now is the financial predicament that the States will find themselves in at a time when State governments are doing all they can to prevent bankruptcy. In Ohio, it is estimated that it could cost up to \$750,000 to register 18- to 20-year-olds. Washington State anticipates a cost of \$357,000 to implement separate ballots for 18- to 20-year-old voters. New York City alone estimates an additional expense of \$5 million. In Connecticut, \$1,- new voting machines and in California, new voting machines and in California not including the cost of new equipment, \$5 million must be spent.

Immediate action on a constitutional amendment is the only reasonable answer to this situation. An amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of the State legislatures. If we can submit the amendment to the States early this year, it could be ratified before the general elections of 1972. It is our responsibility to forestall the chaos that will ensue in 1972. I urge unanimous support for the constitutional amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words concerning the passage of House Joint Resolution 223, a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18 in State and local elections.

When the 91st Congress voted last year to extend the Voting Rights Act, and to enfranchise 18-year-olds, I was opposed for a number of reasons. I felt that this enfranchisement was being rushed through the House without adequate debate, especially considering the seriousness of the issues involved. I also felt that, on the whole, the 18 to 21 age group was not responsible and socially aware enough to be given the vote. Studies have shown that even when enfranchised, the turnout of this age group tends to run about half of the normal voter turnout. Moreover, most of the States which had considered lowering the voting age had found that a majority of the people opposed this action in statewide referendums.

Now the Supreme Court has found that the enfranchisement is legal only for Federal elections, leaving a rather chaotic situation as regards State and local elections. In another mad rush we are attempting to remedy this situa-

tion—again without a really adequate exploration of the issues involved and debate on the floor of the House.

I am most concerned about this infringement on the expressed will of the American people, and the States' rights, at this point. The high rejection rate of the 18-year-old vote at the State level is a clear mandate for the Congress, a mandate which we are now ignoring for the second time. How much further is this erosion of the will of the people going to continue?

I would like to reiterate my opposition to this measure. I have the greatest respect and admiration for the youth of America. I have found them consistently aware, knowledgeable, and concerned. But this particular combination is not necessarily conducive to the evolution of a politically and socially aware and responsible electorate—namely, the fact that the voting turnout among 21- to 30-year-olds is still markedly lower than the national average.

It takes more than education and idealistic principles to make a responsible American and a good voter. It takes a pragmatic knowledge of the workings of our society, a knowledge that only comes through experience, maturity, and involvement. Paying taxes, raising children, seeing how the Federal Government acts upon our daily lives—I consider these more important requisites for good citizenship than an academic education. The anger with the Government which stems from experience with its redtape is a much more valid and productive anger than one based on negativistic idealism.

Therefore, it is my sincere hope that the legislatures of the several States will be more responsive to the wishes and needs of the American people than this Congress has been, and will fail to ratify House Joint Resolution 223.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 223, proposing a constitutional amendment extending the right to vote in all elections to citizens 18 years of age or older.

In my judgment, the time has come when we must extend the franchise to the 11 million young people between the ages of 18 and 21. Nearly 80 percent of these young people are high school graduates. They keep up with the news and are keen observers of American life; they are at least as informed and certainly as concerned as their parents about the social and political problems from which our election issues evolve.

In addition to being well prepared to exercise their voting responsibilities, our 18-year-old citizens have earned the right to vote because they bear most of an adult citizen's responsibilities. They are drafted to serve in our Armed Forces; many of them have died in battle. Nearly half of our citizens between the ages of 18 and 21 are married; more than 1 million of them are responsible for raising families. More than 3 million are full-time employees and taxpayers. In most States, 18-year-olds are treated as adults in criminal courts of law.

Like many other public officials, I also

feel that our 18-to-21-year-old citizens will contribute a great deal to our society and to the elective process if they are given the right to vote. They have already demonstrated their interest in and concern over our social and political problems. Exercise of the franchise would channel their interests and energies into our political system and give young people a constructive means for influencing public decisions.

Finally, adoption of this constitutional amendment would be practical from a financial point of view. Last year, the Supreme Court upheld the granting of the 18-year-old vote by statute in presidential and congressional elections, but struck the provision for voting in State and local elections. Since only three States presently have an 18-year-old voting age, it will be necessary for the other 47 States to maintain separate voter registration lists and separate balloting procedures for Federal, as opposed to State and local, elections. This will result in extra administrative burdens and expenses which would amount to \$5 million for New York City, for example.

The numerical age of an individual is not any indication of his intellectual age, and therefore the arbitrary determination of 21 as the age of reason is certainly not a valid one. In my judgment, 18 would be a valid age, in view of the fact that people reach intellectual maturity at an earlier age now than ever before.

Clearly, then, we should lower the voting age to 18 for all elections, both because it is right and because it is practical. The most expeditious means of accomplishing this goal is through the constitutional amendment we have under consideration; this is the only method which will make it possible to lower the voting age in time for the 1972 elections.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I support the proposed constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18 in State and local elections.

When the question of lowering the voting age to 18 came before the 91st Congress in June of last year, I stated my view that the question of whether the age should be reduced for national, State and local elections should be decided by constitutional amendment rather than by mere bill. My view was grounded on the strong conviction that Congress has no authority by case law or by the U.S. Constitution to set voting laws. In fact the Constitution itself states that the States rather than the Federal Government have the primary authority to establish voting age limitations.

Despite my objections to and my vote against lowering the voting age by bill, the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 became law. Subsequently, the question of the law's constitutionality was raised in several State law suits including one in my home State of Texas, Texas against Mitchell.

The issue reached the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Oregon against Mitchell, and the court ruled that all of the provisions in the new law were constitutional except for title III, which lowered the minimum voting age in all

elections. The Court, in a 5-to-4 decision, upheld provisions of the new Federal law lowering the minimum voting age for Federal elections, but invalidated the provisions which lowered the minimum age in State and local elections. What actually happened was this: Four judges, Chief Justice Burger, Justices Blackmun, Harlan, and Stewart thought title III was completely unconstitutional. Four other judges, Justices Brennan, Douglas, Marshall, and White thought title III was completely constitutional. The ninth judge, Justice Hugo Black sided on the State and local election question with the four who thought the law was unconstitutional. On the Federal elections question, Black agreed with the four Justices who thought the law was valid.

This split decision by the Court created a situation wherein the 47 States which have not already lowered the voting age to 18, have to bear the costly and administratively burdensome process of setting up two sets of electoral machinery, one for Federal elections and one for State and local elections. In States such as Texas that are financially floundering for want of money, this would extend State resources beyond the breaking point.

Mr. Chairman, this unacceptable situation could be best remedied by Congress passing a constitutional amendment and giving the States an opportunity to make their own decision as to whether they want to lower the voting age to 18.

In conclusion, I do not believe like some that lowering the voting age to 18 will save the Republic. Neither do I share the views of those who contend that lowering the voting age will wreck the Republic. There are individuals who, by virtue of interest, concern, and knowledge, will make very competent voters at the age of 18; there are others who will make incompetent voters no matter how old they are. Thus, although drawing the line at 18 is necessarily an arbitrary dividing line, it is one I think that has a very real basis in everyday life. I believe 18 reflects a real beginning of adult responsibilities in terms of education, gainful employment, Federal income taxes, military obligations, and civic responsibilities.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives voted last June to lower the voting age in all elections by statute to the age of 18. The same vote provision was passed in the Senate as a rider to the Voting Rights Act. However, when the Supreme Court this past December ruled on the constitutionality of this enactment, the court upheld the vote granted to 18-year-olds in presidential and congressional elections, but struck down provisions for State and local elections.

The confusing effect of this decision is to bar citizens aged 18 to 21 from voting in State and local elections in almost all the States, while permitting them to vote in national elections. While the States are presently attempting to bring their voting age qualifications in line

with the Federal standards in time for the 1972 elections, more than 20 States will be unable to lower the State voting age prior to November 1972. Not all State legislatures meet annually, and a number of States require that a proposed State constitutional amendment must be approved by two sessions of the legislature. Moreover, almost all the States require that a referendum be held on a proposed amendment.

Ratification of the new article of the Constitution embodied in House Joint Resolution 223 would make uniform voting qualifications for the next national election a possibility. It might also save the States the extra administrative burden and expense of maintaining separate voter registration lists and separate balloting procedures, which it is estimated would cost an additional \$1.5 million in New Jersey alone.

I therefore believe it most important that Congress move promptly and favorably on House Joint Resolution 223 to give the States the opportunity to act before the next national election.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I have long supported lowering the voting age to 18. I have also advocated that this change be effected by the States. The constitutional amendment that we propose today would extend the voting franchise to 18-year-olds, but would not be effective until ratified by three-quarters of the State legislatures. Thus, this measure respects the authority of the States, and I support its passage wholeheartedly. It is a States rights measure.

Mr. Chairman, it would be most confusing and expensive to maintain a dual system of voting ages, one for State elections and one for Federal offices. The action we propose today will avoid such confusion by providing for voting at age 18 in all elections.

But the most important reason I support this proposed constitutional amendment, Mr. Chairman, is because it is the right thing to do. When our 18-year-olds wear the military uniform of the United States they are our representatives abroad. When they risk their lives on the field of battle they are our defenders. Surely they should be able to participate fully in the political process. Surely they should be able to vote for their local and State officials as well as for the men who write the draft laws. They should be able to pass judgment on all public officials.

This proposed amendment is also a good citizenship bill, Mr. Chairman. Many of our young people go away to college or to military service before they reach age 21, and since they are then not old enough to vote, tend to lose contact with their local and State political process. Allowing them to vote in all elections at age 18 would facilitate an early contact with the process of self-government and might help avoid later periods of political apathy.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in support of the pending resolution, House Joint Resolution 223, to amend the Constitution of the United States to lower the voting age to 18 years.

During the 91st Congress, I cosponsored such an amendment to the Consti-

tution inasmuch as I support lowering the voting age and felt an amendment to be the proper approach to achieve this change.

At that time I was pleased to participate with 21 other House Republicans in a tour of college campuses. In our report to President Nixon, we stated that:

Active involvement in the political process can constructively focus (youthful) idealism on the most effective means of change in a free society.

This is, to me, a most important and valid justification for extension of the voting franchise to 18-year-olds, and we so recommended to President Nixon. We clamor these days that this country must channel the energies of our youth to operate within the system rather than outside it. Giving these young people an active role in our elective system will demonstrate most effectively to disbelievers and dissenters that progressive change is possible within our governmental system.

By extending the franchise to 18-year-olds, we will go a long way toward maintaining the early political interests of our youth throughout their years of young adulthood when their creativity and originality are at their peak.

It is the responsibility of the adults in our society to get our young people personally involved in helping to solve our problems. It is also the responsibility of elected officials who can influence the course of this Nation's progress. We must convince them that one of the greatest gifts passed on to us by the founders of this Nation was the mechanism for changing and improving our society in a peaceful, orderly way. That mechanism is politics. Politics is the only way to strike out against the deficiencies in our society without destroying the system itself. It affords us the opportunity to correct the inadequacies within the existing structure without undermining its foundations.

So to those young people who cry for the destruction of the system, we must say:

Destroy this system and you will destroy not only the hope of America, but of all mankind. Use this mechanism within our system to make changes, to make this a better country and to make this a better world.

We must convince our young people to accept this challenge and opportunity and thereby have a tremendous influence on the kind of world they're going to live in.

More than ever before in our history, young people are getting involved, really involved in the exercise of good citizenship through political action. This is the best possible sign of the vitality of our system.

Furthermore, as a result of congressional approval and enactment into law last year of an extension of the vote to 18-year-olds in Federal, State and local elections by statute, and the resulting Supreme Court decision rendering it invalid so far as State and local elections are concerned, we have a responsibility to the people of this country to approve

a constitutional amendment in this matter for State ratification.

The present State of the law, requiring a dual voting system, burdens most States with added expense and complications. The lowering of the voting age to 18 enfranchises more than 200,000 additional voters in my home State of Maryland. The maintenance of a separate registry and the printing of separate absentee ballots for those persons between the ages of 18 and 21 years presents a financial problem for the State. Since Maryland votes by machine, additional funds would also have to be provided to make the necessary mechanical adjustments to adapt the voting machines to different types of electors.

I supported the Judiciary Committee's efforts to promptly report this resolution to the House for full consideration. It is my view that Congress should act now to approve this constitutional amendment for State ratification in order that the conflict, confusion and added expenses that now exist may be put to an end as soon as possible and 18-year-olds may be given a complete extension of voting privileges encompassing all elected offices.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have always supported the proposal that citizens 18 years and older have the right to vote. In 1950, during my first year in Congress, I proposed an amendment to the Constitution for an 18-year-old vote. In 1969, I served as one of two cochairmen for the Citizens' Committee for Vote 18 in New Jersey. This January 22, I introduced House Joint Resolution 189, which proposes a constitutional amendment for the right to vote for citizens 18 years of age or older, the same proposal we are voting on today.

Mr. Chairman, I have gone on record for the past 22 years in support of 18-year-old suffrage.

And finally the time has come to pass when it appears today that Congress will say that the Constitution should be amended to give people 18 years of age and older that right.

In 1950, I felt that the 18 year old was ready to vote. In 1971, I feel that she or he is more ready than ever. Eighteen- to 20-year-olds can drive cars, own property, marry in any State, pay taxes, be tried in adult courts and serve in the Armed Forces. It is time we acknowledged that these citizens have a vital social and economic interest in the policies of their local, State and Federal governments.

While these citizens have a real interest, we must also recognize that they are fully qualified to make the judgments upon which they will base their vote. Eighty-one percent of the 18- to 20-year-olds have graduated from high school, and nearly 50 percent have gone on to college.

Young people have greater access than ever to information on public affairs. Thorough reporting of state and national affairs pervades the Nation through television and radio, syndicated columnists, news services, national publications, and appearances in highly publicized forums by knowledgeable speakers. The awareness of young men and women about the

issues is reflected by their growing participation within the political process.

In all fairness, we must admit that this political process has not always been responsive to their participation. Lacking a voice at the polls, some of these young citizens have raised their voices in other places and in other ways. The many reports on unrest among young people indicate that a main cause of these disturbances is the frustration that our young people experience in trying to influence the governmental institutions that guide their lives. The vote will provide them with the fullest means of legitimate political expression.

Both our new voters and our Government will benefit from the extension of the right to vote. Our young people will have an opportunity to voice their opinions on the public policies that affect their lives, public policies that in many cases have too long been determined without the contributions of those most concerned. On the other hand, Government will be enriched by the freshness, vitality, and insight of youth.

For these reasons, I will vote today for House Joint Resolution 223. My only regret is that this vote occurs today and not two decades ago.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I support House Joint Resolution 223, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older. Last June, in my opinion, we followed an unwise course because we had exactly 1 hour of debate to consider the voting rights extension, and also attached to that was the voting age amendment, which in my opinion precluded the rights of the States to fix their own voting age limits. I explained my position at that time in my remarks as they appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 15, page 20194. I tried to demonstrate the lack of wisdom of our action at that time.

Now, of course, it is a matter of history that the Supreme Court on December 21, 1970 held that the 18-year-old voting age as prescribed in Public Law 91-285 was valid in the case of election to a national office, but could not be applied to the election of State and local office seekers, or to local referenda.

Last summer, shortly after the June decision on 18-year-old voting had been completed in the House, a group of very fine young people who were members of the 4-H organization in our congressional district came to Washington on their annual trip. We all assembled on the Capitol steps for a picture as is so frequently the case with visiting constituents, and I so clearly recall how disappointed some of the young people were in my opposition to the effort of the Congress to fix the voting age without any State action. When these fine young people told me that they were disappointed, I said:

Let me tell you that I am very much afraid that you are going to be the ones who will be disappointed.

I went further and hazarded the prediction that before all was said and done

on the right of 18-year-olds to vote, they would not only be disappointed but perhaps even embittered.

Just a week or two after our vote on Public Law 91-285, I predicted that even if it should happen that the Court would say that the Congress can prescribe voting rights as to Federal elections, it is most doubtful if any court, even the U.S. Supreme Court, would go so far as to say that the Congress has the constitutional power to order the States to permit all of those electors 18 years of age or older to vote in State, county, city, and school elections.

Well, it is always a big gamble to ever predict what the U.S. Supreme Court will do, but if I had laid a wager last summer when I discussed this matter with our young constituents, I would have won the wager and my prediction would have come true. In essence the Supreme Court did exactly what I predicted. The Court ruled the act of Congress was valid as to the vote for President, Vice President, U.S. Senator, and U.S. Representative. Period. The decision of the Court means almost exactly what I explained to my young friends would happen. They can walk into the polling place and cast their vote for two or three offices, and must turn right around and walk out, being denied the right to vote on those offices closest to home.

There have not been many elections since the decision of the Supreme Court, but I remain convinced that my prediction was accurate in that these young people will be disappointed and embittered, because they have not really been given a right, but only a small part of a right. They will ask again and again, "Why am I denied the right to vote for the members of our legislature, our judges, even our city councilmen and members of our local school boards, if I have the right to vote for President, Vice President, Senator, and Congressman?"

As things stand now only three States have enfranchised 18-year-olds: Alaska, Georgia, and Kentucky. With the Supreme Court decision of December 21, 1970, in the case of Oregon against Mitchell, all of our States and the local subdivisions thereof have staring them in the face the requirement for double sets of ballots, or in the case of voting machines, double voting machines. In all duplicate voting records and voting registration must be maintained. Confusion is one thing. Cost is another. It will not take much imagination to immediately envision the confusion which will arise, of one group coming into the polling place to vote one kind of ballot while another group will have a different kind of ballot. Then, too, the cost could add up to a very staggering expense for the already hard-pressed subdivisions of government, who are imploring us in this new Congress to find some way to approve revenue sharing in order that they can have some more Federal money with no strings attached.

I have no way to estimate what the cost would be in the State of Missouri. In New York State it has been estimated it would range from \$8 to \$10 million. In

our own State of Missouri it is my own estimate that it could run as much as \$3 to \$5 million. The report which accompanies House Joint Resolution 223 points out that the cost in the city of St. Louis alone would be \$2.5 million.

But our action today, meaning the Committee on the Judiciary bringing to the floor a means by which the Constitution of the United States may be amended, is somewhat of a departure from the custom of this Congress in recent years. Our action today indicates that we want to submit this issue of 18-year-old voting to the States. By House Joint Resolution 223 we say, in effect, we want to uphold States rights. Certainly the trend in former years has been in the other direction.

So I suppose it could be said that House Joint Resolution 223 is in fact a States rights measure. While it does not let the voters of each State pass upon 18-year-old voting, it does enable the members of the legislature of each State to respond in an orderly fashion to the judgment of the citizens whom they represent, as to whether or not the young people in their midst are mature and qualified enough to help select the men and women who run their government.

Mr. Chairman, I am not certain whether this constitutional amendment, even if it is ratified by a sufficient number of States to become valid, will cure all the problems which respect to 18-year-old voting. There may be some State laws which restrict voting on the basis of age, where candidates are nominated by petition, or where there are certain referendum procedures that involve issues rather than candidates. It is quite possible there may be other laws governing non-Federal elections in the various States, which will have to be changed to prevent conflict with the proposed intent of this amendment. That is why, Mr. Chairman, I said long ago that the best way to accord the 18-year-olds the right to vote is to have a carefully worded proposition placed on the ballot in each State, which would be tailored to the needs in each State, and let everyone in that State have a voice in determining this important issue.

I have never opposed the concept of the right of 18-year-olds to vote, although the results of an opinion poll circulated a year or two ago in our congressional district revealed that our constituents were overwhelmingly opposed to the concept of 18-year-old voting. I suppose that was because of student unrest on our campuses, and a growing impatience with the militant attitude of youth who were more interested in demonstrations than in getting an education. But even at that time I said I thought the issue of 18-year-old voting should be settled by the electorate of each State, that they should have a right to determine by a clear choice on the ballot whether these young people should vote or not.

I am sure we all hope and expect this resolution to be approved by the necessary two-thirds vote of this body, but there is a need for prompt action. Many of our State legislatures are now in ses-

sion. There remains some question as to whether there can be a vote by enough of our legislatures in a sufficient number of States, in time to make this amendment operative in the 1972 elections.

Of course there will be some who will say that to avoid confusion and the expense of a dual age voting system is only a superficial appeal, and that there need be no confusion and expense if each State proceeds to change its own law. The procedure that we are about to employ will, however, foreclose upon some States who may wish to endure these admitted problems of confusion and cost as a price of adhering to their own State's policy concerning voting age. That could very well be a policy contrary to the intent of this amendment, and of course if this amendment is approved by a sufficient number of States then it will apply to those who disapprove it as well as those who approve it. I suppose there may be those who will vote "no" on this effort to amend the Constitution, largely upon the basis that the sovereignty of our States should not be further eroded by denying to every one of them the right to set qualifications for voting in their own elections.

But, Mr. Chairman, there comes a time that every one of us cannot be indulged in his own preferences and for his own convenience. Someone has said that just a slight mistake on the part of the polling officials by permitting an 18-year-old to vote, just one or two or three in a bond election, could invalidate the entire election. If the bond council ever found out there had been just one error, they would never approve the bonds, and then think of the expense to have to hold the election again.

A while ago I said there would be confusion. Once again let us think of the expense. There will be separate Federal ballots for each congressional district. There will have to be separate registration, separate voting, and separate counting of these newly enfranchised youth. When voting is complete, there will be an uncertainty and delay in tabulation of the election results in 1972. In order to implement a dual voting age system where machines are used, there will have to be separate machines, one with a complete ballot, another listing only Federal candidates. It will be hard to calculate a way to lock the levers under State and local offices when a young voter uses a machine that contains a full list of candidates. In those areas using paper ballots, there will have to be two sets, one listing only Federal candidates, and the other listing all candidates.

For the foregoing reasons I hope and trust that we may have a two-thirds vote today to submit this amendment at a very early date, which will certainly be a step toward dispelling the confusion that would exist without this change. It would be my judgment that most Members will approve this resolution, and those who do not, of course must accept the tremendous extra cost of a dual election system in the belief that this is a price worth paying for preserving the rights of the States to set the age of suffrage in their own areas.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I support today's effort to lower the voting age in elections in the United States to age 18. The joint resolution before us today, which must be passed by a two-thirds vote and ratified by three-fourths of the States, lowers the voting age to 18 in State, local and Federal elections. The week before last the Senate passed an identical resolution by a vote of 94 to 0. It is my hope that today's vote in the House will be a similar demonstration of our faith and confidence in the ability of our Nation's youth to participate in their government.

Last year the Congress provided for a lower voting age in all elections through an amendment to the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended. In December of last year the Supreme Court passed on the constitutionality of that act in its decision, *Oregon against Mitchell*. The Court ruled that the act was constitutional insofar as it lowered the voting age for Federal elections. The Court ruled however, that Congress could not by simple statute lower the voting age for State and local elections. The decision of the Court is a remarkable one for the number of Justices who dissented or wrote concurring opinions. The Court was badly split on each of the questions it was asked to decide. It is proper, therefore, that we provide clearer constitutional guidance and support in this area through a constitutional amendment rather than a simple statute. There is logic to the argument that if it took a constitutional amendment to allow all citizens to vote regardless of color, to allow women to vote, and to abolish the poll tax, then we should provide for a lower voting age through a constitutional amendment.

The Court's decision in *Oregon against Mitchell* means that in the 47 States which have a higher-than-18 voting age requirement, the group of citizens between 18 and 21 will only be able to vote in Federal elections. This means that those States will need to maintain separate voter registration lists and balloting procedures. This will result in a fantastic amount of extra administrative burden and expense. It is estimated that the lack of uniformity would cost New York City an additional \$5 million alone.

In my State of Ohio, the Hamilton County Board of Elections—which includes Cincinnati—has predicted that it will have to spend approximately \$50,000 extra to take care of the separate sets of registration cards and other records. In Cuyahoga county, which includes Cleveland and its many suburbs, the board of elections has estimated that the dual registration of 90,000 new voters would cost between \$40,000 and \$50,000. As the secretary of state of Ohio has predicted, there will be confusion to the voter and confusion at the polling place for the precinct elections officials.

If this additional cost and confusion is to be avoided, the States must act individually to lower the voting age or Congress must pass a constitutional amendment. But because of State requirements for amending State constitutions, it is apparent that 22 States—many of whom are interested in acting in this area—

cannot act to lower their voting age before the November 1972 elections. A National constitutional amendment would avoid this dilemma and enable the entire Nation to move to a lower voting age in time for the presidential elections.

But I would not, Mr. Chairman, be arguing for a measure of this importance on the grounds of convenience alone. I am for this amendment because I believe it is right.

Today there are some 3 million American taxpayers and full-time employees, about 983,000 members of the armed services, and more than 5 million Americans pursuing higher education that are denied their right to vote. Altogether, some 10.5 million young Americans, for the most part sharing the same civic and personal responsibilities as voting citizens are disenfranchised merely by reason of age. In many States young people under 21 are permitted to carry and in most 18- to 21-year-olds are liable in criminal and civil actions. The States themselves have thus recognized this age group as responsible. The famous social scientist, Margaret Mead has said that this age group is: "Better educated than any other group and more mature than young people in the past."

On the whole 81 percent of all Americans graduated from high school before the age of 18 and more than half of all 18- to 21-year-olds have gone on to higher education. It is clear that this age group does have the capacity for intelligent and rational civic choice.

Furthermore, the enfranchisement of these young Americans would greatly benefit local government—especially in light of the widespread interest of today's youth for public service, education reform, and improvement of the environment.

It is time to extend the vote to 18-year-olds in all elections; it is time to establish the principle in the supreme law of the land. The maturity and willingness of today's youth to bear the responsibilities of citizenship is certainly and without question deserving of the right of franchise.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the proposed constitutional amendment to give 18-year-olds the right to vote in State and local elections as well as Federal elections.

Our young are better educated and better informed than any previous generation. They have taken a deep interest in the policies of our Government. They have fought our war. We can no longer deny them the privilege of participating in the democratic process; we can no longer deny ourselves the promise of new ideas and fresh approaches.

The Supreme Court recognized these facts in sanctioning the 18-year-old vote for Federal elections. They held, however, that a constitutional amendment would be required to extend the franchise to State and local elections. Consequently, under the present ruling 18-year-olds will be able to vote for President and for Congress, but not for their Governors, mayors, or State legislators.

This leaves us with an almost unworkable set of voting laws—at least, as they relate to 18-year olds. Most States will be

forced to set up dual balloting and registration procedures at substantial costs to themselves. We cannot begin to estimate the confusion a system like this will cause among the voters.

Even more important is the fact that, if 18-year-olds are felt by the Congress and the Court to be responsible enough to vote for Federal offices, then certainly they are responsible enough to vote at the State and local levels. A dual system would be as unjust as it was unworkable.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we must be aware that ratification of the amendment by the States is going to take some time. If 18-year-olds are to vote in the 1972 elections this amendment must be approved immediately by the Congress. It has my full support.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the proposed constitutional amendment which would lower the voting age to 18 in State, local, and Federal elections. It is gratifying to see the Senate approve an identical resolution by a vote of 94-0.

As most of my colleagues know, I have long been a vociferous and enthusiastic supporter of lowering the voting age and on February 4, 1969, when I introduced my resolution proposing such a change I said then it was a matter of gravest urgency.

Now a little more than 2 years later we are showing those who do not have the franchise in all elections, that the House of Representatives believes they are worthy and capable of voting for their elected officials.

As a matter of fact, just yesterday I had the opportunity to greet the first young person under 21 to register in my congressional district. There were more than 800 registrants who patiently awaited the opportunity to sign up during that first day. I want to now share with my colleagues the sentiments of one youthful voter in my district who expresses disillusionment to the way our country has proceeded with its foreign policy and how he has determined to make his voice heard. This college student said:

After reading your views (of the necessity for 18-21 year olds to be permitted to vote) I then went down to the Board of Elections and registered to vote. You have renewed my faith in trying to help correct our mistakes we have made in the past so that this country can once again take its place as the greatest country in the world.

There is no question but the majority wants to work within the system to affect the necessary changes for us to remain the greatest country in the world. Mr. Speaker, this is an old battle for me and legislatively at least it ends in victory with our approval of the constitutional amendment which I cosponsored.

As far back as 1966 the New York State Assembly, of which I was a member, approved my bill which would reduce the voting age to 18 in the State. Unfortunately, the Republican-dominated senate judiciary committee refused to report out the bill.

But the goal permitting 18-year-olds the right to vote in all elections will not be an easy one to obtain. A constitutional amendment following approval by the Congress must now be ratified by three-fourths of the State legislatures. And if

past experience in New York State is an indication, then it will be extremely difficult to achieve final ratification. Yet, I feel certain following last year's approval by the Congress of the bill permitting to 18- to 21-year-olds the right to vote in Federal elections that now three-fourths of the legislatures will eventually grant this age group the franchise.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our positive action today is a manifestation of our desire to welcome into the democratic process today's young people.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, when the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the 1970 Voting Rights Act provision extending the franchise to 18-year-olds, it ruled that the law was binding only upon elections for Federal office. We were thus confronted by an ironic situation: that the Government of the United States considered persons between the ages of 18 and 20 sufficiently mature to participate in the election of a man to the highest office in Government; but most States, unless they acted promptly to revise their voting laws, would not consider them discerning enough to discriminate between candidates for State, county, or local offices.

I believe we have an obligation to the States and to these newly enfranchised citizens to amend the Constitution of the United States to extend the right to vote in every election to citizens 18 years of age and older. By adopting House Joint Resolution 223, we have confirmed this Nation's voting policies and cleared up any questions or confusion that would have arisen as a result of the Supreme Court's decision.

When the original States set 21 as the voting age almost 200 years ago, we were a small, agrarian Nation, with low levels of education and poor means of communication. Today, our Nation's young people are better educated, better informed, and better able to grapple with the sophisticated concepts of government than those of even a generation ago. They are entering the armed services, undertaking family obligations, and accepting responsibility for their own support. They have already entered the mainstream of political life by giving of their time and talent working for those issues and candidates they support. By denying them the full franchise, we are denying them expression of commitments they have voluntarily undertaken. Thus we serve only to frustrate their energies, enthusiasm, and sense of purpose. The time is therefore ripe to permit their inclusion in the total electoral process.

For that reason I voted "yea" on House Joint Resolution 223. I hope that the States will act swiftly, as several already have, to ratify this proposed amendment so that we will have, by the time of the 1972 elections, extended the full rights and obligations of the franchise to Americans who have reached the age of 18.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

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

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOWARD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWARD: Page 2, strike out lines 3 and 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. Neither the United States nor any State shall make or enforce any law which shall have the effect of treating as other than a person who has attained the age of legal majority and citizen of the United States who is eighteen years of age or older.

"Sec. 3. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. However, Mr. Chairman, I will withhold my point of order and reserve it until the gentleman from New Jersey has explained his proposed amendment.

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

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) reserving his point of order in order to provide me with time to explain this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I feel, is the only opportunity we will have in this country this year to provide the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds in America with the opportunity to vote in all elections. I believe it is necessary for this amendment to pass, which merely states that not only will we give the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds in the Nation the privileges of adults and the responsibilities as far as voting is concerned but that we will give to them the privileges and responsibilities of everything under the law which is deemed necessary for people who have attained the age of majority.

It has been mentioned here before that 14 States recently voted down referenda concerning the lowering of the voting age to 18 and 5 others turned down referenda which would have lowered the voting age to 19. This is a total of 19 States, which leaves only 31 State legislatures that will be faced with this proposition, where they have not had an opportunity for the people to vote against the referendum either for an 18- or a 19-year-old vote.

However, I believe much of the objection of the people in the referendums throughout the country to this is that they object to our saying to the young people of America that we consider you adults only on election day but we do not consider you to be adult enough to take

the responsibilities of majority. This amendment would take care of that situation.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote for this constitutional amendment. I have introduced legislation and have been in favor of an 18-year-old vote since I arrived in Congress in the 89th Congress. I was the State cochairman for a campaign for an 18-year-old vote in my own State of New Jersey 2 years ago, but I am concerned that we do not drop the ball after it leaves the House of Representatives and merely say that we took care of it here in Congress. The real issue and the intent that we should have is to have an 18-year-old vote.

Our young people are serving in the Armed Forces and certainly they are doing adult work there. They have shown and demonstrated over the past years that they are concerned with others and with America. As we talk with young people, they are concerned with what we are going to do about educating people in the future; they are concerned about peace and concerned about helping and working with the poor; they are concerned about narcotics control. Truly, I do not know how we did it, but this generation of American adults, of American young adults, which we have raised is the best generation that has ever been raised in any country at any time. Truly we have given them a lot of things such as clothing and automobiles.

Sometimes we get upset with them and we say how can they be so ungrateful, because we have given them everything. We heard the voices coming back to us, "Yes, but it was the wrong kind of everything. We need the intangibles; we need improvement for the future, improvement for the young and the poor." I believe that they should have a voice in making these decisions. It can only be done through the acceptance of this amendment.

And, so, if we truly want an 18-year-old vote in this country, I urge the consideration of this amendment. Let the House work its will. Let us accept this amendment. The only way we can do that is through the kindness and generosity and foresight of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary whom I humbly appeal to to please withdraw his point of order against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) on his point of order.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the merits or demerits of the proposal, the proposal is not germane to the resolution at hand, for the following reasons:

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD) does more than extend the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older. By its terms it prohibits the United States or any State from making or enforcing:

Any law which shall have the effect of treating as other than a person who has attained the age of legal majority any citizen of the United States who is 18 years of age or older.

Apparently this would entail a far-ranging revision of all State and Federal

laws in which age distinctions play a role. For example, the proposed amendment would prohibit age distinctions in laws dealing with criminal responsibility such as youthful offender statutes; it would alter State restrictions on liquor consumption. It would affect adoption and guardianship laws and laws relating to the management of estates and the right to contract and the age to marry. It would probably affect a variety of State and Federal licensing statutes and support laws. I suspect that the proposed amendment would affect regulations and statutes in a number of fields which the proponent of the amendment himself may be unaware.

The House Joint Resolution, as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, embodies a new article of amendment to standardize the minimum voting age for Federal as well as State and local elections. It deals only with access to the franchise. It does not touch on the wide variety of subjects affected by the proposed amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD).

Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order on the grounds that the proposed amendment is nongermane to the new article of amendment to the Constitution now under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I do.

Mr. Chairman, I have already spoken on the factual aspects of this amendment as to why I feel it should be adopted. So, I shall speak now as to the germaneness of the amendment.

I feel quite presumptuous in doing this, as a former elementary schoolteacher, to debate this issue with one of the most renowned attorneys in the United States of America on what may be a point of law here. But I would point out the fact that the matter which we are debating on the floor this afternoon has to do with American citizens who are age 20, 19 or 18, and what privileges and responsibilities we feel that they should obtain.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment deals only with American citizens who are 20, 19, and 18 years of age and what privileges and responsibilities they should be given.

It is exactly the same idea. I cannot think of anything more germane. The gentleman from New York stated that this would have implications concerning court actions in this country. Well, for 6 years while I traveled around my own State and other States urging 18-year-old voting in America, I said that one of the things that was wrong was that people could not vote below the age of 21. But yet the criminal courts themselves consider them to be adults at 18. In other words, if a person is arrested at age 18 and if he is indicted and tried and if he is found guilty he can be sentenced as an adult. This amendment would not change that at all.

The gentleman from New York mentioned liquor consumption. Whether we have a voting age at 21 or 18, I do not know of many people 18 years of age or

older who desire to have a beer in this country will be changed as long as they have the funds to pay for it.

The chairman also mentioned guardianship and support. This is another area that has already been determined, that 18-year-olds are adults.

When a person receives help as a young child, whether it be under welfare programs or alimony, or anything else, any other kind of support, that support stops at age 18 unless someone is mentally or physically handicapped.

The Government itself has said they get no more help after 18. Why would that be? It must be because the Government has decided that at 18 they are ready to fend for themselves, they are adults.

So my amendment would merely extend this subject, just exactly the same as what we have before the House today. And I submit it is germane, and I hope it will be so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOLLING). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) makes the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD) that it is not germane. Clearly the amendment is not germane. One individual proposition may not be amended by another individual proposition, even though the two may belong to the same class. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a question or two to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER).

Does the gentleman contemplate at an early date bringing forth legislation from his committee to provide all the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship for the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old voters this resolution seeks to enfranchise?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think that is a matter that appropriately must be left to the States rather than the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. Left to the States?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, the gentleman is content to make second-class citizens out of the young people the gentleman would enfranchise by this resolution?

Mr. CELLER. I do not think that is a proper conclusion.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Would 18-year-old Indians be able to vote?

Mr. CELLER. I think the only ones who can vote are citizens. If they are citizens, and they are 18 years of age they would be able to vote.

Mr. GROSS. Well, would an 18-year-old Indian living on a reservation be able to vote under the terms of the resolution?

Mr. CELLER. The proposed new article of amendment simply forbids denial of suffrage on the ground of age to citizens who have attained the age of 18.

Mr. GROSS. Well, are they citizens, the 18-year-old Indians who are living on a reservation?

Mr. CELLER. I hope that some of my Indians in my district are citizens, but I am afraid they are not the Indians that the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. GROSS. I am afraid they are not, either.

Is there any denial under the Voting Rights Act of the franchise for Indians of any age who are living on reservations?

Mr. CELLER. There is nothing specific in the resolution itself, no, sir.

Mr. GROSS. But there is no denial of Indians who live on a reservation who are 18 years old, or of any age, no denial of their right to vote under the Voting Rights Act; is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. CELLER. If he is a citizen, and he is 18 years old, and he is otherwise qualified, of course.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, and say to the House that I am opposed to this resolution for I believe that extension of voting rights for 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old youths should be left exclusively to each of the 50 States.

I agree fully with the conclusions reached by Representatives MAYNE, of Iowa, and WIGGINS, of California, members of the Judiciary Committee which produced this legislation:

We are convinced this Republic will be better served in the long run if the sovereignty of our States is not further eroded by denying them the power to fix non-discriminatory qualifications for voting in their own elections.

I share the doubts and misgivings of Representative EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, the residency claims of 18-year-old college students and their participation in all forms of local elections as well as those for Federal and State offices.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that when 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds are made adults in the matter of voting they should also be made to assume all the responsibilities and obligations of full citizenship under the laws of this land.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had authorized an 18-year-old vote proposal, House Joint Resolution 476, similar to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey in that it would confer full citizenship on the new voter.

I was sorely disappointed that the chairman felt it necessary to raise the issue of germaneness and that now the Members of this body are denied the opportunity to vote on a measure which would grant not only the vote but also the responsibilities of citizenship.

Last June, the media-generated "public opinion" of the hour so clouded reason that many Members ignored the constitutional questions presented, and passed the buck to the President. The President of the United States, while openly stating that the 18-year-old vote bill was of doubtful constitutionality, nevertheless signed the bill and again

passed the buck to the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court in turn by one vote, a 5-to-4 decision, expediently compromised the bill by holding that the act of Congress amended the Constitution as to Federal voter qualifications but was invalid as to the States.

Ever since, confusion has resulted with the States now facing the dilemma of dual voter qualifications; that is, those qualified to vote in State elections and those qualified to vote in Federal elections. And, as if to solve the problem that this body originally helped create, we are now being asked to go back and correct the situation by passing a "guideline-like constitutional amendment for the States to ratify—which could take up to 7 years or never be ratified."

I suggest that the pressing issue at hand is not whether or not 18-year-olds are given the vote, but rather whether or not we as representatives of our people will run the Government within due bounds as provided in the Constitution and as entrusted to us, or if we will again submit to emotion and hysteria, to justify our actions merely to appease pressure groups.

And to those pious souls who can but come forward with pleasant rhetorical rationalizations to justify voting "yes" without admitting that it is because they fear the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds—already Federal voters who will be participating in the next congressional election—I would remind them that statistics are oftentimes misleading. They may well be making a mistake if they feel that all of the teenagers' vote can be captured merely because of a "yes" vote on this amendment.

After all, it is the Government and Constitution of 18-year-olds also, and I believe teenagers understand that what Congress has given one day, Congress can take away another day. Only a constitutional amendment is intended to protect the individual from panic reaction by future legislatures.

After all, this vote gives them nothing. The determination of giving 18-year-olds the right to vote in State and local elections still rests with the States—which could have given what we purport to give at any time and even without this amendment. At most we are, but playing politics with both national parties vying to out do each other in trying to make the young people think they are receiving something.

In fact, to face up to our responsibility as sworn, we should first repeal the section 320 of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970, and then properly bring up for consideration the question of amending the constitution as provided in article V of that document.

To be considered in our deliberation there should be more than a simple proposal to grant the vote to the 18-year-old. Why should his new citizenship be limited exclusively to the vote? If age is to be the sole qualifying factor and he is considered intelligent enough, mature enough, and informed enough to vote, it would certainly seem that the 18-year-

old should be fully emancipated from all Federal and State, civil and criminal disabilities and be awarded full equal citizenship just as any other adult under existing laws. If the 18-year-old is going to be able to help choose lawmakers, why should he be protected as a privileged class not subject to the equal protection of laws he will be helping to make through the power of his vote?

While passage of House Joint Resolution 223, limited only to granting the right to vote, offers a solution to but one of the pressing desires of youth to get involved in the action, I suggest it will but create additional problems and inequities. If the teenager is old enough to vote, he should be old enough to own property, to sue or be sued in his own name, to give consent to marry or to have an abortion, to own an automobile, or carry a firearm, to run for Congress and be able to buy a drink of hard liquor. By limiting this amendment to merely suffrage, are we not opening a Pandora's box for "causes" and "crusades?"

Since we are limiting the vote to youth 18 and above, can it not be that we will later be accused of discriminating against those 16 or even 14 years of age? If age 18 was selected merely because it was easy to adopt an argument for, because they can be forced into military service, "old enough to fight—old enough to vote," then could we not ask, "Why not reduce the voting age to 16 or 14 years of age?" After all, I know many school children even 6 years of age who do not like being forced to attend school and who would like to be able to vote so they could vote against their school board members just as it is suggested that the 18-year-olds will be mobilized to vote against the draft in the expectation that by so doing they will end the war.

If, as responsible representatives of our people, we are going to give the 18-year-old the right-to-vote portion of citizenship, then why should they not be given full citizenship—the responsibilities of American citizens as well as a privileged right to use the vote to protest against the Government but escape accountability? We should not leave them half teenager and half citizen. What more equitable proposal for full citizenship could be considered by us than by amending House Joint Resolution 223 to provide an additional section that "neither the United States nor any State shall make or enforce any law which shall have the effect of treating as other than an adult—a person who has attained the age of legal majority—any citizen of the United States who is 18 years of age or older?"

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 223) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote

to citizens 18 years of age or older, pursuant to House Resolution 299, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SCHMITZ

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. SCHMITZ. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SCHMITZ moves to recommit the Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 223) to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 401, nays 19, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—401

Abbott	Brozman	Dellenback
Abernethy	Brown, Mich.	Dellums
Abourezk	Brown, Ohio	Denholm
Abzug	Broyhill, N.C.	Dennis
Adams	Broyhill, Va.	Derwinski
Addabbo	Buchanan	Devine
Alexander	Burke, Fla.	Dickinson
Anderson	Burke, Mass.	Diggs
Calif.	Burlison, Mo.	Dingell
Anderson, Ill.	Burton	Donohue
Anderson, N.Y.	Byrne, Pa.	Dorri
Tenn.	Byrnes, Wis.	Dow
Andrews, Ala.	Byron	Downing
Andrews, N.D.	Cabell	Drinan
N. Dak.	Caffery	Dulski
Annunzio	Camp	Duncan
Archer	Carey, N.Y.	duPont
Arends	Carney	Dwyer
Ashbrook	Carter	Eckhardt
Ashley	Casey, Tex.	Edmondson
Aspin	Cederberg	Edwards, Ala.
Aspinall	Celler	Edwards, Calif.
Badillo	Chamberlain	Ellberg
Baker	Chappell	Erlenborn
Baring	Chisholm	Esch
Barrett	Clancy	Eshleman
Begich	Clark	Evans, Colo.
Belcher	Clausen	Evins, Tenn.
Bell	Don H.	Fascell
Bennett	Cleveland	Findley
Bergland	Collier	Fish
Betts	Collins, Ill.	Flood
Bevill	Collins, Tex.	Flowers
Blaggi	Colmer	Flynt
Blester	Conable	Foley
Bingham	Conte	Ford, Gerald R.
Blackburn	Conyers	Ford, William D.
Blanton	Corman	Forsythe
Blatnik	Cotter	Fountain
Boggs	Coughlin	Fraser
Boland	Crane	Frelinghuysen
Bolling	Culver	Frenzel
Bow	Daniel, Va.	Frey
Brademas	Daniels, N.J.	Fulton, Pa.
Brasco	Danielson	Fulton, Tenn.
Bray	Davis, Ga.	Fuqua
Brinkley	Davis, Wis.	Gallagher
Brooks	de la Garza	
Broomfield	Delaney	

Garmatz	McMillan	Ryan
Gaydos	Macdonald,	St Germain
Glaime	Mass.	Sandman
Gibbons	Madden	Sarbanes
Gonzalez	Mahon	Satterfield
Goodling	Mailliard	Saylor
Grasso	Mann	Scherle
Gray	Martin	Scheuer
Griffin	Mathias, Calif.	Schneebell
Griffiths	Mathis, Ga.	Schwengel
Grover	Matsunaga	Scott
Gubser	Mazzoli	Sebelius
Gude	Meeds	Seiberling
Hagan	Melcher	Shipley
Haley	Metcalfe	Shoup
Halpern	Mikva	Shriver
Hamilton	Miller, Calif.	Sikes
Hammer-	Miller, Ohio	Sisk
schmidt	Mills	Skubitz
Hanley	Minish	Slack
Hansen, Idaho	Minshall	Smith, Calif.
Hansen, Wash.	Mitchell	Smith, Iowa
Harrington	Mizell	Smith, N.Y.
Harsha	Mollohan	Snyder
Harvey	Monagan	Spence
Hastings	Montgomery	Springer
Hathaway	Moorhead	Stafford
Hawkins	Morgan	Staggers
Hays	Morse	Stanton,
Hechler, W. Va.	Mosher	J. William
Heckler, Mass.	Moss	Stanton,
Helstoski	Murphy, Ill.	James V.
Henderson	Murphy, N.Y.	Steed
Hicks, Mass.	Myers	Steele
Hicks, Wash.	Natcher	Steiger, Wis.
Hillis	Nedzi	Stevens
Hogan	Nelsen	Stokes
Holfield	Nichols	Stratton
Horton	Nix	Stubblefield
Hosmer	Obey	Stuckey
Howard	O'Hara	Sullivan
Hull	O'Konski	Symington
Hungate	O'Neill	Talcott
Hunt	Passman	Taylor
Ichord	Patman	Teague, Calif.
Jacobs	Patten	Teague, Tex.
Jarman	Pelly	Terry
Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Thompson, Ga.
Johnson, Pa.	Perkins	Thompson, N.J.
Jonas	Pettis	Thomson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.	Peyser	Thone
Jones, N.C.	Pickle	Tiernan
Jones, Tenn.	Pike	Udall
Karh	Plrnie	Ullman
Kastenmeier	Podell	Van Deerlin
Kazen	Poff	Vander Jagt
Keating	Powell	Vanik
Kee	Preyer, N.C.	Veysey
Keith	Price, Ill.	Vigorito
Kemp	Price, Tex.	Waggonner
King	Pryor, Ark.	Waldie
Kluczynski	Pucinski	Wampler
Koch	Purcell	Ware
Kuykendall	Quile	Watts
Kyl	Quillen	Whalen
Kyros	Railsback	Whalley
Landrum	Randall	White
Latta	Rangel	Whitehurst
Leggett	Rees	Whitten
Lennon	Reid, Ill.	Widnall
Lent	Reid, N.Y.	Williams
Link	Reuss	Wilson, Bob
Lloyd	Rhodes	Wilson,
Long, La.	Riegle	Charles H.
Long, Md.	Robinson, Va.	Winn
Lujan	Robison, N.Y.	Wolff
McClary	Rodino	Wright
McCloskey	Roe	Wylder
McClure	Rogers	Wyllie
McCollister	Roncalio	Wyman
McCormack	Rooney, Pa.	Yates
McDade	Rosenthal	Yatron
McDonald,	Rostenkowski	Young, Fla.
Mich.	Roush	Young, Tex.
McEwen	Roy	Zablocki
McFall	Roybal	Zion
McKay	Runnels	Zwach
McKevitt	Ruppe	
McKinney	Ruth	

NAYS—19

Burleson, Tex.	Hall	Rousselot
Clawson, Del.	Hébert	Schmitz
Fisher	Hutchinson	Steiger, Ariz.
Gettys	Mayne	Wiggins
Goldwater	Michel	Wyatt
Green, Oreg.	Poage	
Gross	Rarick	

NOT VOTING—12

Clay	Edwards, La.	McCulloch
Corbett	Green, Pa.	Mink
Dent	Hanna	Roberts
Dowdy	Landgrebe	Rooney, N.Y.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), pursuant to the provisions of the Constitution, the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Landgrebe.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Clay.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mrs. Mink.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 7, a measure identical to that which the House has just approved, for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 7

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

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that the joint resolution is identical to the House joint resolution just passed by the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chairman of the committee so stated when he called up the Senate joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the Senate joint resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), pursuant to the provisions of the Constitution, the Senate joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar joint resolution (H.J. Res. 223) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 223, a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens of 18 years of age or older, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that assurances were given by the leadership that there would be no vote on Tuesday, March 16, I had committed myself to business which kept me in the State of Indiana, and was therefore absent from rollcall No. 20, the conference report on the debt limit and social security. Had I been present, as I would have been had those assurances not been given, I should have voted "yea" on the conference report. I would like the RECORD to show that fact.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED BY THE TWO HOUSES AND FOUND TRULY ENROLLED, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, the clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICAN POLICY: FROM "EVEN-HANDED" TO "HEAVYHANDED"

(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, the term "evenhanded" was once used to describe U.S. policy in the Middle East. Our present actions in regard to the developments in that area have confirmed my long-held conviction that the title was a serious misnomer. "Heavyhanded" might have been a more appropriate description.

In return for vague assurances of security, the United States is pressing Israel to withdraw its troops from all the territories acquired in 1967. I strongly believe that this unilateral American initiative will have unfortunate consequences for the achievement of any set-

tlement in the Middle East and for the security and survival of Israel.

In the last months, the policy of the United States has changed from a pledge to support Israel's need for secure borders to yesterday's insistence on withdrawal. Israel is now feeling the weight of that heavy hand.

What has taken place in the interim to account for this change of American position? Has Egypt suddenly promised to abide by any peaceful settlement? Has Russian presence in the area been removed? Has Egypt declared that Israeli ships would be allowed access to the Suez Canal in the event of its reopening? Has she made the most basic concession for peace—the renewal of the cease-fire agreement? To all these questions, I must answer, no.

What concessions have the Arabs made to give Israel reason to sign away all this territory as she mistakenly did in 1957? None. Indeed, what incentive would there be for any Arab concessions after Israel gives up these claims? I must give the same answer.

In return, Israel is being promised the security that comes from the presence of an international peacekeeping force. But unless Secretary Rogers has a different interpretation than I do of the factors responsible for the 1967 war, I cannot see how such a guarantee can be taken seriously by Israel. Ten years after Israel gave up the territory she had won in 1956 her citizens were again forced to fight when the United Nations Emergency Force left so precipitously. A settlement must be worked out by the parties to the conflict.

U.S. action in this is worthy of examination. In 1957, in a memorandum to Abba Eban, the then Secretary of State John Foster Dulles wrote that—

The United States believes the Gulf of Aquaba and the Straits of Tiran to constitute international waters, and no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage of these.

But at the same time it appears that no nation will act in the event that there is a violation of this principle. After the United Nations Force left that area in 1967, the United States did nothing to assure Israeli access to these waterways. Israel seems justified then in her skepticism that such access will be assured in the 1970's.

In addition, the Rogers declaration of a nation's security as something unrelated to her geographical boundaries is an interesting one, but quite inconsistent in the light of past events. I recall, and I am sure all of you do, America's reaction when Russian missiles began to be installed in Cuba in 1962. President Kennedy's initiative in that matter was entirely justified, and I wholeheartedly supported that initiative.

Yet, I recall that one of the most salient arguments given at that time was that Cuba was only 90 miles away from the U.S. territorial boundaries. It then appears that we are using arguments as they suit our particular purpose at a given time, and I for one think this weakens our credibility in the eyes of the world, not to mention the well-being of our allies.

The strategic importance of this area is well known. And it should by this time be recognized that a strong Israel is the one guarantee of peace in the region. It should also be obvious from past history that for peace to be meaningful, it will have to be achieved by give-and-take among the parties—not by the heavy-handed imposition of conditions for settlement from the outside.

Israel has repeatedly stated that she will be willing to give up most of the territory she acquired. Is it not right that she be allowed to bargain as to how much and in return for what assurances? I sincerely hope that the ill-conceived declaration by the State Department does not irreparably injure Israel's chances for a just settlement.

RETURN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

(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, as a long-time supporter of the SST I naturally was disappointed at the outcome of last Thursday's vote. In my opinion, terminating the SST prototype program will, in the long run, adversely affect our Nation's economy.

Nevertheless, my frustration was more than assuaged by the fact that political scientists someday may term Thursday's proceedings one of the most memorable in congressional history. Indeed, thanks to last year's rule changes, March 18, 1971, will be remembered as the day when the House of Representatives was returned to the people of the United States.

Under previous House rules, when amendments were decided on nonrecorded head counts, some Members' decisions often were based upon anticipated colleague reaction to their vote. Consequently, rather than offend their party leaders and committee chairmen—or ranking minority members—upon whose favor they often must rely, these Members found it convenient either to avoid a teller vote or, worse, vote against their convictions. This accounts for the fact that, heretofore, most controversial amendments frequently were decided by the votes of fewer than 100 Members.

Thanks to the new House rule, voting motivation has changed. Now that he must go on record, each Representative will cast his teller vote on the basis of constituent, rather than colleague considerations. This fact accomplishes two important objectives.

First, it materially dissipates the grip of the seniority system. Last Thursday, for example, a majority of this body refused to follow the example of the House Majority Leader, the Minority Leader, Minority Whip, and 18 of 21 committee chairmen.

Second, this new voting rationale inevitably makes the House of Representatives more truly responsive to the constituency which it was elected to serve.

Communication is the essential ingredient of representative government.

This communication must be a two-way street. First, the citizen must convey his views to his elected official. Second, each legislator should be obliged to reveal, and explain, to his constituents his votes on current issues. While under previous congressional rules the former was possible, House Members were able to mask their views behind the cloak of nonrecorded teller votes. This screen having been removed, a majority of Representatives last Thursday communicated their agreement with what apparently was their constituents' sentiments.

As one whose vote contravened—and rightly so, I believe—the opinion of a majority of those contacting me regarding the SST, my communication role now begins in earnest.

RAILPAX BYPASSES CLEVELAND

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

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I along with many others in the northern tier of Ohio was greatly shocked and disappointed that the Railpax bypassed the city of Cleveland in the Railpax's route system announced yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable that one of the Nation's largest cities be omitted from the system, to say nothing of the entire northern tier of the State of Ohio with a population in excess of 5 million people.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Railpax Corporation would conduct an immediate rehearing on this matter and give Cleveland the rail transportation that it and the surrounding communities need.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1971.

HON. DAVID W. KENDALL,
Chairman, The Incorporators of the National
Railroad, Passenger Corporation, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KENDALL: This is to register my extreme shock and disappointment at the bypassing of the City of Cleveland in the rail passenger route system announced yesterday.

It is inconceivable that one of the nation's largest cities be omitted from the system, to say nothing of the entire northern tier of the State of Ohio with a population in excess of five million people. I strongly urge that you immediately reconsider this decision and would appreciate the opportunity of discussing this matter with you at the earliest possible time.

With best regards,
Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1971.

MR. DAVID KENDALL,
Chairman, National Railroad Passenger Cor-
poration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in support of the proposal submitted to you by U.S. Representative Walter E. Powell, Chairman of the Miami Valley Congressional Council, proposing certain routes for Railpax. We feel that the national interest and the success of Railpax dictate that Cincinnati be made the principal route for passenger travel from the Midwest to Florida.

In support of that recommendation, we submit that connecting lines from Cleveland, Detroit and Dayton are needed to service this gateway. We are further recommending that Cincinnati and Dayton be linked with the New York-Kansas City train, and that Washington-St. Louis should be operated through Cincinnati.

In addition to members of the Council, this letter is being signed by other interested Ohio Congressmen who have areas that would be favorably affected by the proposed connecting routes.

We respectfully urge your inclusion of these proposed routes in your March 15 decision, both to insure adequate service to Ohio and to assist in the financial success of the National Rail Passenger Corporation.

Respectfully,
William M. McCulloch, Jackson E. Betts,
William Minshall, Donald Clancy,
Charles A. Mosher, Walter E. Powell,
William B. Saxbe, Robert Taft, Jr.,
Delbert Latta, Charles W. Whalen, Jr.,
Clarence Brown, William J. Keating.

RAILPAX ROUTES

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, as I came on the House floor I heard the gentleman from Ohio speaking about the Railpax. I, too, would like to say that I have been bombarded by hundreds and even thousands of protests about this Railpax and their choosing of routes.

It seems to me that they have not followed the intentions of the committee and of the Congress nor have they followed the law of the land in some of the things that they have done. I cannot conceive leaving out a city of the size of Cleveland and bypassing it completely—a city that is one of the hubs of the West, as they have done in many other regions.

I can say that in my own situation back home, they have cut out all rail passenger traffic through that area where it is needed just as badly if not more than any other State in the Union. The system, as announced, puts Washington on a side track as far as Pittsburgh, Chicago, St. Louis and the industrial midwest is concerned. Two routes are suggested, both detours. One goes south to Charlottesville, thence west to Cincinnati and Indianapolis, and finally north to Chicago. The other detours north to Baltimore, thence to Harrisburg, then west to Pittsburgh, and finally zigzags on to Chicago. Either route sounds about as practical as a horse and buggy layout.

The logical and preferred routes would run directly west, through Cumberland to St. Louis or Cumberland to Chicago, via the B. & O. They are the shortest and quickest routes.

Railpax offers the following as reasons for failing to select these preferred routes, and I quote:

The route via Cumberland was not chosen principally because: (1) Specially suspended cars are required because of severe curvature track, and because tracks in some areas are so close together that soft-sprung cars run the danger of side-swiping trains on other tracks; (2) Population along the Baltimore route is five times as high; (3) A difficult connection at Pittsburgh requires at least 30 minutes; (4) Train could not be consolidated with the premier "Broadway Limited" at Har-

risburg unless operated over the recommended route.

Rejecting reasons three and four as unworthy of consideration by anybody except one who wishes to rationalize a mistake, I should like to make some comments on the other assigned reasons.

One of the reasons given for not selecting the B. & O. route was because of the tracks. However, some of the money made available to Railpax is to be used for track and equipment changes if necessary.

The segment between Washington and Cincinnati through Clarksburg was not chosen because of low current ridership and low population. I think that other factors should have been considered.

One of the criteria for route selection was the adequacy of other travel modes. Transportation is now, and has always been one of the major problems in West Virginia. The lack of good highways through the mountains and areas available for airports certainly should have been considered as a plus for using rail routes through West Virginia.

Another plus should have been the fact that there are 10 colleges located between Washington and Parkersburg which could have been served by a B. & O. route through West Virginia.

Thousands of citizens have business in Washington every day. Many of them would use the rails if service was adequate, convenient, and of superior quality. At present, railway service is incredibly poor. Under present conditions, passengers will choose the air. That will be no help to the railroads.

I have had literally thousands of complaints from people along the B. & O. and from other Congressmen.

Congress usually gets the blame, but I feel the fault lies with the railroad management who are primarily interested in dropping as many passenger trains as possible.

The Railpax system is being supported by the Federal Government. It was authorized by congressional action, and was designed to serve Government needs as well as the general public. The system was further designed as a prop for rail financial embarrassment. I do not believe the way it is set up now that it will do any one of these three.

If I had thought it was going to turn out like this, I would never have worked so hard to get this legislation through the House. I think the way it is set up now it will practically destroy essential and vital passenger service in many areas of the country. Congress should not put one more cent into Penn Central or any other railroad if this is what happens when you try to help them.

I am sure the situation is worse than we realize when you consider the complaints I have had from people and at least 50 to 100 Congressmen by letters, calls and so on who have said they do not think the distribution was fair.

I do not believe it was fair and I do not believe the decision was as the committee intended it to be or the Congress intended it to be.

Because of the many complaints, I will reopen the hearings on the entire Railpax system and will endeavor to see

why so many Members of Congress are dissatisfied with this plan.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned the fact that there was a lot of dissatisfaction with Railpax. Since then I have received I would say 25 calls from Members of Congress about it. Several of them have said that they cannot understand the reasoning of those on the committee who made the decision.

For instance, two cities in Texas were missed, one of them the largest city in the State, Dallas, was completely bypassed and Austin was bypassed and would have no railroad service there. In addition, they have no connections at all with Mexico.

Certainly, it seems to me that there was not good reasoning back of this and insofar as I know there is no direct connection with Canada.

So, I just think that it is time that, perhaps, the Congress take a look at this situation to see what did happen and who did make the decisions and how and why they made the decisions.

As I said this morning, I think the Committee on Banking and Currency will take a look at this problem to see what it is all about.

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

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

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend the gentleman from West Virginia for the action that he and his Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are going to take. I certainly agree with the gentleman that we should have a rail route directly connecting the United States and Mexico as well as one between the United States and Canada.

We in south Texas, and particularly myself who is honored to represent the city of Laredo, which is the main international gateway between the United States and Mexico, certainly urge the committee to look into the Railpax system and make sure that there is a north-south route coming through Austin and San Antonio and connecting with the National Railways of Mexico at Laredo on the border.

ARCADIA RESERVOIR SHOULD BE STARTED NOW

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Okmulgee County Soil and Water Conservation District has joined the growing list of responsible Oklahoma groups to urge that the United States take immediate steps to begin construction of the Arcadia Reservoir.

By resolution, this group has put the "top priority" tag on this project, and I concur with the District's judgment. This resolution, which I would like to have appear in the Record following my remarks, sets forth clear and compelling

reasons why it is not only necessary to begin construction of this reservoir, but reasons that we are losing money every month we delay the start—and thus the completion—of this project.

The Arcadia Reservoir, which has an exceptionally good cost-benefit ratio of 1 to 1.4, was authorized by Congress last year, but the administration has not budgeted funds for either planning or construction. I hope the Congress, in its review of the budget, will correct this situation and appropriate the funds to begin this project without further delay.

RESOLUTION TO GIVE ARCADIA RESERVOIR TOP PRIORITY—BY INDIVIDUALS, FIRMS AND GROUPS

Whereas, The President has proposed a full employment budget for fiscal 1972, and

Whereas, Construction of Arcadia Reservoir was not included, and

Whereas, The Public Works Committee of the House of which Congressman Ed Edmondson of Oklahoma is a member declared on December 3, 1970, that floods in the Deep Fork Valley cause damages of about \$791,000 annually, and

Whereas, Construction of Arcadia Reservoir would provide benefits estimated to be \$230,000 annually from flood damages prevented and the restoration of thousands of acres to better land use, and

Whereas, A spirit of hopelessness now exists which could be turned into a gigantic urge of self-help when the headwaters of the raging Deep Fork are curbed which is now beyond the control of landowners and is the most depressive factor in the economic and spiritual well-being of the entire valley, and

Whereas, Other benefits would include \$222,000 annually for a municipal water supply for the city of Edmond, also \$411,000 annual benefits for recreation, and \$208,000 for area re-development which is vital for full employment, and finally \$1,158,000 for water quality control, and

Whereas, The annual benefits from the above five sources have been declared to be \$2,229,000, and

Whereas, The annual charges against these benefits have been estimated to be only \$1,558,000 which provides a benefit to cost ratio of 1.4, as calculated by said Committee, and

Whereas, Public Law 566 retardation dams could never be expected to provide adequate protection because of rapid run-off plus industrial development in the Oklahoma City area, and

Whereas, This budget will be debated in many hearings and in associations and conferences related to water development during the year 1971,

Now therefore, be it resolved by the Oklahoma County Soil and Water Conservation District that it endorse(s) the program of the Deep Fork Watershed Association to ask the Oklahoma delegation in Congress to give top priority for funding the start of Arcadia Reservoir in the fiscal 1972 budget, and

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Executive-secretary of the Deep Fork Watershed Association to be used in the best interest of the Association.

MORATORIUM ON AMERICAN TROOP MOVEMENTS TO VIETNAM

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am to-

day renewing my call upon the President to impose a moratorium on the shipment of any further American replacement troops to Vietnam effective May 1.

Recently I introduced a sense of Congress resolution calling for such a moratorium, and it is my hope that this resolution will be considered by the Armed Services Committee.

My resolution in no way affects our present policy of rotating American troops back to the United States at the conclusion of 1 year of service in Vietnam.

What my resolution does is merely urge the President to announce to the world that as American troops are rotated back home they will not be replaced so that in 1 year all American troops would be out of Vietnam.

I have reason to believe that just as the cessation of American bombing raids on North Vietnam 2 years ago broke the deadlock and opened the way for peace talks in Paris, so would an announcement by the President of a moratorium on any further troop movements to Vietnam at this time lead to a release of American POW's and negotiation of a cease-fire for the orderly withdrawal of our troops.

I believe that such a moratorium is worth the risk for American disengagement from the Vietnam conflict.

If I were not absolutely certain that the South Vietnamese forces are now more than capable of carrying on the defense of their homeland, I would not be making this suggestion.

But the confident statements of the South Vietnamese command as to the success of its mission into Laos; the predictions of President Thieu that they are now strong enough to seriously consider invading North Vietnam, and all of the other statements being made by South Vietnamese authorities, make it crystal clear that the rest of this conflict is limited to the South and North Vietnamese forces.

The United States has fulfilled its mission—it has given South Vietnam the time this nation needed to develop its own defense capabilities, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that any further American casualties in Vietnam are not only needless, but senseless.

I fervently hope the President will announce such a moratorium as a significant gesture toward disengaging America's combat role in Southeast Asia.

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I had a particularly gratifying experience this morning as the House went into session when, for the first time, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration, I had the honor to bring forward a number of resolutions to provide money for the committees.

Mr. Speaker, I did not take time, I regret, to express to the Members of my subcommittee and to the chairman of the Committee on House Administration (Mr. HAYS) my appreciation for their cooperation and support.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. The gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) are members of the minority. On the majority side there are the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. POBELL), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO), all of whom, in addition to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE), the ranking minority member of the committee, and the committee chairman (Mr. HAYS) were in attendance and cooperated splendidly.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in my recollection all the ranking minority members of all the committees, all the subcommittee chairmen and prospective subcommittee chairmen, were contacted by members of the committee to determine their needs in terms of staffing. Their needs were realistic and necessary, and in every instance are justified.

I had a colloquy this morning with my distinguished friend from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), and my distinguished friend from Missouri (Mr. HALL)—Dr. HALL being Mr. GROSS' personal physician. I am delighted to be able to report that I have determined the good state of health of the gentleman from Iowa as certified by the gentleman from Missouri.

In our colloquy we discussed the oversight responsibilities of the legislative committees.

In each and every instance, Mr. Speaker, the majority and minority of the committees have been advised of the absolute necessity for the exercise of their oversight responsibilities. They have pledged that they will exercise that responsibility and report back. They have been notified that in the future, in the event their oversight responsibilities are not fulfilled, they cannot expect the staffing at the present level.

I am confident that these committees will exercise their oversight responsibilities, and I might expect that as they get into these very substantive matters involving the total Federal commitment and expenditures they might well come back for additional staff help which, if justified, and only if justified in each instance, will be forthcoming.

This is in a sense, I believe, the dawn of a new era brought about by the revision passed last summer of the Legislative Reorganization Act under which the committees are instructed to concentrate more on oversight and perhaps, we may hope, less on legislation itself.

Again I reiterate my gratitude to the members of the subcommittee and the members of the Committee on House Administration for their cooperation.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. I should like to congratulate the gentleman on the job he has done and say that until this hour I had never believed brother Friedel would ever be replaced with as able a man in explaining legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman very much. I regret very much I am not as articulate as our former colleague and friend from Baltimore, or as persuasive, but I learned at his feet.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. Reference was made a moment ago to one of our colleagues from Missouri, and from Iowa. It has just come to my attention that our colleague (Dr. HALL) wants to have a really good physician. I do not know whether it is the gentleman from Iowa or not, but it was just discovered that at an earlier operation his tonsillectomy had not been completed.

So on the advice of the gentleman from Iowa, he has just now had his tonsils removed for a second time, and we are glad he is back with us today. I am happy to have him here.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to proceed for an additional minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to grant the request, as much as the Chair would like to do so and is willing to do so now.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank my friend from Iowa for yielding.

I must say I was very heartened this morning when I called Dr. HALL's office and inquired of the health of the gentleman from Iowa to learn that his most recent physical had described him as a man of infinitely fewer years than his chronological years both in health and in spirit. It was just a very heartening thing to me.

I wonder if the gentleman from Missouri would like to add any details such as the blood pressure, and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri, but I will say to the gentleman that since I am under the tender care of the gentleman from Missouri (Dr. HALL) I have regained my youth.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is very good news to us.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. I am hoping and I understand it is the case, but I am very pleased that the distinguished gentleman from southwest Missouri did not encounter the trouble in his tonsillectomy that it was said developed in the case of an administrator of a Govern-

ment agency many years ago who had been under the impression that he had already had his tonsils removed when he was at an earlier age. However, it seemed they missed them and had to take them out. When they took him to go to the operating room they had a regular service sheet that they put on people who have their tonsils out. I guess most people who have their tonsils out run about 8 to 10 years of age, and this sheet that they placed over him did not reach his nether extremities. When they came to wheel him into the operating room he asked them if they were sure they knew where his tonsils were.

RUSSIAN MILITARY THREAT

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of this House is deeply concerned about the numerous reports that we get about the continuing expansion of the Soviet military forces and the continuing aggressive reach of their military power in many, many parts of the world. Perhaps the most serious of those to ourselves is their penetration into the Atlantic and especially the Caribbean and their reported establishment of a submarine base in Cuba. We all know the effect of that would be to make the Russian submarines very much more effective along the Atlantic seaboard and in the Caribbean and gulf area because they will not have to go all the way back to Russia in order to be resupplied.

Mr. Speaker, all the information we get is that in the realm of space the Russians are going steadily upward and forward. In the building of their defense forces in some areas they have already exceeded our capacity. For example, they are building submarines of a nuclear character two or three times as fast as we are; even two or three times beyond our capacity, according to information that we derive from certain quarters. It seems to me that the time is here and it is long past due when with respect to the Russian penetration into the area of Cuba and the Mediterranean—and a little while ago they had a submarine in the Gulf of Mexico—that the administration must tell the Congress and the country what the facts are. Then, if they are penetrating into our area with nuclear weapons or the potential for the employment of nuclear weapons, we must face the Russians and demand that they get out as we did in 1962. And the time is now, because there are many who think that a year from now the Russian power will be so much greater than it now is, even exceeding ours, that they will not yield as they did in 1962 to a confrontation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope our administration, from the great knowledge that it has, the information that it can acquire, will ascertain the facts about Russian penetration into the Caribbean and Cuba and tell the American people the truth and take that action in the face of this threat which is consistent with our national security.

RAILPAX DECISION BYPASSES CLEVELAND, OHIO

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 1 year, many of us in Cleveland have tried to prevent the cutoff of passenger rail service to and from the city of Cleveland. Yesterday, my city of Cleveland was completely bypassed under the proposed plan submitted by the Railpax Corp. It is indefensible that a city the size of Cleveland should be totally overlooked; it is the Nation's largest city so neglected. It is indefensible that no passenger rail service is provided in any manner along the shore of Lake Erie between Buffalo and Cleveland. The nearest passenger terminal for national rail service will be in Canton, Ohio, 60 miles south of our city.

As long ago as June 9, I objected to the Interstate Commerce Commission's attempts to cease all passenger rail traffic to and from our city. Our hope at that time was that the national policy for a defensible passenger policy for the railroads of America would by necessity and wisdom include our city of Cleveland. My telegram was as follows:

Oppose termination of rail service from Cleveland. Urge your decision be deferred until Congress can develop a national policy on rail transportation service. Action is pending. Your commission and railroads have obligation to continue service until Congress acts. Start-up costs after service is discontinued would be overwhelming and self-defeating. America needs a balanced transportation system. Help preserve it until Congress can act.

Therefore, the decision rendered by Railpax yesterday is in shocking disregard, not only of Cleveland's central location to a population of over 5 million people, but of already existing passenger facilities and the crying need for adequate, convenient, and efficient surface transportation. I have advocated strongly a unified passenger railroad program. However, this decision indicates a need to restudy the efficacy of the program which has resulted.

I wish to insert the recommendations made on December 23, 1970, submitted to the Secretary of Transportation on three major lines through Ohio which clearly demonstrated the need to go through the city of Cleveland. This report was prepared and submitted by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Ohio. The Railpax proposal must be amended to include Cleveland on its basic routes so that the millions of people of northern Ohio can be served. Otherwise, the efficacy of this program is seriously in doubt. I am communicating my strong objections to this proposal to the Secretary of Transportation and to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees in the Congress. The Ohio Utilities Commission report excerpts are as follows:

A New York to Chicago route via Pittsburgh, Youngstown, Cleveland, Toledo, South Bend and Gary would tie together the industrial heartland of the nation. Along this route lie the production facilities and supporting industries of America's automobile business. The provision of connecting service between Detroit and Toledo would not only

complete this network but also provide access from Detroit to the East to support passenger travel through Pittsburgh to New York and Washington, D.C., Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit and Chicago all boast major league football and baseball teams. Eight SMSA's exceeding 500,000 people would be linked in a corridor only 400 miles long.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. CRANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to be in attendance for the vote last Thursday, March 18, 1971, regarding continued funding for the supersonic transport plane. Had I been present on the floor at the time the vote was taken, however, I would have voted "Yea." That is, I would have voted to delete funding for the supersonic transport.

I oppose continued Federal appropriation because, aside from the allegations of contributing to air and noise pollution, I believe this represents a spending of the taxpayers' funds where private capital should be allowed to operate.

IN SUPPORT OF OUR PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud to take part in this program today in which we will have the opportunity to demonstrate our support for the more than 1,600 Americans imprisoned or believed missing in Southeast Asia. They deserve our vocal and prayerful support to demonstrate to them and to their captors that they have not been forgotten.

It was on September 22, 1970, that I first introduced a resolution which would have designated November 11, 1970, as a National Day of Support for U.S. Prisoners of War. November 11 is a day of special significance to the millions of Americans who have served their country in the armed services and it seemed appropriate to me that we should dedicate last year's observance of Veterans' Day in honor of those Americans imprisoned or missing in Southeast Asia.

While that resolution was not acted on, our efforts in its behalf did culminate in the introduction on the first day of the 92d Congress a resolution calling for a National Week of Concern for American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action. Representatives JOHN ANDERSON of Illinois and ROGER ZION of Indiana joined with me as prime sponsors of this resolution which eventually was cosponsored by more than 150 of our colleagues in the House. A similar resolution sponsored by Senator WILLIAM BROCK was sponsored by 67 Senators in that other body.

The House of Representatives unanimously approved House Joint Resolution 16 on March 3 and the other body followed with its unanimous

approval March 5. President Nixon signed the resolution during special White House ceremonies last Friday.

Those of us who support this resolution have no illusions about its passage leading to the immediate repatriation of our prisoners or significant information regarding those men now listed as missing in action. But we do believe that this Expression of National Support for the POW's/MIA's will serve to focus world attention on the issue with the hope Hanoi will get the message and enter into serious negotiation of the Prisoner of War issue.

According to the latest reports, Indiana has 26 POW's/MIA's who are being treated in violation of international law. Their captors have refused to provide proper nourishment for them; refused to provide information on their camps or access to the camps by neutral observers; they have refused to identify all prisoners; they have denied them the simple right to communicate regularly with their families, and have detained the seriously ill or wounded, all of which are in violation of the Geneva Convention.

This National Week of concern will serve to call attention to Hanoi's flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention and their continued refusal to negotiate the POW issue. All this despite President Nixon's October 7 offer of an immediate unconditional release of all prisoners being held in Indochina. As the President put it:

War and imprisonment should be over for all these prisoners. They and their families have already suffered too much.

The week of March 21 has historical significance. It was on March 26, 1964, that an American adviser, Capt. Floyd J. Thompson, was captured in South Vietnam and thus became the first American POW. Today, nearly 7 years later, Captain Thompson still is listed among this group of prisoners of war and missing.

Many groups deserve special recognition for their continuing efforts to bring the pressure of world opinion to bear on Hanoi by keeping the POW problem front stage. Certainly the Indiana chapter, National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, headed by Mrs. Samuel Beecher, Jr., of Terre Haute, has set the pace in this effort.

If there are those who question the strength of character of this Nation, they have only to look at these wives and families for an example of hope and integrity and love that would befit all of us. We must not let these families wait alone, without hope.

I personally delivered to President Nixon last fall petitions with the signatures of more than 8,000 Seventh District of Indiana residents urging renewed efforts on behalf of the POW's. Most of those signatures were collected at the Putnam County Fair.

I am certain that the expression of concern from Hoosiers combined with similar outcries from Americans across this land led to our increased activity to win the release of American prisoners, both at the negotiating table in Paris

and through rescue efforts conducted into enemy territory.

It was just last week that President Nixon addressed himself to the POW issue in a statement delivered at the Gridiron Club dinner in Washington. The President said:

There are many kinds of heroism in wartime; the raw courage of the soldier in the field; the skill under pressure of the air crew in combat; the dedication of the corpsmen going after the wounded under fire. Another kind of heroism is that imposed in meeting the ordeal of prolonged captivity.

Our program here today can play a significant role in bringing the pressure of world opinion to bear on the North Vietnamese if we hope to win the release of American prisoners of war. We must not dismiss the force of world opinion in accomplishing this goal.

Hanoi may be falsely interpreting dissident opinion over the course of the war as an indication of American opinion about the POW's. Hanoi should not be permitted to doubt that civilized nations throughout the world, led by an America truly united on the treatment of our prisoners and missing in action, will hold the enemy fully accountable for these courageous Americans.

The most persistent and widespread efforts of our Government to secure release of American prisoners and the humane treatment of these prisoners and those missing in action, have been barbarically ignored or rejected by Hanoi.

An end to the war and end to imprisonment are the goals behind which we all are united, as the President, as Members of Congress, and as Americans. Let us pray that the observance of a National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action will direct the spotlight of world attention on the plight of our POW's and serve notice in this country that our POW's are not forgotten Americans and that we shall not rest until they have all been returned to their homeland and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi who has been an outstanding leader in the House of Representatives in the efforts to secure the release of and more information about prisoners of war, Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the three gentlemen for sponsoring this special order this afternoon on our prisoners of war and those listed as missing in action. I also commend them for coauthoring House Joint Resolution 16 which established the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

Seven years ago this coming Friday, the first American became a prisoner of war in the Vietnam conflict. Since that time some 1,600 U.S. servicemen have been listed as prisoners of war or missing in action. The fate of these men is uncertain at this time since the North Vietnamese, Vietcong, and Pathet Lao have refused to abide by the Geneva Convention and have shown no sincere inclination to negotiate the prisoner issue in either official or unofficial talks.

This morning two of my colleagues and myself sponsored an off-the-record briefing on the POW/MIA situation. Bringing

us up-to-date information on the situation were representatives from the Department of State, Department of Defense, and National League of Families. The briefing this morning reinforced my belief that 1971 is the critical year for our prisoners of war and those missing in action.

As Members of Congress and as American citizens, I believe it is our duty and responsibility to explore every possible avenue of seeking a solution to the POW/MIA problem. We must never allow our prisoners of war to become just a topic of conversation similar to the weather where everybody talks about it, but nobody does anything about it.

I often ask myself "Am I really doing everything I possibly can for our POW's/MIA's?" I believe the Congress needs to ask itself the same question. I am afraid our answer would be far less than a resounding yes. We need to take the lead in coordinating efforts of the legislative branch, executive branch, and private organizations such as the National League of Families.

Mr. Speaker, the key word is coordination. At present there are several different groups, both private and Government, as well as individuals exerting concerned efforts on behalf of our POW's/MIA's. But no one group or individual appears to know what the others are doing. We need to coordinate our efforts in order to achieve more effective results and maximize the time spent on the prisoner of war problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to remind the Members of the letter we will be sending to the President of North Vietnam in the near future. The essence of the letter is a proposal that North Vietnam allow a representative group from the Congress to inspect all the POW camps in North Vietnam. This proposal is being made since the North Vietnamese have refused to allow an inspection by the International Red Cross. I would urge those Members who have not called my office or Congressman FREY's office indicating their desire to sign the letter to the North Vietnamese to do so as soon as possible. There have been indications that the North Vietnamese are considering the possibility of an inspection visit by a group from the Congress and I feel we should pursue the matter to the best of our abilities. Joining with us in securing signatures are Congressmen JIM HOWARD and JOHN DELLENBACK.

Through a coordinated and expanded effort, I believe we will be able to find a solution to securing the release of our prisoners. We can do no less than exert every possible effort toward this goal.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest concern that I join my colleagues in the Congress this week in making speeches, statements, and pleas that I profoundly wish did not have to be made, on a situation which I profoundly wish did not exist.

This deplorable situation concerns, of course, the more than 1,500 American

servicemen who are prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia. The plight of these courageous fighting men weighs heavily in the hearts and minds of concerned people throughout the world.

Those of us who are privileged to enjoy the freedom for which these brave men have risked so much to preserve are particularly saddened by their continued captivity and particularly angered over the refusal of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong to abide by the Geneva Convention.

The American people have continuously indicated their deep concern through letters to public officials both here and in North Vietnam. Countless organizations and groups throughout the Nation have expressed similar concern through the passage of resolutions and the circulation of petitions. There have also been commendable efforts on behalf of our prisoners of war by the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia and other like groups. I am heartened and gratified by all of these efforts, Mr. Speaker, and profoundly hope that they shall not prove to be in vain.

The enactment of legislation designating this week, the week of March 21, 1971, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action" is certainly also gratifying. This week's observance is a very timely one since March 26, 1971, will mark the 7th year since the first American was taken into captivity in Southeast Asia. Together with a number of my colleagues in the House I have cosponsored this and numerous other bills on behalf of these American servicemen in an attempt to underline and bring into focus our very grave concern for their safety. Through such actions we hope to further stimulate an aroused world public opinion sufficient to bring about pressure to change this terrible situation.

During this week the committee on which I am privileged to serve, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, is also conducting hearings on the prisoner of war situation in Southeast Asia. The testimony given at these and previous hearings before the committee has served to dramatize the terrible treatment which our prisoners have received at the hands of the North Vietnamese. As I have previously indicated on numerous occasions, such treatment is directly counter to the Geneva Convention's prisoner-of-war provisions.

In further disregard for the provisions of the Geneva Convention the North Vietnamese have consistently refused to give complete and accurate releases of the names of our prisoners of war, to permit the regular flow of mail to or from those prisoners, or to permit inspection of the facilities in which those prisoners are held.

These actions have resulted in the tragic situation whereby the families of these men often do not know whether they are dead or alive. Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to these men and to their loved ones here in the United States.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for the Congress to convey this concern and match

our words with more for regulation. These courageous Americans deserve nothing less than the most and the best we can do toward their humane treatment and early release. We will not have done enough in their behalf until they are safely home.

During this week of national concern for their unfortunate plight, I join with millions of Americans and freedom-loving people throughout the world in reiterating an urgent plea to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front to comply with the tenets of the Geneva Convention. Our concern, our efforts, and our pleas, furthermore, shall not cease until these men are released from captivity.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN), has been one of the Members of this House who have spoken numerous times on the atrocities that are alleged to have occurred in Southeast Asia in the prison camps.

I now yield to the gentleman from Hawaii, who knows firsthand the problems of our young men who are being held captive.

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

I commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS), for his leadership in paying tribute to our American prisoners of war and those missing in action in the Indochina war and to their families. It is with a deep sense of sympathy and gratitude that I join in honoring them.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said on many occasions, the war in Southeast Asia has become the most divisive force in American society. There is, however, one aspect of the conflict on which all Americans are united. We deplore and condemn the mistreatment of American servicemen who are being held prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese.

The Government of North Vietnam has consistently flouted the covenants of the 1949 Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, despite the fact that it had agreed in 1957 to abide by such covenants.

As a sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 122, I join my colleagues in the House today in calling on the Government of North Vietnam to comply with four simple mandates of that 1949 convention:

First, impartial inspection of POW camps must be permitted;

Second, seriously ill or injured prisoners must be released;

Third, free mail exchange between prisoners and their families must be allowed; and

Fourth, all prisoners of war must be identified.

The adamant refusal on the part of Hanoi to identify formally all the American prisoners it holds inflicts grievous mental and spiritual anguish upon their families at home in this country. Certainly, there can be no military advantage in merely maintaining the secrecy of the names of prisoners being held. Why, then, is Hanoi stubbornly refusing to release even the names of American POW's?

Unfortunately, our American prisoners of war have become the pawns in a chess game of war and politics: Hanoi is saying it will not release our men until we withdraw all troops from South Vietnam; we are saying we will not withdraw all our troops until Hanoi releases all Americans held as prisoners. Which is it going to be? It is a chicken-or-the-egg situation.

There is one point, Mr. Speaker, about which there has been a great deal of misunderstanding, and some clarification might be in order. No provision of the 1949 Geneva Convention requires a nation to return captured enemy soldiers before the fighting ceases. Article 118 of the Convention provides as follows:

Prisoners of war shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities. (Emphasis added.)

In other words, Mr. Speaker, North Vietnam is under no obligation under the Geneva covenants to return our POW's until the war is over. Judging from Hanoi's past attitude, so long as hostilities continue with American participation, therefore, there is little hope for the release and repatriation of our prisoners.

If 50,000 American troops are to remain in Vietnam at the end of 1972, as the President has indicated, we can expect the North Vietnamese to continue to hold American POW's. Right now, it appears that negotiations for the return of our captured men are at a complete standstill. Why cannot we initiate a move which may alter the situation? What can we lose?

Let us propose to the Hanoi government that we will withdraw all American troops from South Vietnam by a date certain, if it will release all American POW's by that same date. Let us propose the date of December 31, 1971, or any reasonable date—but a date certain.

By setting such a deadline, we would also serve notice on the South Vietnamese leaders that they must accelerate and seriously undertake their role in the Vietnamization program.

Mr. Speaker, if this Week of Concern for POW's, MIA's, and their families is to mean anything, we must endorse in the strongest possible terms two separate actions:

First. We must call on the North Vietnamese to comply with the provisions of the 1949 Geneva covenants and the most basic tenets of civilized human behavior: Identify our prisoners; release the sick and injured; permit impartial inspection; allow free mail exchange.

Second. We must call on our own President to set a date certain for complete withdrawal of all our troops and proceed from that position to negotiate for the release of all Americans held as prisoners of war.

Mr. Speaker, next Friday will mark the seventh anniversary of the capture of the first American who is still being held prisoner. Seven years of needless human suffering both by the prisoner and his family.

Mr. Speaker, the time to end the suffering has come.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, it is only appropriate that I join with my many other colleagues who have cosponsored House Joint Resolution 16 authorizing the President to proclaim a "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action." We are, of course, all grateful to President Richard Nixon for so proclaiming the week of March 21 through March 27 as such a special occasion.

In my opinion, the way to remember these men is to send special units of the Marine Corps, the Air Force, or whatever units are needed, to go in and secure their freedom. This is the kind of attention and recognition they deserve. I believe the first search and rescue effort of Defense Secretary Melvin Laird to obtain the freedom of these men was appropriate and these missions should be continued immediately. While it is true that the prisoners-of-war camps in which our men are now being held by the Communists in Southeast Asia are of a different type and nature than those maintained by the Nazis, or our other enemies in previous wars in that the camps are moved from location to location and are buried in a land of jungle areas making them difficult to find, I have confidence in the overall capability of our military units to seek out and free these men. This would be the real answer to the pleas of the wives and families of these fine men who have served our country. In my opinion, it would be better to run the risks involved in forcefully freeing these men than to allow them to rot in the unbelievably inhumane conditions in North Vietnamese prisons as they are now doing.

Let me compliment the leaders who have joined in this effort to demonstrate to the world that these men are not forgotten Americans, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, JOHN ANDERSON, and the gentlemen from Indiana, JOHN MYERS and ROGER ZION, by obtaining this special order today so that we may all express the feelings of 99 percent of our constituents, who want to see an end to this long vigil, the wives, children, mothers, and fathers of these men have maintained.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I commend the gentleman from Indiana, my distinguished colleague, Mr. MYERS, for the statement he has made. I was leaving the floor when I heard the gentleman start his speech, so I came back to listen.

I agree with what the gentleman has said. I would also say to the gentleman and to the Members of this House that I entered in the RECORD today a resolution which was passed by the Legislature of West Virginia, bearing on just exactly what the gentleman has said. It will be in the RECORD tomorrow.

I think the barbaric conditions under

which our prisoners of war have been held during these times of modern civilization will long be remembered by all the civilized nations of the world.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his contribution.

I recognize the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. First, let me compliment the gentleman from Indiana for reserving time for this special order.

When his letter went out on March 12, I wrote a note across the top of that letter calling attention to my administrative assistant that this was not just another "dear colleague" letter, but the request to discuss the plight of POW's was something very important. It was not a routine matter, but something very special.

We are here today, because House Joint Resolution 16 authorized the President to proclaim March 21-27 as National Week of Concern for Our Prisoners of War and Those Missing in Action.

Sometimes we hear it said that it is easy to be concerned about something and easy to raise questions, but it is awfully difficult to propose solutions. I do not know that we are going to be able to propose any solution to the plight of our brave men who are being held prisoners or who are listed as missing in action. It seems to me that pending such time as we are able to do something about the situation of our prisoners, we should never fail by events of this kind and by efforts of those who journey to try to see the North Vietnamese negotiators in Paris, and by letters written to Hanoi or by whatever means or method—to let the impression prevail we have forgotten or lost interest in these men. For their sake and for the sake of their relatives, we must not ever let the world believe they have been forgotten, and although we may despair, we cannot ever stop trying to help these brave men—now held prisoners.

We must all recognize that the enemy holds these men as hostages. It may very well be that we have a long road ahead of us before we can see any light at the end of the tunnel. But I repeat again it seems to me the value of this special order today is to once again express our concern for the plight of these 1,500 or 1,600 men. We must continually remind the world of their deplorable situation.

We must let these men know they have not been forgotten and that they will never be forgotten.

In the view of our prisoners captors, life is cheap, including the lives of their own countrymen. The reliable reports on treatment accorded imprisoned American fightingmen provide stark proof of this. But in the more enlightened, more compassionate view of this country, for whom 1,600 of our men are in enemy prisons, or missing in action or perhaps dead, their plights represent profound suffering in behalf of their country's honor.

These are not just 1,600 men. There may now repose in some dirty, dingy prison in North Vietnam the man who can bind up the wounds of this country

and provide the leadership that will, indeed, bring us together again; bridging the gaps of understanding between men and classes of men. But, also, among those prisoners of war and included in the missing in action rolls, there are hundreds of just ordinary men of the kind that provide the steady backbone of American productiveness and patriotic support.

Included on the roster of men whom we honor today is the name of one man who has now been held for 7 years—more than twice as long as any American was held prisoner of war in World War II. Many of these men have been unaccounted for in more than 6 years. Back home they have children they have never seen. In some cases their children have grown into adulthood since last they were seen. Their loved ones have passed away. Even now, there are wives, or parents, or others of these men's families who lie ill and for whom just one hopeful word from those so long silent would be of greater therapeutic value than all the attention modern medical science can give them.

Physical torture and improper diet are the mainstays of those now incarcerated in North Vietnam. Those comparatively few of our men who have been released from captivity have brought back stories of the pork fat and pumpkin soup that constitutes their bill of fare. These same men have told stories of unending dedication to and love for their country by the imprisoned.

There has never been a reliable list of our men the enemy now holds in prison, or of those who are sick or injured. No impartial inspection of the prisons has ever been permitted. It is obvious that the North Vietnamese have not the slightest intention of complying with the articles of the Geneva Convention having to do with treatment of prisoners of war.

In propaganda packed interviews film clips have provided fleeting glimpses of some of our men. We know that these films were made under "staged" conditions contrived to show far better conditions than those actually existing in the prisons.

What we do here today may seem empty and helpless. But at the highest level of our Government—by Presidential proclamation and by the speeches in the Halls of Congress—it is being shown that we are not unmindful of the sacrifices made by our men who are now prisoners of war, or who are missing in action. The least that can be accomplished is an arousal of worldwide denouncement of those who hold our men in prisons. Perhaps in this way the court of world opinion can force upon their captors a more humane treatment of the prisoners.

It may be too much to hope that Hanoi's representatives in Paris will be influenced to positions more favorable to humane treatment in prisons or stockades, or that they will be moved to a greater sincerity around the conference table. But somehow and sometime, those men who have been captured while fighting for the American cause may come to know of our deep national concern for

their plight. Meanwhile, the observance of this Week of Concern POW/MIA's can hopefully provide the extra encouragement for those who still fight for us, and move the entire war effort towards a successful and earlier conclusion.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, compliment the Members who have joined in this special order for this very worthwhile undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the President has proclaimed, pursuant to House Joint Resolution 16, this week from March 21 to March 27 as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Those Missing in Action."

The fate of the over 1,600 of our brothers, fathers, and sons who are prisoners of war or missing in action in Vietnam cries out for the concern of every person in this Nation and for the concern of humanity everywhere. Their captors in North Vietnam have truculently and constantly refused to abide by the rules of the Geneva Convention to which they subscribed and have continued to treat these American prisoners and the knowledge of our people missing in action as pawns in a cold and calculated political game designed to win victories and concessions which they cannot win on the battlefield.

It is hardly surprising that the calculating North Vietnamese invaders of their neighboring countries of South Vietnam, of Cambodia, of Laos, should also show contempt for their agreed word and for mankind in their illegal and inhumane treatment of American prisoners of war and in concealing from the families of those who are prisoners or are missing in action whatever knowledge they may have. The fact of this inhumanity, however, cries out for the concern of all peoples everywhere. The weight of this concern, and the prayers of the concerned, will be felt by the brutal masters of Hanoi.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TERRY) who has a very personal interest in this most serious situation.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, we have recently passed a resolution declaring this week the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action. It was done to focus attention on the tragic and shameful status of 1,600 of this country's finest men; men who despite the tumult of discord in their own country, willingly supported their government's foreign policy.

This week has been chosen because it marks the seventh anniversary of the first man captured in the conflict in Southeast Asia. It also marks the seventh anniversary of one of the most ignominious policies ever adopted by a country; the policy of the North Vietnamese to use our men as poker chips on the table of negotiations to end the conflict.

Through the magnificent efforts of

such groups as the National League of Families of the American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, our Nation's awareness of the plight of 1,600 men has been awakened.

Mr. Speaker, there are elements in this country who would wish the prisoner issue would go away. It is an embarrassment to their pious pronouncements about the integrity of the North Vietnamese Government to see publicity given to the callous treatment of our men held in the cages and pens of the Hanoi prisons.

No one can deny today that the war in Vietnam has extracted a terrible toll in American lives, dollars, and spirit. But to turn our backs on the men held in these enemy prisons would be the most devastating blow ever struck at the heart of America.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who tried to justify the North Vietnamese treatment of the prisoners on the basis of other issues in the war. What many fail to realize is that the North Vietnamese have totally disregarded the Geneva agreements by which 128 nations agreed to abide, with regard to treatment of prisoners.

Some of the erstwhile "peaceniks" have justified the North Vietnamese position because neither side has officially declared war. One need only look at articles of the 1949 Geneva Convention to see that this is no justification for the treatment being given to our men. The agreement applies to any armed conflict that "may arise between two or more of the contracting parties even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them."

The North Vietnamese chief supplier in the war is the Soviet Union. Even they supported the Geneva Conventions recently during the 1969 meeting of the International Red Cross held at Istanbul, Turkey. The North Vietnamese did not attend the meeting, but other Communist nations did and there were no dissenting votes on the resolution.

If the North Vietnamese disregard for an international agreement is not enough to justify the anger and outrage of the American people, then one need only think of the moral and humane aspects of the situation.

How long can we expect to wait for the North Vietnamese to even agree to a neutral examination of the prison camps. If they have nothing to hide, then what is the reason for prohibiting an inspection. This inspection does not have to be accomplished by American military or civilian personnel. It can be done by disinterested parties whose only concern is the humane treatment of their fellow human beings. This and a final exchange of prisoners can be handled in this manner, as performed by India during the Korean conflict—also an undeclared war.

Are we asking too much that the common standards of humanity be applied in this situation? Are we asking too much that the suffering ignorance of the fate of their loved ones by many families be brought to an end?

Mr. Speaker, a slogan of the National League of Families has been, "Don't Let

Them Be Forgotten." In our efforts to bring this tragic war to a close, we must not permit these men who have given so much to be cast aside as an unimportant and easily discarded vestige of an unpopular conflict. Mr. Speaker, we cannot forget them.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. TERRY), whose son-in-law today is one of the more than 1,600 prisoners of war with which we are concerned here.

I now yield, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McEWEN).

Mr. McEWEN. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am joining with my colleagues today in speaking on a very vital issue, hoping to focus world attention on the plight of the more than 1,600 American prisoners of war and servicemen missing in action. I feel that, through continued public expressions of this type, we shall keep this most shocking situation before the eyes of the world.

Having spoken and met with the wife of an Air Force major who has been missing since 1966, and having had the opportunity to meet with their children, I know from personal experience that they are bolstered by their faith and the faith of their neighbors and friends.

On November 14, 1969, I testified before the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Development of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

What I said then is just as relevant today. I said that while we in the Congress cannot direct nor control the actions of the North Vietnamese, I strongly feel that we can continue to bring attention to the uncivilized conduct of the North Vietnamese to the end that we may aid in molding public opinion, both at home and abroad, to the point that it might, hopefully, influence for change the conduct of the North Vietnamese.

The conduct of Hanoi is inhumane and in complete and total disregard for human decency. Not only is their conduct illegal and outrageous, but the conduct is morally corrupt, indecent, and without any regard for the most basic rules of human behavior. I do not know how the North Vietnamese could ever be forgiven in the eyes of the civilized world for their failure to live up to the Geneva Convention and their obvious lack of respect for their own commitment to that convention.

Wives of these servicemen are forced by the North Vietnamese to live in atmospheres of uncertainty and worry. They know not if their husbands are injured or well, prisoner or free, tortured or not, and, yes, even dead or alive. The fact that these women have been able to maintain normal lives and homes for their children—as normal as possible without the benefit of a husband and father—is a tribute to their determination and brave spirit.

They and their innocent children are being severely punished by our enemies in North Vietnam.

My heart, like the hearts of all free men, grieves for these families.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the eyes of the world are upon the Congress today as we unanimously rise to express our concern for Americans held prisoner of war or missing in action in Vietnam.

Nobody in this entire Nation, no matter what their views on the war itself, can feel anything but revulsion over the violation of all humane standards by the North Vietnamese. It is simple barbarism to hold these men incommunicado for years on end, with no communication with their loved ones at home must suffer the double pangs of not knowing whether a husband, a son, a father, is alive or dead.

The U.S. House of Representatives, the Senate, and the President have joined in declaring this a National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action. The world must witness our unanimity and press with us for humane treatment for these men in accord with international agreements on prisoners of war.

All civilized peoples agree that war is tragic enough without imposing suffering on civilians. And yet that is precisely what the North Vietnamese are doing in withholding the names of American prisoners. Mothers and children who have nothing to do with this war have suffered the tortures of uncertainty long enough. In the name of basic decency, we urge Hanoi to end this unconscionable game in which the lives of missing men and the sanity of their families are the pawns.

Some day the war in Indochina will be over, and we will work as we have throughout our history for a reconciliation of nations. But the scars deepening every day in the hearts of bereaved parents, wives, and sons and daughters will never be erased. We earnestly beseech Hanoi to listen to the dictates of conscience and humanity.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam has divided this Nation as sharply as any issue or any event in our history and this is a lamentable fact.

I remain convinced that the original premise upon which we entered the war was in the best tradition of this Nation, to protect and defend those unable to protect and defend themselves from cruel oppressors. By the same token, I wholly agree that the war has been mismanaged in an incredible fashion. Thousands of Americans have died, scores of thousands have been wounded and we have squandered uncountable billions in an endless conflict we have had neither the determination nor the courage to win. And this has been and is today a disgrace.

But all that aside, for it is a separate topic, there is one subject upon which all decent men and women can agree and that is the deplorable, inhumane and unconscionable treatment of our prisoners of war and those missing in action.

I pray daily for their release or at the very least, some assurance that their imprisonment is not the horror we have reason to believe it is.

I have joined every effort, both officially as a Congressman and personally as an individual citizen, to help persuade

the enemy to guarantee this humanity, to permit correspondence between the prisoners and their loved ones and to abide by the minimal requirements of the Geneva Convention.

The Convention is a humane document, of some age and considerable moral value. There have been exceptions to it, God knows, and I deplore every one. But it is a fundamental concept that decent men abide by. The difficulty is that we are not dealing with decent men in Hanoi. We have pleaded with them as a Government, we have pleaded with them through special committees, we have pleaded as individuals. All our entreaties have fallen on deaf ears.

I weep for these men, I weep for each daughter, each son, each wife, parent and friend. If there is any cause I can join which I have not joined, any act within my power to perform it, I ask only to be told and I will do it.

If this Congress can, in its wisdom, arrive at any course of action to alleviate this sorrowful condition, it will have my entire support. There is no length to which I will not go.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pride that I stood beside the desk of President Richard Nixon this past Friday as he signed House Joint Resolution 16 designating March 21-27 as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action". The act of signing was only the culmination of a great deal of dedicated effort by many concerned people, both in and out of the Congress.

Were I to attempt to recognize all of those who have played a part in gaining recognition for this week of concern, I would consume far too much of the valuable time of this body. Most of the parties involved do not seek any form of recognition. They are content with knowing that their roles may have contributed to the future life and happiness of men now languishing in stinking prison cells in a faraway land, or to the future peace and joy of their families who wait in the shadows.

The national week of concern is a product of many hearts and many consciences actively dedicated to the proposition that American sons must not be forgotten. Countless efforts have been made to compel Hanoi, the National Liberation Front, and the Pathet Lao to comply with Geneva Convention provisions and generally recognized international standards of conduct with reference to the treatment of prisoners. Basic to all of these requests has been the simple plea that families of these men learn with a certainty whether or not their sons, husbands, and fathers are even alive. All inquiries have been received either with callous indifference or with out-of-date, inaccurate compilations. And, as for the other elements of the Geneva standards for prisoner care, we have no reason to believe any substantial compliance has taken place and we have very reason to believe our men, where they still live, exist in the most substandard of conditions.

America is beginning to respond to this issue. The ennui that afflicts so many of our people on so many issues has been

brushed aside by the growing realization that young American men may never find their way to freedom again.

No small part of this growing national concern over our POW/MIA's is due to the hard work and dedication by my colleagues in the Congress. It has been deeply gratifying to witness the swift and bipartisan response to humanitarian appeals on behalf of America's sons. Last summer I requested House colleagues to sign my letter to the Premier of North Vietnam seeking Geneva Convention compliance. The response was as near a unanimous effort as I have personally ever witnessed to a "dear colleague" letter. I was able to go to Paris armed with a letter signed by well over 400 Members of this House. The leadership of North Vietnam cannot fail to have noted this resolution of purpose by so many representatives of the American people.

Since that Paris trip, a host of other endeavors have begun and have been prosecuted to successful conclusions. The stage has been broadened considerably from the early beginnings and we now seek to involve the world community in this plea for humanitarian treatment of our men.

But, as I have often remarked, we tend to be a fickle people who burn our candles a little while in the night and retire to our apathy. This candle of concern must not be extinguished; this cause must not be forgotten.

The Congress of the United States has seized this issue and has run with it. My colleagues, with few exceptions, need apologize to no one for any lack of concern or effort. This week of concern that we mark today was the product of nearly half of this body who joined in cosponsoring the resolution authorizing the President to so designate this week. Anything that might humanely be undertaken by this legislative assembly has been done.

Now Congress must, in turn, look to the people of the United States to continue this expression of concern. The passing of this flame must be carried in the hearts of the people in every rural hamlet and urban metropolis throughout the broad reaches of our land. On the floor of Congress we have echoed the question that must cry out from the heart and soul of every American son imprisoned in Southeast Asia; Is anybody there? Does anybody care? I have heard the response of Congress to this cry. Now, in this national week of concern, I await the answering response from the people who must not afford to care less or to do dare less for our sons. Congress, by its resolution, has now passed the torch to the people we represent. Future humanity will judge the quality and quantity of this response.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, since the early days of the present war in Indochina, when our men were there to counsel, to advise and then to supervise, more and more the full weight of the war has been placed on the shoulders of our American fighting men. Today I join with my colleagues in these renewed efforts to direct the attention of all the

world to the sad plight of the hundreds of American servicemen who are now prisoners of war or among the missing in Vietnam.

During the last Congress the appropriations bill for the Department of Defense carried language which I wrote, calling for the "support of free world or local forces in actions designed to promote the safe and orderly withdrawal or disengagement of U.S. Forces from Southeast Asia" and "to aid in the release of Americans held as prisoners of war." Earlier this year I cosponsored legislation protesting the treatment of U.S. servicemen held prisoner by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front, calling on them to comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention—and further urging efforts by our Government, the United Nations, the International Red Cross, and other leaders and peoples of the world to obtain humane treatment and the release of American prisoners of war.

If the North Vietnamese and their allies, whoever they are, care anything about world opinion, they should act immediately to end this impasse. There are so many good reasons why Hanoi should yield our prisoners, but none more compelling than the simple humane act of restoring these lonely men to the warmth of their loved ones.

Certainly, the unanimous support given the resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period March 21-27 as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action" is significant of the anxiety of our entire Nation as to the plight of these brave men, and should inspire a concerted movement throughout the universe to help in our efforts.

Again, I wish to express my earnest hope that the war will soon end and our young men can be reunited with their families, reaping the benefits of their labors and contributing their fine worth to our Nation here at home.

Mr. ADDABO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the official congressional observance of the first and I pray the last National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Those Missing in Action. This observance comes as the result of legislative action by the House and the U.S. Senate in approving House Joint Resolution 16 and the signature of the President to this law.

The purpose of this special ceremony is to place the spotlight of world attention on the tragic and uncivilized treatment of the more than 1,500 prisoners of war/missing in action and the cruel hardships which their families must suffer as the result of that treatment. The POW/MIA issue transcends politics. It does not matter whether we believe in this Nation's Vietnam policy, the wisdom of our initial involvement in Southeast Asia whether we agree on the exact day of our final involvement. The POW/MIA issue is a human rights issue, deeply rooted in international law and the basic rights of man.

As a humanitarian issue we look to world opinion to work its will on those who can do something about this problem. This week marks the anniversary of

the seventh year in which a U.S. serviceman has been held captive in Southeast Asia. Many of the more than 1,500 servicemen in the POW/MIA category have been missing for 3, 4 or more years. It is certainly beyond justification to realize that many of their families remain without a clue as to their health or very existence at this late date.

The POW/MIA issue can be dealt with separate and apart from the continuation of the Vietnam war. The application of the 1949 Geneva Convention on Prisoners of War can be discussed and debated between the parties to the Indochina war without further delay.

Millions of Americans have already written to the leaders of other nations expressing their deep concern about this issue. That effort must continue in the hope that the broad base of support for the POW/MIA's will bring about a change in policy. The Members of this House of Representatives are joining that campaign today by this special appeal for humane treatment and for the recognition of basic elements of international law.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to ask all who are listening or reading this Record of the Congress today to think about the plight of the wives and children of the POW/MIA's. These are the unfortunate people who must suffer because of the uncivilized actions of a few. Let us hope that the desires of literally billions throughout the world will bring about a reconsideration of that policy.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I speak out today as part of a National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action. I hope that participation in this week of special attention to this grave question will not give anyone at home or abroad the idea that the Congress of the United States is not concerned every day of every week with the plight of our brave men imprisoned in North Vietnam.

We are concerned at all times and shall continue to be concerned until the Government of North Vietnam adheres to its responsibilities as a signer of the provisions of the Geneva Convention in 1957.

It is incredible to think that the first American pilot was shot down and captured by North Vietnam in 1964. According to the best evidence available, this airman is still a prisoner—over 6½ years later.

It is estimated that more than 1,500 American servicemen are considered missing in Southeast Asia. About 460 are listed by the Department of Defense as captured, but we cannot be absolutely sure since contrary to the Geneva accords, the North Vietnamese and Vietcong have not given us a list of those captured.

The International Committee of the Red Cross declared as early as 1965 that the Geneva Conventions are fully in force in the Vietnam conflict and that all parties are bound to adhere to their terms.

Nobody outside the Communist world would accept North Vietnam's contention that captured American pilots are criminals, rather than prisoners of war.

Certainly the International Committee of the Red Cross does not accept the

contention. Article 2 of the Geneva Convention says very clearly that it is applicable to "all cases of declared war of any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the parties to the Convention, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them."

Mr. Speaker, available reports tell us that American prisoners of war are being treated brutally. How many have been executed? How many have been starved to death? How many are critically ill?

We cannot answer these questions, because the Government of North Vietnam, so adored by some of the lunatic leftists in this country, will not release information on its prisoners. We do not know who they have or how many they have.

Those who suffer most from this despicable action are the mothers, fathers, wives, and children of these brave Americans. Those of us who have not experienced the agony of not knowing whether a loved one is alive or dead—an agony which has lasted for 6 years in some cases—can only imagine the slow torture the families of imprisoned and missing servicemen are suffering.

Surely, all of us in Congress, regardless of our views on the Vietnam war per se, are vitally concerned about Americans being held captive in North Vietnam, and under the most deplorable circumstances.

Resolutions calling on North Vietnam to cease its inhumane treatment of Americans held captive have received virtual unanimous approval when offered in both Houses of Congress.

I am concerned, and I know that all of my colleagues in this body are concerned. We reaffirm our commitment to apply every possible pressure on the enemy to abide by the tenets of the Geneva Convention. Thus far, they have violated practically every provision.

It is my judgment that if we had moved swiftly for a military victory in this bloody war, we would not be faced with the prisoner of war situation. We would have long ago liberated our men.

In fact, there probably would have been very few to liberate to begin with. We would have smashed this little second-rate country in short order, and all of our men would be home right now.

However, this administration has followed the folly of the last one and we are bogged down in a self-defeating war of gradualism to which our own President has publicly vowed not to seek a military solution.

Given this situation, it is therefore imperative that the President exert every possible effort to see that our men held prisoners in the camps of North Vietnam and the Vietcong are identified, humanely treated, and released.

We in Congress must continue to exert maximum pressure to turn the international community of nations against the barbaric POW policies of the Republic of North Vietnam, so that hopefully the basic humanity embodied in the Geneva Accords will once again mean something to Hanoi.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the fact

that we have chosen this special day and this special week to express our concern for American prisoners of war and those missing in action in no way reflects a temporal limitation on our sense of outrage over their treatment.

This National Week of Concern is a—hopefully effective method—which provides a forum for the elected representatives of our Nation to focus world attention on the plight of more than 1,500 men. These are men who wanted only to live in peace at home with their families, but who have become instead the unfortunate and unwilling pawns of a foreign nation.

I think it is encouraging that despite differences of viewpoint on other aspects of the conflict in Southeast Asia, we in the United States are united in genuine concern for the prisoners of war, some of whom have been held captive for many years.

The particular relevance of this week is by now well known. We are marking the seventh anniversary of the capture of Capt. Floyd J. Thompson, who is still listed as one of the more than 1,500 men who are prisoners of war or missing in action.

The North Vietnamese Government has been callous to all humane requests concerning these men. They have refused to negotiate the issue. They have refused to identify or release the sick and wounded. They have cruelly restricted mail privileges and refused inspection of POW facilities by impartial humanitarian organizations.

These actions have been in blatant violation of the terms of the Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners of war, which the North Vietnamese Government signed in 1957.

There have been many innocent victims in this tragic war. Perhaps the most tortuous cruelty has been inflicted on the families of prisoners of war and those missing in action. Since the North Vietnamese Government will not provide a complete listing of the men whom they are holding, many of these families have nothing more than simple faith to sustain them that their loved ones are alive.

Mr. Speaker, as are all Americans, I am very distressed about the situation with respect to American prisoners of war and those missing in action. However, the activities and discussions during this special week will multiply the increasing pressure of world opinion on North Vietnam to abide by the Geneva Convention.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to participate in this program to center attention on the plight of more than 1,500 brave American men being held prisoner in Southeast Asia or missing in action against the Communist forces of North Vietnam.

This is our way of letting the entire world know that we have not forgotten these men and do not intend to sacrifice them in any agreement with the enemy to end the war.

It was Congress, indirectly at least, that has upheld the policy which sent these men into combat. It is, therefore, the duty of Congress to do all that it can

possibly do to gain their release and to help their loved ones in this time of travail.

In this humane undertaking, there can be no doves and no hawks, no Democrats and no Republicans. It transcends political beliefs and personal feelings. These imprisoned heroes were not serving as Republicans or as Democrats, as hawks or as doves. They were serving the cause of America, and the least we can do is to leave no stone unturned in our efforts to obtain their freedom.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Congress unanimous approval of the resolution authorizing the President to designate this week as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action," and the President's subsequent response, were most gratifying to the many thousands of Americans desiring to speak out in one voice for humane treatment by the North Vietnamese of prisoners of war.

The dates March 21 through 27 are significant, for they mark the anniversary of the time, 6 years ago, when the first U.S. serviceman was made captive in North Vietnam. Today, some 1,600 young Americans fill the detention camps in that land, while their brave families await their return, hoping in the meantime, and too often in vain, for some indication of their welfare.

Mr. Speaker, our effort this week is an indication these families do not wait alone. It is an indication that all America is but one large family awaiting the return of its servicemen sons. We must hope and pray that this united expression of concern will reverberate in Hanoi and that it will have positive results.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, all of us here in Congress are deeply concerned about the plight of American prisoners of war and those missing in action. This concern was clearly demonstrated by the unanimous approval by Congress of a resolution authorizing the President to proclaim this week as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action."

Mr. Speaker, let this action demonstrate that we have not and will not abandon our brave men. Let us announce to the world that America will not forget her sons who are held prisoners by the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, the 21st International Conference of the Red Cross at Istanbul in 1969, adopted resolutions which urged that prisoners of war be given the protection of the Geneva Convention's tenets on the treatment of war prisoners. The Government of North Vietnam was one of common concern for the fate of the POW/MIA's, urging Congress to support the 77 governments which unanimously adopted these resolutions and finally was a signatory of that convention. However, instead of abiding to these tenets, the Government of North Vietnam has criminally disregarded not only the rules of the Geneva Convention, but the rules of common human decency.

The Government of North Vietnam has refused to cooperate, time and again with the Red Cross. They have refused

to permit inspection of their prison camps. They have refused to release the sick and wounded. They have refused to permit a proper exchange of letters and packages. They have refused to accurately report the names of the prisoners.

As we go about our daily activities, we must not forget these men who are being held captive in Southeast Asia. Let our conscience not be dulled by the passage of time. Let the word be carried to our prisoners of war and to those brave men who are missing in action that their country has not forsaken them. Let it be known that America will not rest until these men are released.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the words we speak here today may be of little comfort to the loved ones of our prisoners of war. Neither will our words provide solace to the prisoners themselves for they, no doubt, are being told by their captors that America has forgotten them.

But our words today can and should be directed at the North Vietnamese themselves and to the court of world opinion in the hope that some thought—some phrase—some idea, will filter through to the Communist mind and bring forth the realization that America has never and will never forget those men being held in confinement from their families and their Nation.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that our adversaries in North Vietnam have misjudged us as a people. They seem to harbor the idea that Americans are as unconcerned as they to human suffering or that we will bow to their tactic of using prisoners as political and diplomatic pawns.

Congress and all America must continue to speak with one voice on the prisoner of war issue. Let not our enemies take comfort in their misguided judgment which tells them that honest differences among honest men over the conduct of the war is also a signal of differences concerning the fate of American prisoners of war.

Let not the Vietnam government in the North think they are witnessing a split in our ranks over prisoners when they witness sincere debate over policy.

There is no difference in this Nation over our determination to secure the release of Americans held prisoner by the North Vietnamese. We are one people on that issue, and I pray this message is sounded loud and clear in this chamber today.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1964, an American Army adviser, Capt. Floyd J. Thompson, was captured in South Vietnam and had the misfortune of becoming the first American POW. Nearly 7 years later, Captain Thompson is still listed, along with nearly 1,600 other Americans.

I have received letters from my home State of Wyoming from persons of all political persuasions who have voiced the national effort toward a "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action." I would like to quote from a resolution passed by the Kiwanis Club of Sheridan, Wyo., on February 4, 1971:

Our Government has been denied any reliable information regarding servicemen held as POWs by the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, or any reliable information regarding many of our servicemen listed as missing in action in Vietnam; although repeated demands have been made upon the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese to provide proper treatment for the POWs and to release reliable information as to the POWs and MIAs. Efforts of the families of the POWs and MIAs. Efforts of the families of the POWs treatment for these men, have been to no avail but have been, in fact, turned into propaganda tools for the benefit of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

We call upon the President of the United States, and our Congress, to take a definite stand in this matter to obtain the return of all POWs and complete information on all of our servicemen listed as missing in action.

I would like to include in my remarks the following letter to Premier Pham Van Dong of North Vietnam which was signed by a large majority of the members of the Winter Memorial Presbyterian Church of Casper, Wyo.:

HIS EXCELLENCY PHAM VAN DONG, Premier, Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi, North Vietnam

PREMIER PHAM VAN DONG: As concerned Christians and United States citizens we are appealing to your humanity, and that of your nation in regard to our prisoners of war and our men missing in action.

In the name of humanity we call for Hanoi to release the names of all prisoners you hold, and to urge the National Liberation Front to do the same. In the name of humanity we call for the assurance of proper detention facilities, food and medical care of Prisoners of war. In the name of humanity we call for unhampered correspondence with prisoners of war's families. In the name of humanity we call for repatriation of sick or wounded who might not survive captivity. In the name of humanity we call for the International Red Cross or International Control Commission to be permitted to inspect the prison camps in North Vietnam as has been done in the South. In the name of humanity we call for an honoring by Hanoi of her legal obligations under the Geneva Convention which she signed in 1957.

It is my sincere hope that we can continue work on this problem throughout the year, and not forget it as quickly as this "week of concern" will pass. We must double our efforts in this legislative body so that a National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action will not become an annual event.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, last Friday when the President signed House Joint Resolution 21 declaring this week as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action," I was in my home State, North Dakota, to address the League of Women Voters and the International Club at North Dakota State University in Fargo. They, and all North Dakotans, are deeply concerned about our men who are being held in Vietnam.

This is another facet of this overdrawn war which has confused Americans for years. I am glad that this Congress is considering possibilities as to what is the fairest and most efficient system to maintain an army in America. And I am confident that the President's schedule for

withdrawals will take us out of this war. But the problem of getting back our prisoners of war and of finding out information on our men missing in action still plagues us.

None of us can realize the anguish and questioning families and friends of these men have experienced, wondering where they may be and how they are being treated.

I have before me a letter from Mrs. Leland Torkelson, Crosby, N. Dak. Her son has been a prisoner of war since April 1967. She has asked that Congress act upon House Resolution 517 and 562, which would exempt the earnings of a prisoner of war or a soldier missing in action from Federal income tax for as long as he has this status. I, too, urge that the Ways and Means Committee bring these two bills to our Chamber. Exempting them from paying Federal income tax is the least we can do for these men who have served above what they were called to do.

My hope is that this week will focus attention on the fact that there are over 1,600 Americans listed as POW's and MIA's. My hope is that our people's voiced concern will serve to awaken the numbered conscience of the North Vietnamese to observe the 1949 Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners, which they signed in 1957. And my hope is that this week will unite all of us as Americans, bringing our varied lives together into one heart, one mind, demanding that justice be given to our men in Vietnam—that this 1 week will demonstrate to the peoples of the world that this Nation is still united and is still concerned about the life of each one of its members.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker—

He serves me most who serves his country best.

These words from the "Iliad of Homer, Book X," express precisely the feeling of the average American citizen toward those who have fought on battlefields all over the world in the interest of the United States of America.

Veterans of military service fall into various categories.

There are those who have escaped the hazards of the battlefield and who are among the living, both with and without the scars of war. These are characterized by the servicemen who fought in World Wars I and II, as well as the various emergency actions immediately following the last World War and those who have been engaged in the present conflict in Vietnam.

There are those who have given their last full measure of devotion to their country and who are, in deep reverence, referred to as our "honored dead." These are remembered as those servicemen entombed in the hulls of sunken vessels as a result of a sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, and those who rest in peace in the fields of Europe and the rice paddies of Southeast Asia.

Then there are those who have been captured on the battlefield and who are listed either as prisoners of war or miss-

ing in action. These are represented by the nearly 1,600 young men of the Armed Forces of the United States who fought in the war in Vietnam.

They are American lads who have been placed in bamboo cages and put on public exhibition in enemy lands, who have been locked up in filthy cells and supplied only meager fare for subsistence, and who have been denied by their captors the rules of humane treatment that have been spelled out for prisoners of war by the Geneva Convention. In short, these are the men who have paid an extremely dear price for their country and who every day are bearing hardships occasioned because they fought to make men free. These, truly then, are our "honored living."

It is for us who are removed from the thunder of the battlefield to give assurance to our "honored living" that they will not be forgotten as they languish in dark cells in remote corners of the world.

In this, we must charge ourselves to remember that this group of "honored living" takes many forms.

They are of many different religions and philosophies. Some of them go to church as Catholics, some as Jews and some as Protestants. Some of them might not go to any church but, nonetheless, carry the precepts of the golden rule deep within their hearts.

They come from every walk of life, some of them being the sons of farmers and others having parents who work in the various ranks of the white and the blue collar.

Politically, these individuals might be Republicans or Democrats, and, philosophically, they could be of either conservative or liberal leaning. They also might be in dead center, politically and philosophically.

Before going into the service these imprisoned servicemen did many different things, extending all the way from working at a hot dog stand to taking a pre-medical course in preparation for becoming a doctor.

As diverse as their backgrounds might be, there is one thing they have strongly in common; that is, a sheer dedication to fight for the principles that mean so very much to free men.

Let us, then, in the course of our everyday living pause frequently to express our deep respect for those "honored living." Let us also resolve to press relentlessly forward to have their North Vietnamese captors give these American servicemen the dignified treatment to which they are, without reservation, eminently entitled.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, today I am privileged to join with my colleagues in an attempt to focus attention upon the fate of over 1,600 American prisoners-of-war and missing in action.

The week of March 21 to 27 has been proclaimed "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action" because 7 years ago at this time—on March 26, 1964—Capt. Floyd J. Thompson was captured in South Vietnam, and became the first American

POW of the war. Today, he remains a tragic statistic on Defense Department records, along with far too many other Americans.

It is quite obvious that until man can discover and implement a more rational method for settling differences than bloodshed, we will not escape the consequences which befall individuals such as Captain Thompson. This issue—perhaps the most discouraging—raises a multitude of legal, humanitarian, moral, political, and social questions which must be answered by the Communists. Hopefully, our actions on the House floor today will compel them to respond.

Since the initial capture of an American serviceman in Indochina, the United States has made every effort to identify all prisoners, establish communications between prisoners and their families, encourage repatriation of the wounded and seriously ill, and have impartial observers inspect the POW camps. However, Hanoi has been operating under the misinterpretation that not responding to our requests will work to its advantage, and thus our efforts have been thwarted at almost every turn. I am certain it is little consolation to the families of those missing that the majority of people surveyed approved of the raid on Son Tay. Their relatives are still not home.

In the Geneva Convention of 1949, the nations of the world attempted to make warfare as humane as possible for those who could no longer pose a threat in an existing conflict. This convention, legally binding the signatory parties, applies to "all cases of declared war or any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the high contracting parties, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them." Since the United States ratified it in 1955, and the Republic of Vietnam acceded in 1953 and North Vietnam in 1957, North Vietnam's position that the Convention is not applicable because war has not been declared is illegal and unjustifiable.

Yet, as we know too well, Hanoi has consistently refused all attempts by our Government to discuss the issue. Representatives of their government have responded to the desperate pleas of wives and mothers of Americans by stating these women should return home and demonstrate against the war. Only in this way, say the Communists, will the conflict be ended and will their husbands and sons be returned.

Although we have little information about the fate of the majority of these servicemen, we do know some very tragic facts concerning them. Only about 175 families have even received communications from their relatives, and the average frequency of such communications is less than two a year. American servicemen were marched down the streets of Hanoi in 1966 and threatened with execution as war criminals. Frank Borman reported, "we have documented cases of 19 of your fellow prisoners being murdered or allowed to die in South Vietnam and just recently the North Vietnamese have spoken of five deaths in their prisons."

Major Rowe explained that an American prisoner of war is isolated and a serious attempt is made to convince him that he is completely alone and helpless, totally beyond the protection of the United States, and at the complete mercy of his Communist captors. Such brutal treatment, the failure to identify prisoners, and the lack of POW camps are an affront to those who believe in common standards of decency and civilization—and certainly are in violation of the Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War.

President Nixon has denounced the Communist treatment of POW's as "one of the most unconscionable in the history of warfare," and both he and Secretary of Defense Laird have stated that "until the prisoners are released there will not be total and complete withdrawal of the American presence in Vietnam."

The leaders of the Nation and the world are giving the POW/MIA problem the highest priority. At the Paris Peace Talks Ambassador Bruce speaks of it almost daily. The Congress has held joint sessions exclusively on the problem. Numerous Congressmen have proposed new laws to provide additional benefits to families of POW's and MIA's.

The Red Cross and the United Nations have intervened, asking that the tenets of the Geneva Convention be upheld. Various groups and individuals such as H. Ross Perot, whose efforts thus far have been termed "propaganda" by the enemy, have offered ransom money for the prisoners.

In the near future, I will send a letter, with at least 85 of my House colleagues, to the President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, requesting an opportunity to inspect POW prisons in North Vietnam. If we cannot secure our servicemen's release, we in the Congress can attempt to ascertain whether they are being treated in accordance with the Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War.

One thing that desperately needs to be done is for U.S. officials, Congressmen, and the American people to stress equally the need for information about the many Americans who are also being held captive in South Vietnam. Too often we have stressed the plight of those held by Hanoi to the exclusion of the NLF. In fact, we know much less about the latter category of prisoners. I hope we will be able to help these brave individuals also. Their numbers certainly match those of the men held in North Vietnam, and, unfortunately, only one of them has even been permitted to write a letter. Therefore, their fate is quite obscure and distressing.

My purpose today is to call attention to the plight of all U.S. servicemen being held prisoners of war or listed as missing in action. The following table shows the actual numbers in various categories and suggests how so many American lives have been touched by this tragedy—but numbers alone can never reflect the grief endured by them or their loved ones.

The table follows:

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA (AS OF FEB. 28, 1971)

	Missing	Captured	Total
By country:			
North Vietnam	402	378	780
South Vietnam	482	79	560
Laos	261	3	253
	1,145	460	1,605
By service:			
Army	385	59	444
Navy	107	143	250
Marine Corps	93	23	116
Air Force	560	235	795
	1,145	460	1,605
Statistical recapitulation by year lost:			
1964	4	3	7
1965	54	74	128
1966	206	93	299
1967	247	162	409
1968	284	113	397
1969	200	11	211
1970	92	4	96
1971	58	0	58
Total	1,145	460	1,605

	By mail	By propaganda	Total
Captured acknowledged by enemy:			
North Vietnam	334	15	349
South Vietnam	1	19	20
Laos	0	1	1
	335	35	370

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in Congress to commemorate this National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action. We have chose the week of March 21 through 27 because it marks the seventh anniversary of our first prisoner of war. Capt. Floyd Thompson, an American adviser, was captured March 26, 1964.

Today there are over 1,500 men who are either prisoners or are missing in action. Many of these men are listed as missing because North Vietnam refuses to comply with the Geneva Convention which requires all countries to make a list of names of men that have been captured. North Vietnam also refuses to release the sick and wounded and will not permit the International Red Cross to inspect the prison camps.

We have heard of these deplorable conditions in which our prisoners are kept and the American people are growing impatient with North Vietnam's stalling tactics. We have witnessed public rallies, resolutions in the Congress, and pleas to the United Nation by concerned American citizens.

I hope this week of National Concern will demonstrate to the world that these are not forgotten Americans and that world opinion in return will convince North Vietnam to release the prisoners.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as many of our colleagues know, I was a prisoner of war during the Second World War. My experience has convinced me that our men held captive today can survive the long, miserable and lonely hours and days in the hands of the enemy if only they are convinced the American people care.

It is hard for a man in a prison cell to feel any tangible evidence of concern on the part of others. But, just as American bombers flying overhead once gave me and my cellmates the proof we needed that our Nation had not forgotten us; that our fellow Americans were still fighting to rescue us, I believe word of Son Tay and the rescue attempt there must have reached our captive men, and word will also reach them that we are setting aside this week as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action."

It may be difficult for the barbarians in Hanoi, who so cruelly use our captive servicemen as pawns in the game they are playing at the so-called peace table, to understand our free society. They may often misread our intentions when they hear that some of our leaders criticize the conduct of this miserable war or disagree with the President's timetable for withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. But we must not let them misread the united determination of the American people that this Nation will never desert the American men they persecute so brutally.

The North Vietnamese are violating international law, and those of us in the Congress as well as in the executive branch, must demonstrate to them that we are united in our demand that they cease and desist. We must continually remind the other nations of the world of their atrocities, and insist that every nation which pays decent human behavior more than lip service stand with us in our demand that they cease and desist. We must insist on unrelenting pressure from every world capital until the Hanoi barbarians give us the name, rank and serial number of every man they hold prisoner, as well as information concerning his health and well-being. We must also insist that they begin immediately returning our men as we are committed to returning theirs.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is concerned. The Members of this House are concerned. I urge with all the conviction I can muster that every Member rise and say so today; that every Member of the other Body likewise rise and say so; and that the President of the United States in the name of all the American people convey to the Hanoi Government this unanimous message of concern.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, in a spirit of deep concern, I join with my colleagues today in making a straightforward appeal of the utmost seriousness and urgency. It is an appeal that transcends politics and policy, an appeal that goes far beyond any possible questions of the merit of present military activities in Southeast Asia. For the appeal we make today is an appeal for international justice. Even more, it is an appeal for common decency, for the most basic standards of human morality. In sum, it is an appeal on behalf of the dignity of human life itself.

The President and the Congress of the United States have proclaimed the week of March 21 through 27 as a "National Week of Concern" for American prisoners-of-war and men missing-in-

action. We sincerely hope that by doing so, we will help to focus the attention not only of the nation but of the entire world on the plight of our men and women now held prisoners in Southeast Asia, in addition to the unspeakable anguish of hundreds of their families here at home.

At last count, Mr. Speaker, more than 1,600 Americans were listed either as captives of the North Vietnamese or men missing-in-action. Some of these men have been prisoners now for more than 5 years, and Friday will mark the seventh anniversary of the capture of the first American still being held. In all of that time, only 10 men have been released. The remainder continue to exist under the most horrifying conditions imaginable—treated with disregard and contempt, subjected to inhumane conditions both mentally and physically, deprived of adequate medical care and diet. This, Mr. Speaker, from every indication and report that we have. And, perhaps the most terrifying aspect of the entire situation is that, for the most part, we simply do not know what the situation really is.

For despite intense diplomatic efforts during these last 5 years, the Governments of North Vietnam and the Vietcong have refused even minimal cooperation—cooperation asked not only by the United States, but by the United Nations as well, in addition to the International Red Cross and similar organizations. The North Vietnamese have refused not only to release American prisoners, but even to identify the prisoners they hold. Consistently, they have refused to have their prisoner-of-war camps inspected by neutral observers, such as the International Red Cross. They have refused to release prisoners who are seriously sick or wounded. And they have refused to permit even the free flow of mail to and from prisoners, allowing perhaps only 100 men even to write home.

All of these actions, Mr. Speaker, are in direct violation of the accords reached at the 1949 Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners-of-war, which the North Vietnamese signed in 1957. We appeal today for what is recognized the world over as just and decent, what Hanoi itself, in signing the Geneva accords, has said that it recognizes as just and decent.

We appeal to the North Vietnamese, at the very least, to release the names of the prisoners whom they hold. Across this country, hundreds of families are gratuitously subjected to overwhelming anguish and frustration, not knowing whether their husbands, fathers, and sons are dead or alive. Of equal importance, we appeal to all governments to honor the accords of the Geneva Convention—to acknowledge and respect the simple dignity of human life.

Only when this is accomplished, Mr. Speaker, will we lower our voices of outrage and protest. Until that day, our disgust at mankind's inhumanity to itself must be proclaimed again and again.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this week is very special in the hearts and minds of Americans everywhere. By Presidential proclamation, the country

is observing "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action" from March 21 to 27. To some, this period will have a highly personal significance, dramatized by the absence of a loved one who is in this tragic category. But to all Americans and to free peoples everywhere, it will bear an importance which stems from a fundamental dedication to humanitarian principles.

Nearly 7 years ago—on March 26, 1964, the first American serviceman was captured in South Vietnam by the enemy. Even today, he is included with over 1,500 other Americans who are classified as prisoners of war or missing in action.

Although a signatory to the Geneva Convention regarding humane treatment for prisoners, North Vietnam has disregarded those provisions repeatedly and blatantly. They have failed to release a complete list of Americans which they hold captive; they have refused to release the seriously ill and injured soldiers; they have not been willing to allow the free exchange of mail; and they have not permitted impartial inspection of their prison facilities. All these actions have been flagrant violations of the international agreement which supposedly was to insure the merciful treatment of imprisoned soldiers.

As I reflected on the historical distinction of the dates selected for this observance, the time of year came to mind. On March 21 each year, citizens hail the coming of spring. Whatever the weather on that date, it is known that the season of warmth and beauty is nigh. Traditionally, spring is a time of rebirth. Plants burst from the ground; trees and flowers blossom; many farm animals give birth to their young. But, the most refreshing aspect of springtime is the all-pervasive feeling of hope and anticipation which fills the air.

Thus, as we acknowledge this first week of spring, it is appropriate to reassert our outrage to the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong over their failure to accord captive American servicemen the type of care demanded by all those who cherish human life. Let us—as Americans—renew our pledge to maintain a national protest until these men are granted humane respect. In so doing, let us remind the world that Americans stand united and firm behind our imprisoned servicemen, who have been stripped by the enemy of human dignity. But most importantly, let us reassure our men in Southeast Asia that the status of American POW's and MIA's is ever in our minds and actions. Let us reaffirm a national commitment to seek the release of these men, so that American words cannot be used as propagandizing tools of torture against our imprisoned men. Public uproar must not cease until the enemy allows these Americans to come home to their loved ones and to the country which they have served so well.

Concern over the plight of American servicemen who languish in steamy jungles thousands of miles from home transcends petty partisanship. A soldier writhing in an enemy prison camp is the ward of neither Democrat nor Republican, for his well-being is the responsibility of all Americans—of all free peo-

ples the world over. Especially during this week, let us demonstrate to the world our solidarity behind the ideals of human decency.

At this point, I want to emphasize that this Nation must not overlook the families and loved ones of the POW's and MIA's. They, too, are the victims of a ruthless enemy. By failing to release the names of those whom they hold and who have died in captivity, the North Vietnamese are extending the war to our very shores, toying with the minds and emotions of these countless citizens.

Thus, as a sponsor of the resolution which gave birth to this observance, it is my hope that Americans everywhere will pause in their daily routines—whether it be in formal ceremonies and activities or merely in a concerned thought—and pay tribute to the brave men and their families who have borne a disproportionate share of the burden of this war.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during this National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action, the attention of the Nation is on the prisoners and their families.

Appreciating the degree of heartache experienced by the families of those POW/MIA's is difficult enough. Imagining the inhumane and miserable conditions which these brave men have endured—some for many years—is beyond our ability as we go about our daily lives.

In honoring those in North Vietnamese prisons, we honor, too, the brave women who are their wives and mothers. They have been used as pawns by the North Vietnamese, as have their husbands. Love for their husbands and sons has been played against their love of country. We all owe them the same loyalty and devotion they have shown us. We must do everything in our power to gain for the Americans being held prisoner humane treatment and direct contact with their families. We can do no less.

Perhaps we can do more, however. The vast majority of Americans are united in opposing the wretched treatment accorded to American prisoners. Hundreds of thousands have sent petitions and letters to the North Vietnamese Government urging humane treatment. I have joined nearly 100 of my colleagues this month in writing to Ton Doc Thang, President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to plead the prisoners' case for humane treatment.

Literally hundreds of resolutions on behalf of American prisoners of war have been sponsored, and the entire 91st Congress, without a dissenting vote, passed a resolution calling for better treatment for prisoners. President Nixon has pressed for negotiation of the prisoner-of-war issue since he took office, and he has worked through foreign governments and our own official envoys to assure their humane treatment. Congress has voted to continue the pay, promotions, and benefits of those men missing and imprisoned, and to compensate them for inadequate care by the enemy.

Yet the North Vietnamese Government, while a signatory to the 1949 Geneva

Convention, has refused to accord the status of prisoner of war to our soldiers who have been captured. I propose that the Government of North Vietnam adhere to its treaty obligations in recognizing these American soldiers as prisoners of war.

Perhaps a new convention could be drawn up to limit the time prisoners can be held before being repatriated, and to define the treatment which must be maintained during the prisoner's captivity. Certainly, in modern warfare, where protracted struggles such as this may be common, such guarantees should be internationally established.

America is asking Hanoi this week, and always, that their prisoners—our citizens—be granted the human right to medical treatment for their injuries and the simple right to communicate with those they love.

The prisoners and their families deserve our compassion. They deserve our constant work to assure them humane treatment and early release.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, as fellow Americans who are proud of our fighting men who are enduring the tiring and dangerous Vietnam war, I feel we must bring to bear all the pressure of the Congress, the American public and all world opinion possible to force the North Vietnamese to free American prisoners and comply with the Geneva Convention accords which that Government signed in 1957.

This National Week of Concern for our Prisoners of War and missing in action must set the stage for a concerted effort on the part of all peoples of this Nation to join in voicing the demand upon the North Vietnamese to act to halt the captivity, inhumane treatment, and lack of communication with American prisoners.

I request, on behalf of the families of the prisoners of war and the men listed as missing in action and for all humanity, that the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong identify all prisoners of war they hold in captivity, permit impartial inspection of their POW camps, release seriously injured or sick prisoners and permit the free exchange of mail between prisoners and their families.

Many of these American men are being mistreated and I urge that our efforts today, this week, and in the following months not go unheeded by the North Vietnamese, Vietcong, or any nation's people so that our American fighting men who are prisoners will have hope of being freed.

Most of us today in the House of Representatives have met often and talked with the families of our captured patriots and the men listed as missing in action.

I hope today that the spirit of freedom for all people under which America was formed by our forefathers will be the spirit with which our words today will reach the North Vietnamese.

I hope the North Vietnamese in Hanoi will experience a large dose of that spirit.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a solemn occasion, for we gather here in the Chamber of the House of Representatives today both to pay a tribute of esteem to the American troops who are being held captive in North Vietnam, and to rededicate ourselves to their release.

This morning in a briefing on the situation, an interesting proposal arose, one which I personally intend to follow up. I propose that the Congress form a joint committee to sit as long as the POW situation lasts for the express purpose of attempting to find a resolution to the problem. I propose that both public and Government witnesses be invited to offer their ideas before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, the POW and MIA's cast a long silent shadow over the entire United States. We cannot rest while they suffer; we cannot turn our backs on them or on their families and loved ones.

I urge my colleague to join with me in this resolution. I urge them also to join with me in the prayerful hope that the day of liberation is not far removed.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to register my deep concern for the nearly 1,600 American servicemen who are currently being held captive in North Vietnam.

I believe that a week of concern will help keep national and world attention focused squarely upon this tragic problem. Hopefully, it will continue to bring the full weight of international opinion to bear upon the North Vietnamese, who have mistreated American prisoners in flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention.

Every government has a moral and legal obligation to conduct its affairs in a responsible manner. As a signatory to the Geneva Convention, the Government of North Vietnam should accord our men fair and humane treatment. Hanoi should identify all prisoners being held, release those who are ill or injured, permit international inspection of its prisoner-of-war facilities, and allow the free exchange of mail between prisoners and their families.

Mr. Speaker, along with my House colleagues and my fellow Americans I look forward to the day when these servicemen will be reunited with their loved ones, and I pray that elusive dream will soon become a reality.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tragic episodes of our time concerns the plight of American prisoners of war held by the Communists in Southeast Asia.

It has been more than 6 years since the American Government first asked for, at least, a list of those held captive. We still do not know even the number of American prisoners of war. The families and loved ones of these men have not been able to find out if they are still alive.

In May 1969, President Nixon made a concerted effort to publicize the plight of these American prisoners in hopes that the force of world opinion would encourage more humanitarian treatment of them and lead to their early release. The releases made since then have almost always been timed and planned to obtain the maximum of political advantage.

We need to continue our efforts to mobilize world opinion in support of humane treatment of prisoners held by North Vietnam and the Vietcong.

It is my sincere hope that our continued efforts will convince the North Vietnamese of our sincerity in this regard

and of the need to separate the political question of peace in Vietnam from the humanitarian treatment of prisoners.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the plight of the American military men being held prisoners of war in Southeast Asia still will have to be resolved by worldwide public support. As a Nation we must seize the initiative and make clear to the world that we will not stand by any longer and tolerate the inhumane treatment perpetrated on our brave men. Negotiations with the Communists to learn the names of the prisoners and those still listed as missing in action over the past 5 years has been fruitless.

The last Department of Defense figures show 104 primary and secondary next of kin of missing and captured servicemen in the State of Ohio.

It is a chilling thought to visualize the conditions in an enemy prisoner of war camp—the mental anguish, solitary confinement, inadequate diet, public spectacle and humiliation as the prisoners are paraded through North Vietnam villages—and most of all, the heart-rending feeling of loneliness and being unable to communicate with their loved ones. Many of these men, Air Force and Navy pilots, have not made contact with their wives or children for some 5-6 years because the North Vietnamese have refused mail to go out of the prison camps.

So far the most effective bargaining power has been the brave effort on behalf of the wives who have negotiated tirelessly with Hanoi representatives in Paris and with Soviet leaders in Moscow.

This effort, however, has been wrapped in suspicion as the Communists have told these fine young ladies that they must go home and participate in the mass demonstrations to end the war.

North Vietnam is one of the 123 signers of the Geneva Convention which deals with humane treatment of prisoners.

The Hanoi government so far has refused to acknowledge this. They have refused to allow a neutral nation to go in and inspect detention camps. They have refused to hand over a list of prisoners and they have refused all efforts to deliver mail between the prisoners and their families.

Most of the wives and next of kin are members of the "National League of Families of American Prisoners in Southeast Asia." This group should be commended for their tireless energy to correct a grave wrongdoing.

It is a little known fact that Vice President Agnew has donated more than \$12,000 to the league from royalties he received from two firms that are producing Spiro watches and sweatshirts bearing his caricature.

I am privileged to join in cosponsoring a resolution authorizing the President to proclaim a "National Week of Concern of Prisoners of War/Missing in Action." It is my sincere hope that such an observation will serve as a focal point for many individuals and organizations to arouse the conscience of the world in support of Americans being held captive in Southeast Asia.

These men deserve our vocal and pray-

ful support to demonstrate to them that they have not been forgotten.

A strong national response will encourage reciprocal acts of justice and humane treatment on the part of the Communists.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, wars are an ever-present curse of mankind in every age. In past eras, pure barbarism was the order of the day. To a certain extent this is still true, for the institution of armed conflict itself is a barbaric throwback to man's primitive beginnings.

Yet over the ages of human development, there has evolved an effort to ameliorate the conditions under which it is fought and how its victims are treated. This includes civilians innocently caught in its turmoil and combatants inextricably intertwined in its upheavals.

If there is one significant advance that has been made in human history, it is this evolution, institutionalized in a series of signed conventions. All nations, whether they are signatories to such documents or not, are influenced in the strongest possible manner to at least attempt to abide by their provisions.

This brings us down to the modern era and the conflict in Vietnam. At present there are upward of some 1,600 Americans who are being detained as prisoners in Indochina. Most of them are in the hands of the Government of North Vietnam. In most cases, all we know of them is that they are missing in a combat zone. Little more is known by Government and most important of all, the families of the missing men.

There are, as I mentioned earlier, international rules to be abided by all parties to any conflict. This includes North Vietnam, South Vietnam and the United States. The most elementary one of all is to at least notify the opposing side of the fact that you have a certain number of their personnel in custody. Their names, ranks and identifying military numbers should be included and the fact that they are alive or not. This is elementary international courtesy to an opponent. Ideology does not enter into it. Negotiations toward settlement of the conflict do not figure in this portion of the equation, either. It is simply an international courtesy exchanged by opponents.

To this date the overwhelming majority of the families of those who are unaccounted for in the Southeast Asian conflict have no knowledge whatsoever of the true fate of their loved ones. Their agony has continued now for several years, compounded by succeeding developments.

It is unforgivable, to say the least, to set such a precedent for lack of information on prisoners. And I say this completely apart from the debate on the war, with which I have taken issue on more than one occasion.

Elementary assurances of basic treatment are also in order, such as no torture, no deprivation of basic necessities and amenities of life and the right to communicate periodically with their loved ones.

It is unnecessary for the government of North Vietnam to invest a cent in such treatment. The Government and people

of the United States of America will eagerly step forward with all that is needed to carry out these functions. It would not even cost North Vietnam the price of a postage stamp or a grain of rice. I am also certain that few if any voices would be raised across the breadth of America to such a process.

All we need is the acquiescence of the North Vietnamese.

Mr. Speaker, the prisoners of war on both sides have one basic right that has been infringed upon. That is not to be used as pawns in the game of international politics. They have committed themselves on behalf of their governments and the respective policies engaged in by them. In the process they suffered the misfortunes of war resulting in capture by the enemy. For them combat should and must be over. They have a right to be left alone, treated decently and freed. To allow them to become elements in the equation of war once again is unconscionable.

These men should be allowed to know that no matter what other considerations there may be surrounding this conflict, that they are not forgotten. They dwell ever in our hearts, and we shall not rest until each and every one of them is free, returned to the circle of home and family and embarked upon a new endeavor.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, we must not allow controversy over this Nation's involvement in Vietnam to obscure the personal sacrifices that that conflict continually demands of our servicemen there. Tragically, tens of thousands of our young men have had to sacrifice their lives. Others are having to make sacrifices short of—but only just short of—death itself. Among these are the more than 1,500 who are prisoners of war or are missing in action and presumed to be prisoners of war.

The agony of their confinement is not limited to the prisoners themselves. Mr. Speaker, there is a large Air Force installation in my district. Many of the families in my constituency are service people. Among them are wives of men who are known to be prisoners of war in North Vietnam. I have talked with some of these brave women; I have corresponded with others. I know of the deep concern for their loved ones that presses upon them without letup, day in and day out. I appreciate the feelings of anguish that have become a part of their lives because they learn so little about the health and well-being of their men.

Their anguish would be alleviated somewhat if they knew that the provisions of the Geneva Convention were indeed governing the treatment of Americans by their North Vietnamese and Vietcong captors. As we all know, those provisions—which all of the nations participating in hostilities in Southeast Asia on both sides have agreed to abide by—are not now being observed by our enemies.

Recognizing this, the following resolution was adopted February 16, 1971, by the Senate and by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan.

I respectfully commend it to my colleagues in this House.

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON PRISONERS OF WAR

Whereas, The Unknown Soldier is not solely represented among the dead, where for generations those unknown sacrifices to their countries' service have been publicly and ceremoniously honored and great monuments are erected to their memory. During this decade and now, there has been a return to barbarism in the treatment of many hundreds of unknown soldiers among the living; and

Whereas, Known prisoners of war and many "Missing In Action" who are unknown prisoners of war are daily, hourly, suffering and dying of cruel and barbarously inhumane treatment by their North Vietnam captors in contemptuous violation of the articles of the Geneva Convention—which Hanoi signed in 1957 as solemn pledge of agreement to provide humane treatment to all captives taken in wartime; and

Whereas, Proof has been obtained of these extreme cruelties practiced daily; and for the thousands of relatives and friends of such living sacrifices, these facts bring a never-ending anguish. Not only are barbarities of extreme abuse and corrosive public ridicule inflicted, but Hanoi thus far refuses to release any listing of prisoners of war, deliberately spreading anguish among families of American service personnel and thereby compounding Communist barbarities; and

Whereas, Although the contention as to whether America should continue her presence in Southeast Asia is currently dividing this Nation, that contention should neither divert nor delay the compelling need for immediate action concerning American prisoners of war. By any civilized standard, by any claim to humane decency, this Nation, through her public, demands humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war; now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That hereby the Congress of the United States is memorialized, requesting that immediate and effective measures be taken to obtain identification of POW and MIA personnel; to compel treatment for such prisoners according to Hanoi's signatory with the Geneva Convention articles with humane treatment; to impose impartial inspection by authorized agencies of prison facilities; to effect immediate repatriation of the sick and wounded prisoners; and, without exception, to establish and sustain the right of communication between prisoners and their families; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of each of the sister State Legislatures; and to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the Michigan delegation to the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the Senate, February 16, 1971.

Adopted by the House of Representatives, February 16, 1971.

Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to express my strong approval of the Presidential proclamation by which this has been designated National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action. As a sponsor of the joint resolution which sets aside this week to express concern for our men who are missing in action and who are prisoners of war, I want to reaffirm my personal disbelief that there should exist today such unconcern for the human values which are involved in the lives of our POW's and MIA's and their families.

Mr. Speaker, what possible end can be achieved through mistreatment of men

who have fallen into enemy hands—and what valid reason can justify the North Vietnamese authorities in refusing to identify and divulge the names of those who are held as prisoners?

Mr. Speaker, in the case of my own constituents, I have three particular examples which have caused untold sorrow and distress. In the first place, it is only human and just that information should be supplied regarding the welfare of our men, or at least information as to whether they are being held as prisoners of war—or not. Maj. Croasley Fitton, Jr., the brother of Mrs. George W. Stone, Jr., of Libertyville, Ill., has been missing in action since February 9, 1968, when he was shot down over North Vietnam. His parachute was seen to open and there is convincing evidence that he landed safely in enemy territory. However, no report or information regarding his welfare has been forthcoming from the North Vietnamese authorities. Special Forces Sgt. John Young, the husband of Mrs. Erica Young, has been missing in action since January 1968. His wife and his brother and sister-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Young, all of Lake Villa, Ill., have sought information about Sgt. John Young—but to no avail. Navy Comdr. Robert Doremus, brother of Mrs. James Courter of Deerfield, Ill., appears definitely to be a POW. However, the communications regarding his whereabouts and his welfare are so sparse and uncertain as to cause continuing concern to his sister as well as to other members of his family.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to me to be no just end to be served by withholding information regarding these unfortunate victims of war. In addition to the reports of mistreatment of our men held in captivity by the North Vietnamese, justice and humanity dictate that they should be free to communicate with their loved ones and that they should be provided with food and lodging consistent with human needs and with standards established by the International Red Cross and by custom and practice.

Mr. Speaker, there is no assurance that any amount of pleading or importuning will change the attitude of the North Vietnamese authorities. However, our efforts must persist and be supplemented by our prayers that human compassion, decency and respect will indeed prevail and that the North Vietnamese authorities will respond with information and with improved treatment of those whom they hold captive within their borders.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, Congressman ROGER ZION of Indiana and Congressman SONNY MONTGOMERY of Mississippi, and all who have assumed leadership in this cause. While I deplore what has transpired in the lives and homes of these families of prisoners of war and men missing in action, I express the profound hope and indeed the expectation that the messages which we transmit today may receive favorable attention by the North Vietnamese authorities.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that we should establish a joint committee to pursue the interests of our prisoners of

war and men missing in action. Such a joint committee will give official status to the action which is sought by most Members of the House of Representatives and Senate in behalf of the men and their families who are missing in action or who are held as prisoners of war.

Mr. Speaker, I support creation of such a joint committee with the hope and expectation that it can lead to the release of the Americans now in enemy hands and that it can provide a comforting and reassuring response to the families of these brave and unfortunate victims of the war in Southeast Asia.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Friday will be the seventh year of the capture of the first American still being held captive in the conflict in Indochina.

His plight and that of all the other men held captive is a source of suffering for their families and cause for great sadness on the part of the American people.

It is inhuman and uncivilized for the North Vietnamese to continue to flaunt the provisions of the Geneva Convention regarding identification, inspections, correspondence, and the release of the seriously sick and wounded.

Each violation of the Geneva agreement is inexcusable.

We owe it to these men and their families to support this "Week of Concern" which has been designated by the President.

Simple human dignity should require information for the families of these men. Inspection of POW camps by a neutral nation seems to me to be a very simple act of human beings.

Nearly 1,600 Americans are held prisoner or listed as missing in action.

Having the opportunity to talk with the wives and families of some of these men is a heartrending experience. Theirs is a life of never knowing if their loved one is alive or dead—if their children have a father or are orphans.

I join most fervently in those statements of concern being made today. The suggestion of the President that this Nation enter into heartfelt prayer for these men should be commended to every man throughout the world.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans have expressed their strong desires to obtain the release of our prisoners held in North Vietnam under conditions which violate the provisions of international agreement. Our fellow citizens have written letters and signed petitions to the leaders of North Vietnam and to leaders of other nations, seeking humane treatment and release for our prisoners and information on those missing in action. In my congressional district, representatives of the Remember Our POW's/MIA's group in Rochester, N.Y., have collected more than 70,000 letters and names which they plan to present next month to both the North and South Vietnamese delegations to the peace negotiations in Paris. More than 1,500 Americans are prisoners or missing in action, and some of our prisoners have been held more than 6 years.

It is appropriate that Congress also participate in these efforts because the force of world opinion can effect changes in North Vietnamese policies. I hope the

proclamation of the week of March 21-27 as National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action will produce strong support of this cause throughout our country.

North Vietnam agreed to the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War in 1949. The convention provides for exchange of information on prisoners, passage of mail and packages, humane treatment and similar arrangements, but the North Vietnamese have failed to honor these provisions to any responsible degree. Certainly we cannot permit this conduct to go unchallenged, and must continue to draw the world's attention to it.

The fate of American prisoners remains a key consideration in our plans to reduce our military commitment in Vietnam. The President has proposed a complete exchange of prisoners by both sides in Vietnam. Such an exchange would result in the release of 10 times as many men to the North Vietnamese as to our side, but the North Vietnamese have refused to agree to this humane act. The President has declared, however, that we will not completely withdraw our forces from Vietnam without release of all our prisoners. One of the most positive steps to be taken toward peace can be initiated by the North Vietnamese if they will take the simple humane action of exchanging prisoners and information about those missing in action.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to express my great disappointment that it is still necessary for this House of Representatives to discuss the prisoner-of-war issue. Despite hundreds of speeches on the floor of the House and the Senate, thousands of diplomatic negotiations and contacts and millions of letters to the answerable North Vietnamese and Vietcong officials, the situation is still almost the same as it was 7 years ago when the first American was captured—no absolutely definite list of prisoners held by the North and by their allies has yet been made available; free exchange of mail has not yet been allowed; international inspection of prisoner facilities has not yet been authorized; prisoner exchange of those who are sick or wounded has not yet been effected.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the North Vietnamese and their allies are still not living up to the terms of the Geneva accords on prisoners of war.

I join in this special order today for several reasons. First, I want to express once again my personal interest, concern, and deep commitment to the cause of returning American POW's to their loved ones and families. Second, I believe this overwhelming expression of official concern serves as an additional commitment on the part of the entire Nation to these men and their families who have sacrificed so much. Third, I believe that the public attention given to this issue and the massive public outcry which has been accorded the lack of humanity shown by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese has, in fact, had some beneficial effect. The North Vietnamese have released a list. We have reason to believe that it is not complete or entirely accurate—but it is

at least a small recognition on their part to their international obligations. Some mail is getting through—not as much as is guaranteed in the Geneva accords, but at least a few letters and packages.

There have been some minor signs that the North Vietnamese are willing to talk—they are faint at best, but they are better than absolute silence on the issue.

While there are faint signs of hope in dealing with the North Vietnamese, however, there have been absolutely no signs at all from the Vietcong or from the Communist forces in Laos and Cambodia. If North Vietnam is to be accorded any respect in the community of nations, it must require its allies to also begin to discuss this situation seriously. As an absolute minimum, all the forces involved should live up to their international commitments to release names of those held, to allow international inspection of prison facilities and exchange of mail between those who are in prison and their loved ones at home.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all nations of good will join with the United States in urging the other side to live up to its international obligations. I have, therefore, proposed that the United Nations Commission on Human Rights assert leadership in securing genuine negotiations on this issue between the United States, the North Vietnamese and their allies, and South Vietnam. An impartial and unbiased international forum, the United Nations can well serve to bring hostile nations together to discuss this issue of humanity to man.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest aspects of our involvement in the Southeast Asian war is the prolonged imprisonment under inhuman conditions of as many as 1,600 American soldiers.

Those few who are released return to this country and relate tales of horror. Some are made to walk in the streets on display as a captured war prize. Others must live in subhuman cells and bear cruel torture.

The Hanoi regime has consistently refused to adhere to the rules of the Geneva Convention. They have refused to permit a Red Cross team to inspect the prison conditions. In many cases they have refused or hampered efforts by the families to write to their loved ones.

But the pressure of public opinion is getting to them. Where once they were totally unwilling to even discuss the prisoner of war issue, they have now shown a crack in the cold facade. Last December the North Vietnamese Government released a list of 339 prisoners they said they were holding captive.

Now the efforts must be intensified. No peace settlement is possible unless the prisoner of war issue is resolved. The first step is for Hanoi to release the names of all prisoners held whether in North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, or South Vietnam. They should likewise require their puppet government in South Vietnam to do the same.

Next they should indicate their desire to adhere to the Geneva Convention rules on treatment of prisoners and permit an inspection team to visit the cells.

Beyond that, definite conditions under

which the American prisoners will be returned to this country must be settled upon.

The involvement of this Nation in the Southeast Asian war is drawing to a close. But I for one will not close the book on this chapter in American history until every last American soldier is brought back. The Congress gave the President the authority to expand the war in Vietnam. Now this Congress must see that the consequences of that authority are not swept under the mat.

To forget these men would be to forget our humanity. We cannot leave them to languish in a foreign prison. Our concern for their safe return should be as deep as it would be if it were us being held there.

I have written to the leaders of North Vietnam and the Communist chiefs in South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia asking that they release Americans being held prisoner. I have also promised them that they can look forward to long and continued fighting unless this issue is settled. As a representative of a half a million Americans I hope they will take heed. I would urge my colleagues to write to these men also. When they realize further procrastination is hopeless, we may then be able to work toward a settlement of both the prisoner of war issue and the end to conflict. Only then will real peace be possible.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the people of Minnesota's Third District join in the activities of the "National Week of Concern for POW's and MIA's" by registering their protest against the treatment of U.S. prisoners in North Vietnam. We resent this violation of the Geneva Convention, and we reaffirm our demands that humane treatment be given to our men, and to all prisoners. Further, we reaffirm our demands that the names of all prisoners be released and that they be allowed free communication with their families.

We hope this week of concern will communicate to the North Vietnamese how strongly we stand on this issue. Efforts to establish an effective exchange between the two sides must be increased. We must have reciprocal agreements for the fair treatment and exchange of all POW's.

Our concern for U.S. POW's-MIA's is not a justification, nor is it necessarily related, for escalation, or deescalation of our efforts in Southeast Asia. Our concern for POW's and MIA's transcends other policies of any countries in that area. We dedicate ourselves to finding a way for the exchange and safe return of all prisoners.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today we speak not as Republicans or Democrats, but as men pleading for the lives of our fellow men. During this week of concern for the nearly 1,600 Americans being held prisoner or listed as missing in action in Indochina, our Nation is united in our prayers and our pleas for the safety of these men.

In one united voice we ask the Government of North Vietnam to identify all those held in captivity, and to release those men who are seriously sick and

wounded. We ask that they abide by the provisions of the Geneva Convention, by allowing the prisoners to correspond regularly with their families and by treating these men humanely.

But, more important than this, we must now rededicate ourselves to bringing these men home. The North Vietnamese have consistently stated they will not negotiate the release of prisoners until the United States has set a date for withdrawal from South Vietnam. Unfortunately, there is little hope that they will change this stand.

So let us not hide behind this week of concern in order to divert attention from our failure to end this war. Our continued involvement in Southeast Asia is prolonging the prisoners' period of captivity. Let us show our true concern for these men by ending the war and bringing them home.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago this week the first American prisoner of war was taken captive in Vietnam. Today this man is one of 1,500 Americans listed as prisoners of war or missing in action.

One man from my district has been missing since 1967. There have been no letters or word from him since that time. Another family in my district had heard nothing from their father, a prisoner of war since 1967, until just recently when the first letter arrived.

Congress has passed several resolutions concerning the prisoners of war, but we must continue to press this issue. We in Congress must take the lead in showing North Vietnam that we have not forgotten these men, that we care, that we are very deeply concerned. No matter what our individual thoughts on the war are, we must be united in a non-partisan effort to assure the POW's humanitarian treatment and prompt release.

Earlier this year, I had the opportunity to visit with Ambassador Bruce in Paris. As a result of this meeting, I have joined with three of my colleagues—GILLESPIE V. MONTGOMERY, JAMES J. HOWARD, and JOHN DELLENBACK—in a resolution addressed to the President of North Vietnam. Many of you have joined us in this resolution. We are proposing to the President of North Vietnam that a group of us, or at least one or two, be allowed to visit the detention camps in North Vietnam.

Our purpose is twofold. First, it is only by personal inspection that we can see how our men are treated and hopefully identify those in the camps. Second, our trip—and our request—will focus world opinion on this problem. Americans are becoming more and more concerned about our POW's. I am hopeful that the pressures of world opinion will be brought to bear on Hanoi for compliance with the 1949 Geneva Convention. Although North Vietnam ratified that convention in 1957, it has refused to release the names of those being held captive, it has refused to release the sick and wounded, it has refused to permit impartial inspections of prisoner facilities, and it has refused to permit the free exchange of mail between prisoners and

their families. World opinion is a powerful force, even to a Communist nation. It can and has swayed actions of governments.

Congress must take the lead. We must take the lead in pressing the case for humanitarian treatment for the POW's. We must take the lead in focusing not only American opinion, but world opinion on this problem. The North Vietnamese must never believe that we in the United States do not care or have forgotten our POW's and MIA's.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the plight of the American servicemen being held by the North Vietnamese Communists. The treatment of our men has been despicable. The suffering undergone by the families of these men is heartrending. The actions of some in our own Nation who are attempting to prove that U.S. servicemen are, in fact, actually war criminals as the Communists claim, is sickening. The attempts of groups such as the Committee of Liaison to use the families of the prisoners as weapons in the Communist war to subjugate Southeast Asia is beyond contempt, but hopefully not beyond the notice of the agencies responsible for punishing this type of activity.

The question is, how can the Congress, and individual Congressmen, best contribute to the efforts designed to bring about the release of our men. To my mind the best way to do this is for numerous Representatives to go on record as being willing to back the President's use of all the force which he feels is necessary to secure freedom for our imprisoned servicemen and peace in Southeast Asia, up to and including removing from power the current North Vietnamese Government which is the cause of the whole situation.

Toward this end I have already introduced a resolution, House Joint Resolution 71, which calls for a formal declaration of war unless all U.S. servicemen are released within 30 days of passage of the resolution and the enemy begins the large-scale withdrawal of his armies from the territory of his neighbors within the same time period. This approach tells the enemy in no uncertain terms that time is no longer on his side; that his continued intransigence and uncivilized behavior will cost him more than just the loss of his expeditionary force, but the loss of his power over the North Vietnamese people.

Congressional initiatives calling for an abrupt withdrawal of U.S. military forces from Southeast Asia, forces which are our primary bargaining tool, may well have encouraged the North Vietnamese to continue fighting. It is high time that a number of Congressmen adopt a position which will have a deterrent rather than an encouraging effect on the enemy. We must put the North Vietnamese Communists on notice that as they continue to expand and intensify the conflict, continue to use our servicemen as pawns in their effort to subdue the non-Communist peoples of Southeast Asia, that the Congress of the United States authorizes the Commander in Chief to use all

the force necessary to rapidly and radically alter the existing status quo and, normalize the situation in Indochina, and secure the release of our men.

The North Vietnamese Communists must be convinced that we are willing to significantly up the price which they must pay for continued aggression and mistreatment of our men unless they become a great deal more amenable than they have been previously. Amenable to the point of freeing the Americans they hold and getting their armies back behind their own borders.

If several of my colleagues will either cosponsor House Joint Resolution 71 or introduce their own resolutions authorizing the President in advance to use sufficient force to bring our men being held by the enemy home and insure a truly lasting peace in Southeast Asia, this will be a big step in the right direction.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the 92d Congress will not consider another issue as important as the one we are discussing.

As we hopefully watch the continued Vietnamization of the war in Southeast Asia, sensing optimism of a new kind with more and more Americans returning to their families, there are also Americans without hope.

Languishing in pens and cages 14,000 miles from this Chamber are hundreds of U.S. citizens. They are sons. They are fathers, some of whom have not seen babies almost ready for junior high school. They are neighbors back home in Richardson, Tex.—back home in New York City, Denver, Seattle, and dozens of communities.

What have we done about it in this room? We have passed resolutions. We have made speeches just like the one I am making right now. We have heard an ex-astronaut say the same things to a joint session. I do not say that to discredit one word of what he said to us. Members have gone to Southeast Asia. Others have gone to Paris. Where, Mr. Speaker, is the official policy of the Government of the United States?

Where is the action this Government owes its mothers, its wives, its fatherless children who hang on every word that is said about the Vietnam war?

These folks, powerless themselves in a world of diplomacy and international bargaining, are desperate beyond words. They cannot get their men back—that is what they have been asking us to do.

As far as I am concerned, we have little more to show that a batch of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD inserts paraphrasing in hundreds of ways the fact that we want our men treated like they should be.

I do not want to think nothing is being done through the Departments of Defense or State. But day by day the thought grows more real.

Brave men locked up in North Vietnam literally breathe on faith that they will one day return home. Their families have pleaded in the same faith for something to be done to bring them home.

It has not been done. I am not talking to Hanoi. I am talking to this House, to the Senate, the President—to the entire structure of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, we had better get caught trying—soon.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of the resolution designating this week as a National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action, it is my hope that by focusing the attention of all nations on their plight we may hasten the day when their ordeal is ended.

We hope that it will inspire their families and strengthen their courage.

Seven years ago this week, Capt. Floyd F. Thompson was captured in Vietnam, becoming the first American prisoner of war in this conflict. There are now over 1,500 other Americans held as prisoners of war or missing in action.

Hanoi's flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention is tragic. All civilized nations are expected to follow the rules of human decency in the treatment of prisoners taken during wartime. Otherwise, all will return to the barbaric customs of the Dark Ages.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, because the intolerable tortures being inflicted by the North Vietnamese on American prisoners of war continue to be a source of great anxiety to all of us, I believe it is most appropriate that Congress has designated this week a "Week of Concern" for our POW's and MIA's.

This April's issue of Reader's Digest contains a shocking article drawn from interviews with men who have been released, as well as reports of informed sources here, in Paris, and in Saigon. The article vividly describes the mistreatment to which American POW's are subjected.

The article reports that before prisoners are moved to Hanoi, they are either tethered or caged like animals and paraded through villages so villagers can file by and insult or spit upon them.

Once incarcerated in the infamous "Hanoi Hilton," prisoners are isolated in tiny cells, fed the same tasteless bread and watery soup twice a day every day and subjected to 2 hours of "reeducation" from Hanoi Hannah each day over the prison loudspeaker.

The meals which prisoners receive contain no meat, nothing sweet, and nothing green. POW's not only have severe vitamin deficiencies, but also suffer from skin diseases, intestinal worms, and even tuberculosis. North Vietnam has refused to observe the Geneva Conventions which require that sick or wounded prisoners be repatriated and has refused to provide adequate medical care to seriously ill or injured prisoners.

It is not surprising that the North Vietnamese will not permit inspections by the Red Cross. It is galling that when antiwar groups or friendly foreign reporters ask questions about prison conditions, the regime brings out one or two of the most healthy prisoners, freshly shaven, and wearing new clothes to parrot rehearsed information.

I respectfully contend, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of the original reasons for this country's involvement in the Vietnam conflict, and regardless of domestic disagreement about what steps should be taken to reduce our involvement, we cannot forget these acts of tor-

ture. We must continue to let the North Vietnamese know through letters and telegrams that we are enraged by their acts. We must seek the release of these men in every way possible. But we cannot accept any settlement in this conflict that compromises the immediate welfare or final safe return of our American POW's.

Of equally great concern to me and my colleagues is the fate of those gallant men who are simply listed as "missing in action." The suffering and hardship which they are undergoing is certainly shared by all of us who are unaware of their fate.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that we observe this week of concern for American prisoners of war and those missing in action in Southeast Asia. This is a significant time, for it marks a special period when we, as a nation, pause to focus attention on the plight of our servicemen held captive by the Communists.

I am proud to have been one of the cosponsors of the joint resolution which has made this observance possible, for I believe it is imperative that we clearly demonstrate that we are united in our concern for the release of these men.

Furthermore, this time also serves as a reaffirmation of our concern to the families of the POW's and MIA's and it shows them that we share, at least to some extent, the heartache and disappointment that they so bravely live with each passing day.

There can be little if any doubt that all Americans strongly support the release of those held captive, and that we believe in the dignity, the value, and the worth of every living human being.

The plight of our prisoners and those missing in action is not a political issue. It is strictly a humane issue—and all the laws of human decency are involved.

The barbaric and inhumane treatment accorded captured servicemen by the Communists has been verified and underscored by the nine former POW's who have been repatriated by Hanoi.

It was Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, who at the time of a press conference in 1969 at which two freed Americans gave a terrifying account of brutality and torture at the hands of the North Vietnamese, said:

There is clear evidence that North Vietnam has violated the most fundamental standards of human decency.

As of February 28 of this year, there were 406 known prisoners of war, and 1,145 others who were listed as missing in action.

Mr. Speaker, just what kind of persons are these Americans who are being so cruelly treated?

Collectively, the American POW is a man of many faces. He could be the fellow next door, or the guy across the country.

He is of many faiths. He worships as a Protestant, Catholic, Jew, or perhaps in some other manner. He could be black, or he could be white, brown, red, or yellow.

His education could range from very little to college graduate. His political

philosophy may be anything from liberal to conservative to somewhere in between.

He could be the last child of a large family, or the only child of a small family. He could be the teenager who left the neighborhood hamburger drive-in—or the father who, as a career military man, left his wife and children to go to a distant land.

Whatever one may say about him, simply put, he is an American—an American who loves his country, loves his family, who has the same desires, aspirations, and dreams that we do, and who most of all, and probably above all else right now, hopes to some day soon return to his loved ones and his home.

Mr. Speaker, the people of our Eighth District have long been concerned over the fate of our captured men. And they have shared too, at least to some degree, the emotions, the anxiety, and the heartache of the relatives of these men.

In August 1970, petitions bearing the signatures of 3,834 citizens of the Eighth District were presented to me at the Huron County Courthouse at Bad Axe, Mich. These people were tangibly expressing their concern over the treatment of our men. They petitioned that a joint session of Congress be called to insist on humanitarian treatment. And, to my knowledge, this was the first time that this proposal was made.

After returning to Washington shortly thereafter, I hand delivered a set of these petitions to Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD and to then Speaker McCormack. I discussed with them the possibility of such a joint session. And, I introduced a House concurrent resolution calling for this joint session of Congress. It was just a few days thereafter, when it was announced that the joint session would be held.

I am pleased to have had some small part in helping to bring about that joint session then, just as I am honored to have had a hand in this special week of emphasis and concern now.

I would hope that our fellow Americans all across the land will take this opportunity to focus appropriate attention on our POW's and MIA's through various community activities. And certainly, above all else, to remember these men and their families in their prayers.

The only precedent in civilized times for the actions of the North Vietnamese occurred in the 1950's during the Korean war. More than 7,000 allied servicemen were captured by the North Koreans and the Red Chinese. Of this total, only 4,428 managed to survive the Communist atrocities.

It is a known fact, that to date at least 17 Americans have been murdered or have died in North Vietnamese prison camps.

Yet, despite the awful conditions and the horrible treatment our men are receiving there, these Americans cling to the only thing at their disposal—hope. And it is our duty, our responsibility, to see that they have reason for this hope.

While it is appropriate to devote 1 week of special emphasis in support of their release and return to their loved ones, this action must not lead to a re-

laxation of our efforts in their behalf during the other 51 weeks of the year.

We cannot, and we will not let these men be forgotten.

I would conclude by inserting at this point a special prayer for these young men, which appeared in the March 18 edition of the Tuscola County Advertiser, Caro, Mich.:

A PRAYER FOR OUR CAPTIVE SONS

Throughout America Sunday, many churches offered special prayers for our young men who are held as prisoners of war in Southeast Asia. The following is a special litany which we believe should be the prayer of Americans everywhere:

Let us now pray, all of us together,
For our people who are prisoners of war,
For our people who are missing in action,
Lost in a strange, strange land.
Lord, our Lord, in Your mercy
Hear our prayer!

Lord, sustain them with Yourself,
Your own love in a day's bread and a day's care.

Give them to find in Your own hand
Meaning in this maze of suffering:
Hear their prayer!

Warm even the hearts of their captors;
Remind them of their bond of humanness.
And from all hatred of Communist Indo-China

Holding secret the names of our sons and brothers and fathers:

Free us in Your forgiveness, Our Lord!

Give our leaders Your own wisdom
To speed the freeing of our loved ones
From strange coldness of an Asian war that seems so terribly far away:
Deliver them, Our Lord!

Almighty Father, their silent Partner in a thousand cells,
Jesus Christ, Eternal Savior of Your People,
Holy Spirit, Redeemer, Feeler of all Human anguish:

For Your own sake, Release Them!

To those who wait here helplessly
Grant faith not to question the quietness,
Or lose their sight of You in separation—
But know that You are here
Even to the end of the World
Comfort us who wait, Our Lord!

May millions of Your people come today,
Begging Your benediction of peace, of freedom

May our Litany fill the hidden corners of the globe

With the fresh new joy of hope and love
And faith! And faith in spite of all!
Fill us with faith, Our Lord!

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak not only for those of us here in this hall, but also for all the decent American people in the country at large, when I say that we are duty-bound to keep the faith with our prisoners of war and men missing in action during the long twilight years of a war which all of us hoped to avoid and now wish to see quickly and honorably ended. I have myself had the honor of cosponsoring, both in this Congress and the last, resolutions protesting the inhumane treatment by North Vietnam of our many, many POW's and MIA's. The most recent of these, House Joint Resolution 22, called for such a National Week of Concern, on their behalf, as this.

I know I speak for most of my constituents when I identify a national showing of support for our POW's and MIA's as

a great part of the moral burden we bear as a free people. Our POW's and MIA's, as well as their long-suffering families, have paid, are paying, and unfortunately will perhaps long continue to pay an extremely high price for our freedom. In fact, they suffer that we should not suffer; and to ignore them, to show a lack of sensitivity toward their pain and what we owe them for bearing it in the name of our freedom, would be to evince in the rest of us a sort of gross ingratitude which does not deserve freedom.

We therefore honor and show our support for our POW's and MIA's this week, as a national demonstration of the duty we bear because others than ourselves find it their lot to pay a continuous terrible price for the greater glory of their country and the freedom of man in general. I urge each and every American to do so with all the fervency his heart and soul can muster. To quote the words used by Winston Churchill in another connection:

Never in the field of human conflicts was so much owed by so many to so few.

In addition to our continued support for the various programs calculated to promote world concern and opinion in favor of humane treatment and release, let each of us call upon the mercy of Divine Providence through daily prayer for their deliverance. We can and should do no less.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, the problem of our prisoners of war is certainly the most heartrending, and, in many respects, it is also the most difficult of all our problems in the very difficult situations presented by the war in Southeast Asia.

Even when civilized treatment is afforded and when treaty obligations are strictly followed, the lot of the prisoner of war is hard. When the conditions of imprisonment are inhumane, when communication is denied, and when the detaining power refuses information as to the names, identity, and status of the prisoners it holds, hardship is aggravated and warfare is needlessly made even more cruel than its basic nature demands.

There is little we can do here today but make our record clear again that these American prisoners of war are not and will not be forgotten, and, in addition, hold the spotlight of publicity on the barbaric and revolting character and conduct of our enemy.

For the future, as it seems to me, we can best serve the cause of these gallant and imprisoned Americans if we stand firmly behind the President of the United States in his determination to end the war in such a manner as to hold forth some hope of peace for the future; and specifically, in this connection, that we support him in his declared position that some American troops will remain in Vietnam at least until such time as the return of our prisoners is definitely assured.

The prisoners of war are Americans who have done their full duty; we at home owe them the obligation to do our duty also.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, no effort to gain information in regard to our known prisoners of war and servicemen missing in action in Southeast Asia can be considered as useless or wasted. Expressions of concern from individuals and from organizations can be expected to have a cumulative effect to which the conscience of Hanoi must eventually respond. We do well, in my opinion, to give these expressions as wide publicity as possible.

I am accordingly submitting a copy of a resolution recently passed by the Legislature of West Virginia. It was introduced by Senator Louise Leonard of Harpers Ferry and Senator William R. Sharpe, Jr., of Weston. These energetic and capable members have produced a document which is as explicit and forceful in its appeal as anything I have seen. It has been commended to me by the White House, the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the Members of Congress from West Virginia.

This resolution is similar to a measure introduced in the 91st Congress, and to House Concurrent Resolution 117 presently before the Congress. There is no reason to believe the latter will not gain universal approval.

West Virginia has a proud record of support for the Government of this united Nation. Her sons have fallen on many a battlefield, some of them in unmarked and unknown graves. Only in this war has the fate of the missing men been deliberately withheld by the enemy. A sense of common humanity demands that information be conveyed to the anguished families and friends.

It is with the hope that the resolution introduced by Mrs. Leonard and Mr. Sharpe may bring the day of acceptance of the common rules of war by Hanoi a little nearer that I include their resolution in the RECORD.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 24
Resolution expressing concern and sympathy to the families of West Virginians, and to the families of all Americans, held as prisoners of war in Southeast Asia

Whereas, All captured American personnel held in Southeast Asia suffer privation and hardship; and

Whereas, Prisoners held in North Vietnam are existing under particularly harsh circumstances; and

Whereas, Many of these prisoners are confined in a primitive jungle environment in Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia; and

Whereas, These prisoners are primarily members of the United States Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps; and

Whereas, These prisoners include American civilians; and

Whereas, The enemy's refusal to acknowledge publicly the presence of all prisoners in these areas, and the enemy's refusal to permit certain prisoners to correspond with their families, have increased the burden of anxiety and concern on the families of prisoners of war; and

Whereas, The Government of West Virginia and the government of the United States are concerned with continuing efforts to bring national and world public opinion to bear in securing humane treatment for, and the release of, our beloved sons of West Virginia, and all captured American personnel; and

Whereas, The National League of Families of American Prisoners Missing in Southeast Asia, recognizes that the Prisoner of War

issue is not a political issue, but is a humanitarian issue; and

Whereas, The West Virginia State Coordinator of the National League of Families of American Prisoners Missing in Southeast Asia has received permission from a few families to furnish names of certain West Virginians who are prisoners of war; and

Whereas, Lieutenant Commander William Hardman, U.S. Navy, son of Mrs. Sadie M. Thompson, St. Albans, West Virginia; Major Glenn H. Wilson, U.S. Air Force, son of Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Wilson, St. Albans, West Virginia; and Major Hubert Kelley Flesher, U.S. Air Force, nephew of Mrs. Charles Carson, Jane Lew, West Virginia are prisoners in Hanoi; and

Whereas, Sergeant Albert H. Altizer, son of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth W. Altizer, Squire, West Virginia, and Chief Warrant Officer Joseph A. Rose, U.S. Army, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Rose, Morgantown, West Virginia, are believed to be prisoners of war in Southeast Asia; and

Whereas, There are more than fifteen hundred Americans known to be missing or prisoners; therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia:

That the members of the Senate express their deep concern and sympathy for the families of all West Virginians held by hostile forces in Southeast Asia; and, be it

Resolved further, That the members of the Senate express their deep concern and sympathy for the families of all Americans held by hostile forces in Southeast Asia; and, be it

Resolved further, That the members of the Senate are mindful of the sacrifice of West Virginians and many Americans who have given their lives in the Vietnam War, and that the Senate of West Virginia expresses sympathy to the families of those who will not return, and, be it

Resolved further, That the Senate of West Virginia urges humane treatment for, communication with, and the release of, all prisoners of war; and, be it

Resolved further, That the Clerk of the Senate is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the families of the West Virginians named herein who are prisoners of war or who are known to be missing and to The Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, Washington, D.C.; The Honorable Ten Duc Thang, President, Democratic Republic of North Vietnam, Hanoi, North Vietnam; The Honorable David K. E. Bruce, U.S. Delegation to the Paris Meeting, U.S. Embassy, 2 Avenue Gabriel, Paris, France; Minister Xuan Thuy, 8 Avenue General Le Clerc, 94 Cholsy-Le-Roi, Paris, France; Mme. Nguyen Thi Binh, 39 Avenue Georges Mandell, Paris 16, France; and Mrs. Bobby G. Vinson, National Coordinator, National League of Families of American Prisoners Missing in Southeast Asia, 1 Constitution Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in this special order to focus concern and attention on the plight of American prisoners being held in Southeast Asia. It was my privilege on the opening day of this Congress to introduce legislation designating this as a week of concern for these men, and I was gratified at the overwhelming support and swift action it received in both Houses of Congress.

When President Nixon signed House Joint Resolution 16 into law last Friday, he noted that of all the proclamations he has signed, "There is none that has a deeper meaning" than this one. And he called on all Americans to join in heartfelt prayer and appropriate activities this week, in his words:

To voice deep concern for the prisoners and missing men, to inspire their loved ones with new courage and hope, and to hasten the day when their ordeal may end.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning I joined with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), in hosting a reception for the National League of Families of those listed as prisoners or missing in action. As I stood in that room and watched these ladies greet the many Members of this body who attended, I was deeply moved by the quiet courage and hope reflected in their faces despite the lengthy ordeal so many have endured. I was reminded that it was 7 years ago this week that the first American prisoner was taken in South Vietnam, and that for many of these families it has been over 6 years that their men have been listed as missing in action. Many of these wives do not know whether their husbands are alive or dead because the North Vietnamese have even refused to release a complete list of those men being held prisoner.

Mr. Speaker, by their actions the North Vietnamese have inflicted a most cruel and inhumane punishment on both the prisoners and their families. They have violated every provision of the 1949 Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners, even though they signed that convention in 1957. In addition to refusing to release the names of all those being held captive, they have refused to release the sick and wounded, have refused to permit international inspection of prisoner-of-war facilities, and have refused to permit the free flow of correspondence between prisoners and their families. I think it is appropriate in this context to point out that on December 9, 1970, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution which, "calls upon all parties to any armed conflict to comply with the terms and provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war." I think the U.N. resolution clearly recognizes that this is a problem of international humanitarian character and that it is, therefore, a responsibility of the international community to press for its solution. It is our hope that this Week of Concern will not only stimulate interest and activity in this country, but will impress upon all freedom-loving people of the world our collective responsibility in securing the humanitarian treatment of all those being held prisoner as a result of armed conflict. This is truly an issue which transcends politics, ideologies, and nationalisms.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to two points which have been raised in connection with this Week of Concern. There are some who say we have already talked this issue to death and that our words are worthless. I would strongly disagree with that opinion on two counts. First, we have done more than talk. Generous offers have been made by the President for the unconditional release of all prisoners on both sides—offers which have been rejected by the North Vietnamese. And we have also made attempts to rescue these prisoners. But beyond that, I think we must keep talking lest our silence be mis-

construed as a lack of concern or that we have forgotten about these men. Let me say that we have not forgotten and we shall not forget and we shall not let the rest of the world forget so long as there is even one American being held prisoner by the Communists. President Nixon noted in his statement to the annual Gridiron Club dinner that, in his words:

Some of the progress that has been made in obtaining information about those captured in Southeast Asia results from the awakening of public opinion.

I firmly believe that further progress will come through the sustained pressures of public opinion both at home and abroad and that we would be derelict in our responsibility to these prisoners if, by our silence, we allowed this problem to drop from public view.

This brings me to my final point. There are some who say that it is wrong to have a week of concern for it will then be tempting to forget about this problem the other 51 weeks of the year. I would agree that we cannot let this happen, and it was certainly not our intention to make this week an end in itself—a time to get all our concern off our chests and then be done with it. That is certainly not what we had in mind. Rather we visualized this week as a time for rededication to a sustained concern for the prisoners and to all efforts to secure their repatriation. This is what President Nixon had in mind in signing the proclamation for this week when he said that we owe these prisoners "our strongest support and our firmest pledge that we will neither forget them nor abandon them."

Mr. Speaker, let us therefore look upon this special week as a time to rededicate ourselves to making every day a day of concern for these prisoners until all have been repatriated to their loved ones.

At this point in the RECORD, I include the full text of the President's proclamation designating this a "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action":

NATIONAL WEEK OF CONCERN FOR AMERICANS WHO ARE PRISONERS OF WAR OR MISSING IN ACTION

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

The first American still being held by the enemy was captured in South Vietnam on March 26, 1964. Now, with the seventh anniversary of that event approaching, the number of Americans missing in action or known captured in the Vietnamese conflict has grown to about 1,600. Most of these men are officers and enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps; some are civilians. Even in captivity, they continue to serve our Nation in the highest sense of honor and duty to country. We owe them, in turn, no less than our strongest support and our firmest pledge that we will neither forget them nor abandon them.

This Government has made and will continue to make strenuous efforts in behalf of these Americans who are prisoners of war or missing in action. In the face of the enemy's callous indifference to the plight of these men and their families, we have sought to focus the attention of the world on the barbaric attitude of North Vietnam and its agents throughout Indochina. We have con-

ducted vigorous diplomatic efforts to resolve the prisoner of war problem on a purely humane basis for the prisoners we hold as well as for our brave men held prisoner.

The Geneva Prisoner of War Convention of 1949 sets forth the minimum standards for humanitarian treatment applying to all prisoners of war. Some 125 nations including all of those involved on both sides in the Southeast Asia hostilities have acceded to the Geneva Convention and have pledged to observe its humane standards. And on a moral plane above and apart from these formal rules, all civilized peoples are subject to the basic humanitarian standards long established in international law and custom.

In view of the continuing disregard of this Convention and basic humane standards by North Vietnam and its agents—their refusal to identify all of the Americans being held, to permit impartial inspection of their camps, to release the seriously sick and wounded prisoners, to provide humane treatment, and to permit prisoners to correspond regularly with their families—and in view of their adamant refusal to consider negotiation regarding the release of prisoners, the Congress of the United States has, by House Joint Resolution 16, requested the President to designate the period beginning March 21, 1971, and ending March 27, 1971, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action."

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the period March 21, 1971, through March 27, 1971, as National Week of Concern for Americans Who Are Prisoners of War or Missing in Action. I call upon all the people of the United States to observe this week in heartfelt prayer, and in ceremonies and activities appropriate to voice deep concern for the prisoners and missing men, to inspire their loved ones with new courage and hope, and to hasten the day when their ordeal may end.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this nineteenth day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-one, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred ninety-fifth.

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, for the past 15 months, a statement has appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every day the House has been in session. This statement tirelessly reiterates the question which no amount of bloody fighting or tedious negotiating has yet been able to answer: How long will our captive servicemen continue to wear their fetters, starve, suffer and die in Communist concentration camps? The end of the ordeal for the 1,600 American prisoners of war languishing in Vietnamese prisons, and for their families waiting out the long months and years at home, is not yet in sight. Until all of the men are released, I will continue to insert this passage in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD daily. Forty-eight thousand copies are distributed to schools, libraries, businesses, and unions throughout the country and to our Embassies overseas. The message it carries will echo and re-echo in the American mind, lest we forget, until the unanswered question is finally laid to rest.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, this is the week that we have set aside for official demonstrations of our national concern for the American boys held prisoner of war by the North Vietnamese or reported as missing in action in Southeast Asia.

This week has been designated, as we are all aware, because it was on March 26, 1964, that Capt. Floyd J. Thompson, an American Army adviser, became the first American captured in this long and difficult war. Today, 7 years later, we recognize the plight of some 1,500 Americans in this National Week of Concern.

One of our intentions in setting aside this week is to focus world attention on the indefensible conduct of the North Vietnamese in refusing to abide by the Geneva accords regarding prisoners of war. No official list of those in captivity has ever been provided; families of the missing have been left to wonder without comfort whether their sons, husbands, or fathers are dead or captured. The seriously injured and ill have not been returned home. Nor has the International Red Cross been permitted to inspect POW facilities. Indeed, the North Vietnamese have violated every principle of human decency for which the Geneva Convention stands.

It is to be hoped that this official Week of Concern by the Government and people of the United States will help to mobilize world opinion against the recalcitrance of the North Vietnamese. It is to be hoped that their sensitivity to the sentiments of other governments—and those to whom they seek to appeal in the United States—will persuade them to abide by the rules that govern the treatment of prisoners of war by civilized nations, and to come to the conference table in Paris with the intention of beginning substitute, serious negotiations for the release of all prisoners.

We cannot know if this effort will succeed. We can only hope, and pray. But we would be derelict indeed in our duty as Americans if we did not make the effort. And that is the purpose of this National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action: To honor the men and the families who have sacrificed so much; to express our national outrage at the refusal of the North Vietnamese to abide by the Geneva accords; and to mobilize world opinion to force the enemy to adopt a more reasonable and responsible policy with regard to prisoners of war.

As one who was an early sponsor of the joint resolution that asked the President to proclaim this National Week of Concern, I am hopeful that the attention of the Congress and the American people to this important issue will not falter when the week is ended. If our efforts are to succeed, they will have to be sustained; and I believe that the Congress should assume a role of leadership in keeping this matter in the forefront of public attention.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to join my fellow colleagues in observing this National Week of Concern for our 1,600 men who are prisoners of war or are missing in action in Southeast Asia.

I think it is most significant that the resolution declaring this week as a National Week of Concern passed the House and the Senate March 12 by unanimous vote. There is no dissent regarding this humanitarian effort, and I am sure all Americans will unite to stimulate mas-

sive support to urge the release of our men.

As we observe this National Week of Concern, I think we should concentrate on a particular goal. If Hanoi can be encouraged to take the initial step of releasing the sick and wounded as proof of her humanitarian claims, perhaps the Pathet Lao and the Vietcong might follow suit. That is the hope expressed by the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, and I am sure it is the hope of every American.

Mr. Speaker, as we in Congress take part in this Week of Concern and as the families and loved ones of these men provide the example and leadership for our States, local communities, civic clubs, veterans' organizations, groups of concerned citizens to take part in this humanitarian effort, let us all hope and pray there will be no need for another National Week of Concern. It is our fervent hope that by this time next year our men will have been returned to their families and loved ones.

In conclusion, I would like to state I have been privileged to take part in the activities now being conducted in my home State of Kansas through the Forgotten Americans Committee of Kansas. In conjunction with these activities, I have mailed a special appeal to every citizen in the First Congressional District to write the appropriate authorities in Hanoi and throughout the world expressing their concern for the safe return of our men.

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere wish that this National Week of Concern will in some way bring about the better treatment of American prisoners of war and possibly lead to their release. This special week could generate a wave of public opinion against the North Vietnamese that could convince them to treat our men humanely and to seriously negotiate the prisoner of war issue.

A unified show of support by the American people for our men would be too powerful a force to ignore.

As Americans, we are all deeply concerned about the men who have fallen into the hands of the North Vietnamese and for their families. They have paid a dear price for their country. We must not let them wait alone—without hope. We must offer them hope and encouragement and do everything possible to obtain their release.

During this week and until the time when they can be reunited with their families, I shall pray along with millions of other Americans for their safety and freedom.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deeply shared feelings of all of my colleagues here today that I speak about the plight of the more than 1,550 American prisoners of war and those missing in action in Southeast Asia, and the hundreds of families of those men who hope and pray daily that their husbands, fathers, sons, and brothers and fathers are given decent and humane treatment by their Communist captors.

Today we are asking all Americans to undertake a nonstop personal effort that

will multiply the world public pressure on the Communists in Hanoi to a point where there will be no alternative but for them to accord the basic standards of accepted human decency to the treatment of American POW's, and in turn, to those men's families in America.

Building that kind of pressure will require an effort by all Americans. We are asking each to write their own letters—to the leaders of North Vietnam and the North Vietnam and Vietcong representatives in Paris, condemning the treatment of American POW's in Southeast Asia and demanding compliance with the rules of the Geneva Convention of 1949 which Hanoi signed but now refuses to honor.

But Americans must not stop there. They should write and talk to their friends and acquaintances, urging them to do the same. The news media should be encouraged to publicize the plight of POW's and MIA's and to take editorial stands in favor of public pressure campaigns in behalf of our POW's and MIA's.

But the message from the American public can also be multiplied by millions of others around the world who equally abhor the barbaric treatment by the Communists of American POW's in their Southeast Asian prison camps. Americans should write to friends and acquaintances in these foreign countries, as well, asking their help. And the same message can go out to foreign governments whose representatives at world forums and diplomatic encounters can also bring pressure to bear on the Communists.

In short, whatever Americans can do to add another bit of pressure on Hanoi should be done. It should not stop until the goal has been reached—and the men are free.

Why is this effort needed?

International law imposes strict and explicit rules for the treatment of prisoners of war. In a series of agreements stretching back for more than a century—as well as in customary international law based on simple human morality—civilized countries have agreed to a code of conduct that forbids cruel and barbaric treatment of war captives.

The most current formulation of this code is contained in the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war. Under the sponsorship of the International Committee of the Red Cross, and with the participation of 61 nations from around the world, the articles of the convention were adopted and put into formal practice in 1949.

Currently 128 nations have agreed to abide by the Geneva Convention including all the nations participating in the hostilities in South Vietnam and the surrounding countries in Southeast Asia.

It has been alleged—and I might add that these allegations have come from a few antiwar groups right here in America who seem to spend most of their time defending Hanoi—that the Geneva Convention does not apply to the present conflict because there has never been a declaration of war by any of the parties involved. But the words of the Convention, itself, refute that allegation. Article 2 of the Convention reads, and I quote:

The present Convention shall apply to all cases of declared war or of any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the High Contracting Parties, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them.

So all of the conditions imposed as "legal" obligations on the North Vietnamese, Vietcong and Pathet Lao by the Geneva Convention apply, even if those parties to the war lack the "moral" capacity to accord decent, humane treatment to the prisoners they hold, and in turn to the families of those men who live month after month in the cruel abyss between hope and the fear over the plight of their husbands, sons, fathers, and brothers.

These hundreds of families must live in this state because of what is probably the most flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention by the other side—article 122, which states that the names of all POW's must be promptly identified and the information reported to the other side. But the North Vietnamese and their allied aggression forces have made not even the slightest pretense of formal compliance with this requirement.

The information has been gained only by a variety of loose and ineffective methods—the few letters received from prisoners, the information known by those few who have escaped or have been released, or by personal sightings of the men captured or in captivity. Last December, 3 days before Christmas, and with the fanfare and the propensity for maximum propaganda effect, the North Vietnamese transmitted the first prisoner list of any type to America—from its representatives in Paris to a representative of Senator TED KENNEDY.

What did the list contain? Absolutely nothing new. It was a list of 339 American prisoners in North Vietnam who were already known to us, and 20 dead who were also known.

What did the maneuver of the Communists do? It seemed blatantly calculated to divert attention from Hanoi's failure to comply with the code of international law or the rules of basic human decency.

But it did not do that, either. All that it did do was raise the false hopes in the families of the more than 1,100 missing in action who have prayed and hoped daily for months and years that some indication might be given from the enemy whether or not those men are alive in captivity or dead. So they will go on living between those two poles of hope and fear.

We are here today to show those families that we care about the plight of their loved ones and about the lives they, themselves, are being forced to live. We will do everything in our power to change those conditions.

Nonreporting of prisoners is just one of the list of flagrant and unfeeling violations by the Communists regarding the prisoners of war, however.

The Geneva Convention—article 126—requires regular inspection of all prisoner of war facilities by a qualified impartial body such as the International Committee of the Red Cross. There have been no inspections of any of the Communist camps in North Vietnam, South

Vietnam or Laos. This contrasts with the regular inspection of POW camps in South Vietnam, where about 37,000 North Vietnamese and Vietcong are held.

These camps are inspected on a regular basis by the ICRC, including interviews with prisoners chosen by ICRC officials. The only "inspections" of North Vietnamese prison camps have been via staged and censored propaganda films released on a couple of occasions, including last Christmas, and by a couple of "peace" group representatives who have publically announced their sympathy for the Communist goals in the war while completely rejecting the purposes of our own involvement.

Article 109 of the Geneva Convention requires the immediate release of seriously sick and wounded prisoners as soon as they are able to travel, and the release of POW's long held in captivity.

Again, the enemy has almost completely ignored this obligation.

Only nine American POW's have been released from enemy camps in the North—the last three in August 1969—and none from the camps in South Vietnam or Laos. This contrasts with the release of 221 North Vietnamese POW's and several hundred Vietcong, despite numerous petty obstacles put up by the other side which refuses to even admit that their soldiers are fighting in South Vietnam.

Article 120 requires the captor nation to advise of deaths in captivity, with full official information on circumstances, cause, burial, and grave identification. There has been only a rare assertion of deaths of American POW's, and this only through unofficial channels. There cannot be any reason for the Communists to refuse to give this information which would ease at least part of the needless suffering of families of men who have died in captivity.

Withholding of such information—along with all other information—is a crude attempt at international blackmail in which the families are the pawns.

Articles 70, 71, and 72 of the Geneva Convention concern the flow of mail and packages between POW's and their families. The first—70—requires that a prisoner be allowed to write to his family within 1 week after capture. But some have not been allowed to write for 5 years.

Article 71 requires a minimum of two letters and four cards per month be allowed between a prisoner and his family. But the average has been 2 to 3 letters per year, and none at all for some. Of the 80 men known to be held in South Vietnam and Laos, only one has ever been allowed to write a letter—and that was only once. Although their families write to them regularly, we do not know if any of these men have ever received a letter.

The picture has been better in North Vietnam, but still far below the standards required by international law or through what should be normal human compassion. From the time the first American prisoner was captured in Southeast Asia in March 1964, through January of 1969, only 620 letters were received by the families of 103 POW's.

As of November, last year, the total known letters received by families of POW's held in North Vietnam had gone up to 2,700 from 332 men: Still far, far below what it should have been. What is more, the letters have all been very short, and obviously written under sharp scrutiny and subject to heavy censorship. And just last week it was reported that families of American POW's in North Vietnam have received no mail from the men since early January after the increase last year.

Article 72 states that free receipt by prisoners of packages from home must be observed. Although North Vietnam states that POW's can receive a package every other month, evidence strongly indicates that delivery is irregular, and the packages that do arrive have often been rifled and portions of the permissible contents removed.

Other provisions of the Geneva Convention require "humane" treatment of all POW's, adequate food and medical care, regular religious services, and prohibit solitary confinement. From the nine prisoners who have been released, from the handful who have escaped, and from the evidence in letters, we know that every one of these provisions have been systematically disregarded and violated by the enemy.

American POW's have been paraded in the streets of Hanoi and other North Vietnam towns and villages; tortured and forced to make statements; held in solitary confinement—in some cases for years—underfed and inadequately provided with medical care. The only evidence of religious services has been in propaganda films, such as the one released last Christmas, which had all the markings of being a staged affair for that purpose only. In fact, the films themselves were a violation of the convention, which forbids the exploitation of prisoners for propaganda purposes and exposes them to public curiosity.

The Geneva Convention states further, in article 23, that all POW camps must be marked so as to be visible from the air and the locations of the camps otherwise provided.

No such adherence by the Communists has ever been observed, while at the same time there has been regular evidence of camps being placed near military installations in both North and South Vietnam subject to bombing by U.S. aircraft.

At the heart of the Communists' refusal to abide by the Geneva Convention are two apparent reasons:

First, they see the prisoner issue not in any human and humane terms, but only as a source of negotiating power to pressure the United States and our allies into capitulation at the Paris bargaining table. This became fully obvious following the October 7, 1970, proposal by President Nixon to exchange all North Vietnamese POW's held in South Vietnam, numbering some 8,200 men, for the 800 or so known American and South Vietnamese POW's held in Southeast Asia by the Communists.

This offer—which still stands—was totally rejected by the other side which has said the repatriation of American

prisoners of war could start only after the United States agreed to: First, withdraw all American troops and those of other foreign allies from South Vietnam by June 30 of this year; second, terminate its Vietnamization policy to allow the South Vietnamese to protect their own nation from Communist subversion; and third, remove the top three officials of the present Saigon government.

Second, it has become obvious that a reversal of the North Vietnamese refusal to abide by the Geneva Convention rules would expose the barbarism that our men have been subject to in the Communist prisons.

A release of sick and wounded, as the rules call for, would reveal the virtually nonexistent care and treatment these men have received, and open a flood of testimony of the inhuman treatment they and their fellow POW's have had to undergo. That is why the raid was carried out at Son Tay last November. Even though unsuccessful, it showed the world our determination to correct the conditions.

Listen to the description of the treatment by Navy Lt. Robert Frishman, one of the three prisoners released in August 1969:

He (one of the prison camp officers) had an uncanny instinct for finding the torture to fit the man. One prisoner who suffered from claustrophobia was rolled up in a bamboo mat and left to scream in spastic fear.

Some were beaten with rubber hoses. At least once, guards broke a man's bones with the butts of their rifles.

Yet old Stoneface never hit me. He had devised more subtle methods of abuse. My nemesis was the stool treatment.

Repeatedly, in the 19 months I spent as his vassal, he demanded that I write statements about my "criminal acts," about the "humane" treatment North Vietnam affords prisoners, and the excellent medical care. If I failed to produce, I was confined in a room bare of everything except a low stool and swarms of hungry mosquitos, and was forced to crouch on the stool, unmoving, for as long as three days.

In the intolerable heat, sweating, bones aching, all thoughts of country, home, even wife and parents, faded.

As fatigue set in and numbness crept up my swelling legs, I sometimes fell from the stool, only to be roughly thrust back by a guard. I sat and sat and sat. Each second became more unbearable.

Now, months later, I am finally able to talk about the horrors of the prisons of Hanoi. Hundreds of Americans still languish in them.

We have no assurances that our men are not being tortured, brutalized and degraded, even as you read this. I hope the world will see these hellholes and their keepers for what they are. I hope there will be a universal cry of outrage demanding that these inhuman institutions be wiped from the earth.

There is only one way to guarantee that the situation and conditions endured by Lieutenant Frishman and hundreds of others held captive by the Communists are corrected—at least made bearable for those men and their families—world public pressure. We here today can be part of that great growing force to bring it about. We call upon all Americans to join with us.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to participate in this special observance designated by Congress as

National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Those Missing in Action.

For many months, the concerns of both servicemen who are in these categories and their families and friends have been close to my heart.

A number of families in the Third District of Tennessee have been touched by the ravages of the Southeast Asian conflict. I must mention again, as I have before, the courage, faith, and enthusiastic efforts of Mrs. Wayne Fullam, wife of Maj. Wayne Fullam, USAF, missing in action since 1967. Mrs. Booncy Fullam has, indeed, been an inspiration to all with whom she has come in contact.

Today, however, I have an unusual opportunity to express my praise for one who has experienced the horrors of confinement by the North Vietnamese and has lived to return home and tell his story to us and the Nation.

Coy Tinsley of Cleveland, Tenn., was a Pfc. in the U.S. Army on March 9, 1969, when he was captured by Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces. He was a member of a patrol team working near Tra Binh, a tiny Vietnamese village west of Chu Lai.

As Coy Tinsley, now Spec. 5, relates, he passed out from loss of blood from shoulder and shrapnel wounds. He remembers regaining consciousness several times while being dragged across rice paddies. When he regained consciousness hours or days later, he was tied to a tree in a dense jungle. Here he remained for several days, losing blood from a gaping shoulder wound, alone, and without food. He then was cut down from the jungle tree and forced to walk several miles to a crude field hospital deeper in the jungle.

He states:

I had a bone sticking out of my back from the bullet that'd busted the bones open inside my shoulder. They cut me up with a pair of rusty scissors and picked out some shrapnel. I don't know if they did anything else, because I passed out. They didn't have any anaesthesia or bandages.

Again, when he regained consciousness, he was tied to a tree, and this time with the injured shoulder, so it was more difficult to move.

It was first thought he was an officer; then an interrogator identified him as a private first class.

During his confinement, he lost 50 pounds, experienced the presence of a pistol at his throat and being told, "To be or not to be, the right to decide is in my hands," and existing on a diet of rice and an occasional fish.

He could not send, nor did he receive any mail.

He spent most of his time reading propaganda pamphlets in a straw hut surrounded by three guards.

When it was determined that he would be returned home, his food ration improved, and his indoctrination was intensified.

All the while his young wife Dorothy was working, waiting, writing undelivered letters, and so forth, which has become the lot of many other wives of those missing in action.

This same story repeats itself many times for many families, but few are so

fortunate as Coy Tinsley and his family to experience the joys of November 5, 1970, which Tinsley described as, "Wonderful—like being born again."

Coy was lucky. He came home. But today there are some 1,600 American servicemen who are still imprisoned in filthy bamboo cages or missing in action in Vietnam.

This story vividly illustrates the plight of our POW's and their families. I hope that all American citizens will express their concern by writing to Hanoi and by showing the rest of the world that we want to get all our boys back home.

Be we hawks or dove or inbetween, it is our obligation to use the maximum of our abilities and influence to relieve this great injustice.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues here on the floor of the House of Representatives today to publicly express our sincere concern for American prisoners of war and missing in action in Southeast Asia and for their families here at home. In view of the obvious attention to American public opinion paid by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong, it is important that we, as elected Representatives, lead the way during this special week of national concern.

As one of the original cosponsors of House Joint Resolution 16 which designated this as a "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action," it was my privilege to attend the Presidential signing ceremonies last Friday in the Cabinet Room of the White House. I have attended similar ceremonies there in the past, but on none of those occasions was there such an atmosphere of unanimity of purpose. This is not a partisan week, nor are we hampered in our concern by such problems as generation gaps or philosophical disputes.

Approximately 1,600 American sons, husbands, fathers, brothers, neighbors, and friends are now classified as either prisoners of war or missing in action as a result of the war in Vietnam. As tragic as this situation always is in time of war, the intransigence and inhumanity shown by North Vietnam regarding these men and their families is unprecedented in modern civilized history. However frustrating it might seem to us as private citizens and as Representatives in seeing the concern of the free world almost totally disregarded by the other side, we must continue all possible efforts to free these POW's and MIA's. That is what this week is all about.

Although North Vietnam agreed in 1957 to abide by the provisions of the Geneva Convention regarding the treatment of prisoners of war, that government, along with its allies operating in South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, has not honored its agreement. The names of the prisoners have not been released as required by the Convention. No independent, humanitarian observers have been allowed into the prison camps for inspection purposes. Mail and parcel deliveries are almost nonexistent. Seriously wounded and ill prisoners have not been released. And it is evident even in the propaganda films that have been released

that the food and medicine made available to the prisoners has not been adequate.

In short, the treatment of these prisoners and of their families back home has been inhumane and senselessly punitive. These soldiers, like those in all wars, did not make the policies which led to their presence in Southeast Asia. Their families at this point understand and care little about the complex geopolitical struggle going on there. All of these people have suffered enough.

Mr. Speaker, very seldom are we confronted with an issue which unifies our country such as the present concern for these POW's and MIA's. I am proud to include at the conclusion of this statement the resolution recently enacted by the Kansas Legislature which established this week as the Kansas Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action. At the present time, 56 Kansans are known to fall into these categories. In addition to the call for State and local observance of this week, this resolution condemns the acts of North Vietnam and its allies and calls on the U.S. Government and the other 119 nations which signed the Geneva Convention to initiate the necessary pressures to halt these inhumane and illegal actions.

Many of us have witnessed admirable private efforts by our constituents in behalf of our POW's and MIA's. Earlier this month, I was briefed by two members of the Forgotten Americans Committee of Kansas—FACK—prior to their departure for Paris to discuss this problem with North Vietnamese and Vietcong representatives at the peace talks. The trip was financed largely through private contributions from other concerned Kansans. These two representatives of FACK, Mrs. Ann Howes and Miss Maureen Smith, carried with them 50,000 petitions signed by Kansans urging humane treatment for U.S. POW's.

While all of their objectives were not satisfied in their meetings with some of the North Vietnamese, Mrs. Howes and Miss Smith felt that some progress and understanding had been accomplished. Typical of the spirit of these two ladies was Miss Smith's comment on their return that they would try again to visit a POW camp:

Our passports are good for five years and I have a three-month vacation coming up next summer.

I congratulate them and their organization and will continue to assist such efforts until all of these men have returned home.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ENACTED BY THE KANSAS LEGISLATURE, MARCH 2, 1971

A Resolution condemning the illegal and inhumane acts of the government of North Vietnam, National Liberation Front and Lao Patriotic Front with respect to American prisoners of war/missing in action; calling on other governments and the United Nations to bring pressure upon the aforementioned governments to comply with the Geneva Convention; requesting the governor of Kansas to declare a "Kansas week of concern for prisoners of war/missing in action"

Whereas, In 1957 the government of North Vietnam signed the appropriate documents

of the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, relating to treatment of prisoners of war, and did thereby solemnly promise to adhere and abide by the covenants of that Convention, thereby joining in a common pledge with one hundred nineteen other national governments to insure the welfare and humane treatment of prisoners of war; and

Whereas, Article 2 of the Geneva Convention specifically provides that the Convention shall apply to all cases of armed conflict which shall arise between contracting parties whether or not a state of war has been recognized or declared; and

Whereas, The government of North Vietnam and her allies, the shadow-governments of the National Liberation Front and the Lao Patriotic Front, have willfully and continuously violated the covenants of the Geneva Convention and have maliciously ignored the provisions of said Convention requiring humane treatment of prisoners of war. Maintaining falsely, in contravention of Article 2 of said Convention, that American captives are not prisoners of war but war criminals North Vietnam and her puppet allies have refused to:

Permit neutral inspections of prisoners of war camps;

Provide identification of all prisoners held; Release those prisoners who are seriously wounded or ill;

Allow a proper and constant flow of mail to and from prisoners;

Provide an adequate and nutritious diet; and

Provide adequate medical and pharmaceutical care; and

Whereas, In addition to the foregoing, the government of North Vietnam and her puppet allies have:

Subjected prisoners of war to public abuse; Subjected prisoners of war to cruel mistreatment and torture; and

Exported prisoners of war for propaganda purposes; all of which acts are in direct violation of the Geneva Convention and the humanitarian principles of civilized society; and

Whereas, Citizens of the state of Kansas serving on active duty in the armed forces of the United States, in Southeast Asia, have been declared to be missing in action and are known or believed to be held prisoners by North Vietnam, the Viet Cong and the Pathet Lao: Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas: That the people of the state of Kansas condemn these inhumane and illegal acts of the government of North Vietnam and of the National Liberation Front and Lao Patriotic Front and call upon them to cease their deliberate and contumacious violation of the provisions of the Geneva Convention.

Be it further resolved: That the people of the state of Kansas call upon the government of the United States, the governments of all nations who are signatory to the Geneva Convention, and the Secretary General of the United Nations to bring such pressures as are necessary upon the government of North Vietnam, the National Liberation Front and the Lao Patriotic Front to insure immediate, full and complete compliance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention.

Be it further resolved: That the governor of the state of Kansas be authorized and requested to proclaim the period beginning March 21, 1971, as "Kansas week of concern for prisoners of war/missing in action," to honor those brave citizens of Kansas who have sacrificed their freedom in defense of freedom for all and that all municipalities, civic groups, fraternal organizations and like entities in the state of Kansas be informed of this resolution and requested to support its intent by every feasible means available.

Be it further resolved: That the secretary of the senate transmit duly attested copies of this resolution to the secretary of the

Senate of the United States, to the clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each member of the Congress from this state, to the Government of North Vietnam and to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, during this "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Men Missing in Action," I want to lend my voice in encouraging all Americans, regardless of their views on the war, to work toward the goal obtaining humane treatment of our prisoners of war by North Vietnam.

In our Nation there are many different views regarding the war in Southeast Asia. Some are calling for an all-out victory in Vietnam. Others are wanting immediate troop withdrawal and still others would set up a fixed timetable for the removal of American forces.

But regardless of an individual's views on war, we all can—and must—unite world opinion in the plea to Hanoi to live up to the provisions of the Geneva Convention. Our men deserve humane treatment now. Our men deserve to be released now.

Reports filtering into the State Department tell horrible tales of the treatment Americans are receiving at the hands of the North Vietnamese.

When an American is first captured, he is thrown into a truck bed and then forced to lie on his back with his feet bound.

He is later herded from village to village where the North Vietnamese cage him like an animal so that villagers can file past to strike him.

Eventually, the captors transfer him to a small hut containing 12 bamboo cages, force him onto his stomach, thrust his feet into wooden stocks and tie his arms behind his back with wet rope.

For 29 days they keep him in this position, freeing him only long enough to eat a daily bowl of rice.

Following this, the American prisoner is then transferred to one of the prisons in Hanoi. Here he goes through a daily routine of agony which includes propaganda against his own country, hard labor, torture, little food, no medical care to speak of, and no mail.

Throughout this great ordeal, there is one thing that is going through the prisoner's mind: "Does anybody care?"

Mr. Speaker, through programs such as the "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Men Missing in Action," we in the Congress are trying to gain worldwide support for the American prisoners of war.

What can we do?

First of all, we can pray daily for these prisoners. We can pray that President Ton Duc Thang of Hanoi will change his practice of inhuman treatment and will begin to treat the prisoners by the standards set out by the Geneva Convention.

Second, we must do everything possible to change the situation where wives and children, parents and loved ones are suffering great agony because they do not know if their husbands and fathers are dead or alive.

Recently, I wrote a letter to President Ton Duc Thang. And last week I asked the citizens of Indiana's Fifth District to join me in a similar effort.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking each citizen who hears or reads this speech to do the same. I am enclosing a copy of the letter I have written, and it would be very easy for each citizen to sign his or her name, clip the letter and mail it.

Do not forget what our young men are thinking.

Is anybody there?

Does anybody care?

The letter follows:

PRESIDENT TON DUC THANG,
Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi,
c/o American Red Cross,
Washington, D.C. 20013

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have claimed that American citizens held in your detention camps are being treated humanely. But you offer no proof of this and reports coming from your camp tell that American prisoners are being subjected to the worst forms of torture.

We ask that you immediately:

1. Identify the prisoners you hold
2. Permit impartial inspection of your POW camps

3. Release prisoners who are seriously ill or injured

4. Permit the free flow of mail between prisoners and their families.

These four points are elementary rules which civilized countries are expected to follow, and I join millions of others in the world urging you to take these steps.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this week has been designated as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action." I am honored to have been a cosponsor of the resolution which authorized the President to so designate this week, and which passed the House of Representatives unanimously.

The concern which brings us to authorize this special week is both non-political and nonideological. It transcends all party lines and joins conservatives and liberals, hawks, and doves. There are very few issues which can bring our diverse membership together into a common bond, Mr. Speaker; but this is certainly one.

The reason for this rare unanimity is simple. Those men over there in filthy jails are our men. They are American men. They have fought bravely for us and we do not intend to let them down. We do not intend to let the world forget for a moment what the Communists are doing to Americans in Vietnam and Laos.

It is most upsetting to hear the details of what these men are going through over there—even harder to talk about it. But that does not make it go away. It is there, and it is going on right this minute. Lengthy, in-depth interviews with some of the men who have been released and also with reliable and informed sources in Saigon and Paris leave no room for doubt. Unfortunately, it is clear that propaganda films showing POW's playing volleyball are just that—propaganda and nothing else. The public never sees the filthy cells where rats coexist with the prisoners or the men with all manner of illnesses or deformities resulting from malnutrition, exposure, and cruel physical treatment.

How much longer can our men hold out? How much longer should they have to hold out? The Geneva Conventions require release of the sick and wounded. It further requires release or transfer to

neutral nations men whose long imprisonment imperils their health.

The first men captured have now been confined under the most degrading circumstances for nearly 7 years. Hundreds of others have agonized through 4, 5, or 6 lonely years.

What does it take to get Hanoi to live up to their legal obligations under the Geneva Conventions?

Occasions such as this special week, and this special day on which we speak out on behalf of our men, are a big help. I am proud to have this opportunity to join in the chorus. I consider it top priority in my office to continue doing everything possible to help these brave Americans and their long-suffering families. We must not let them down.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I feel privileged to participate in this appeal for humane treatment for prisoners of war.

Special orders, resolutions and letters are not new to the odyssey of prisoners of war and their loved ones.

They may seem redundant and futile, but they are necessary and probably beneficial so I commend and thank the organizers of this special order, my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. JOHN ANDERSON, and the gentlemen from Indiana, Mr. JOHN MYERS and Mr. ROGER ZION.

I speak as a private citizen and a former prisoner of war. I would like briefly to make several points which have not been emphasized enough.

First, I have served with some extraordinary Americans—including recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor—but never have I known a more patriotic, brave, or devoted group than the wives and families of our prisoners of war and those missing in action.

Never has a nation owed so much to so few. I hope that each of you will, at this moment, commit yourselves to their cause.

Next, we can be very proud of our country's policies and practices regarding treatment of prisoners. We have always been highly humanitarian and have always complied scrupulously with the Geneva Convention. No nation has performed more benevolently. This ought to impress the news media and world opinion; but it needs reiteration. Throughout the tragic history of warfare, the military have usually conducted themselves more honorably and humanely than the politicians or the populace.

I was a captive of the much maligned Nazis whose mentality ordered thousands of human beings to be gassed in ovens—and permitted lamp shades to be made of human skins. Hitler and Himmler ordered the extermination of all prisoners of war, including Americans; but their grisly orders were contravened, at great personal peril, by the military. A similar dichotomy may prevail in North Vietnam today. If so, we ought to exploit it by appeals to the basic honor of the military.

As evil as the Nazis may have seemed, the Communists are immeasurably more demoniacal. We were confined in groups, so we could at least lean on each other.

We could, within restrictions, correspond with our families. I knew within 3 months that my son was born. But some of the women here tonight whose husbands were shot down 6 years ago do not yet know whether they are wives or widows.

None of you can imagine their longing or anxiety. Some time ago an enemy photograph purporting to show an American prisoner was circulated among the wives—and 22 of them identified one man as their husband. Think of the poignancy of that episode.

Now, I have a serious message for Hanoi. If they are listening, I hope they will heed my suggestion. It is not made in rancor. Twenty-seven years ago, we and the Germans were fierce diplomatic and military enemies. We bombed their cities and war plants; they shot us down and confined us. Today's rhetoric of "gooks" and "war criminals" is reminiscent to me; in my day the enemy were "goons" and we were "luft gangsters." But today, we and our German captors are friends. We are mutually welcome in each other's homes. This friendship is based upon individual mutual respect and appreciation because we treated each other's prisoners with dignity and humaneness. This treatment strongly influenced the free world to assist Germany in her economic and diplomatic rehabilitation.

Times and conditions change kaleidoscopically, but personal attitudes change more slowly. Twenty-seven years from now, the North Vietnamese may need and want acceptance in the community of civilized and peaceful nations. The North Vietnamese Government would be well-advised to emulate the United States, and other governments, who comply with the terms of the Geneva Convention and who treat their prisoners decently in spite of their diplomatic and military differences with enemy nations.

One more point—last year every rider on this planet shared the drama of the rescue from space of the crippled Apollo 13. I salute Captain Lovell and his fellow astronauts, Fred Haise, and John Swigert for their outstanding performance. The outpouring of prayer for the safety of the crew, and the general empathy with their families, was a splendid demonstration of the concern for which fellow human beings can hold for one another.

The fantastic rescue was possible partially because of the cool expertise of the flight and ground crews, but also because of the enormous sums of money we have spent, and the extraordinary care we have taken, to insure the safety of our astronauts. We have, quite properly, "built in" redundancy upon redundancy to safeguard the men who fly in space. But the men who fly over Vietnam and Laos are also skilled, courageous, dedicated pilots—not much different from the astronauts, except that they fly under orders and out of camera range. The wives and families of both the combat pilot and the space pilot share similar risks and anxieties. If we had "built in" comparable safeguards for our combat crews; if we had cared as much for their safe return; if our news media had re-

moved their wraps and had devoted as much attention to the plight of our combat crews, and their loved ones, as to our space mission, I am certain that our prisoners would, by now, be receiving treatment in compliance with the Geneva Convention.

We must prod the news media to measure up to their responsibilities to report the POW and MIA phenomena and to help mobilize international public opinion to demand compliance with the Geneva Convention and to promote basic humaneness among all men.

I am convinced that our Government, our military, and our Red Cross are doing everything possible to help our prisoners and to alleviate the torment of their families. But we can and must do more to mobilize world public opinion. Last November, a team of daring, competent, and selfless volunteers raided Son Tay in an effort to rescue some of our prisoners of war.

I am confident that word of this rescue mission rapidly spread throughout North Vietnam. It gave our prisoners a new hope. Assurance that one's family and one's government cares provides the hope and psychological lift that is necessary to endure the burden and agony of imprisonment during war.

The morale of all servicemen, their families, their neighbors, and their countrymen is affected by their Government's concern for the men who are lost while performing their duty on a military mission. I commend, and salute the men who participated in this attempted rescue.

Last year at the 25th annual reunion of American Airforce Prisoners of War in Cincinnati we conducted a seminar on the present POW and MIA situation. It was a moving, emotional session. We cried together for these wives and their families. No one left their seat for 2½ hours. We unanimously adopted another resolution urging humane treatment for prisoners of war. But it was different, in style and trust, because former prisoners joined to plead for today's prisoners—on a basis of decency and comradeship in the military tradition. We are being joined by former prisoners of many other nationalities. We will soon be joined by German, Italian, and Japanese Nationals, who were prisoners of the allies at another moment in time. Our appeal is for basic humanity and universal comradeship—without regard to color, nationality, charge, or station in life.

Let me read excerpts from the resolution:

We, as former Prisoners of War:

Knowing first-hand the agonies of prisoners of war and their loved ones;

Realizing that individual servicemen have no authority in determining the military or diplomatic decisions of their national governments;

Believing that humane treatment should be accorded every individual regardless of his race, nationality, station in life, or charge against him;

Shocked by the knowledge that the government of North Vietnam refuses to disclose to our government or to the next-of-kin information concerning the capture, condition or location of prisoners;

Appreciating the anxiety and loneliness of

wives, parents and children who are not informed concerning the locations and conditions of their missing servicemen; and

Having uncontroverted evidence that prisoners now in the custody of the North Vietnamese government, Viet Cong and Pathet Lao are being mistreated and their families subjected to unimaginable torment in clear contradiction of the Geneva Convention and the fundamental rights of men;

Now, therefore, in the interests of basic humanity and universal comradeship, we:

Urgently urge that all civilized persons of all nations insist on the elemental judicial privilege of Habeus Corpus—which entitled any next-of-kin to have the person of a prisoner identified or produced or his place of burial known—for themselves and for all others;

Strongly advocate that all nations and governments comply fully with the Geneva Convention pertaining to prisoners of war; and

Earnestly implore every human being in every land to make their feelings known directly to the authorities of North Vietnam.

Executed in open convention during the 25th National Reunion of the Amerikanish Kriegsgefangenen (former American Prisoners of War) at Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A., April 25, 1970.

Many concerned Americans have written Hanoi urging the release or humane treatment of our POW's. Unfortunately, without success.

I believe we should direct this concern and the organizational momentum of letterwriters and petition signers to urge all Americans to call or write their friends, associates, and relatives in other countries to importune their officials to appeal to Hanoi for the humane treatment of all POW's.

By attracting world attention to the plight of our prisoners of war, we could help to bring further pressure to bear on Hanoi to comply with the Geneva Convention and to move toward the repatriation of all prisoners.

If anyone wants to do something special, may I suggest that he or she ascertain the name of one wife or mother of a POW or MIA and write her a personal letter tonight. Tell her of your appreciation for her plight, your gratitude for her airman's service, and encourage her a little as she endures her agonizing torment.

I am hopeful adoption of this resolution of the U.S. House of Representatives will serve notice in our country and around the world that our POW's are not forgotten Americans and that we shall not discontinue our efforts until they have all been returned to their homeland and reunited with their loved ones.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, America's heart goes out to the brave men who are either captured or missing in action in the Southeast Asia conflict. We are touched by the plight of these more than 1,500 men and their loved ones at home.

While Americans may disagree about the tactics and speed in which we wind down this unfortunate war, we are united in our concern for the welfare of these prisoners and missing men.

We must demonstrate to the world that these men are not forgotten.

For this reason, I am proud to be a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 16, designating the week of March 21-27 as

a "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action."

I know that the entire Nation will join with us in expressing concern for the fate of these men, and urge their humane treatment and prompt release.

March 26 marks the seventh year since an American was taken prisoner. Many more have been taken into captivity since; we have no way of knowing precisely how many since North Vietnam refuses us information about our men. This is particularly heartbreaking for the families who have waited for years to learn if their husband or father is alive or dead.

Although the North Vietnamese signed the 1949 Geneva Convention in 1957, they have refused to honor its provisions for humane treatment of prisoners of war.

Our men are confined in camps with no international inspection; they are refused free exchange of mail; their food is meager; and adequate medical care is withheld.

Man's sense of decency and fair play is repelled by the barbaric treatment of American prisoners in North Vietnam. This treatment proves how wrong those are who view the Communists leaders as simple patriots engaged in a civil war.

Americans will not forget our captive men. The world cannot forgive their treatment.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the only hesitancy I have in helping to highlight this week as a national week of concern for our prisoners of war and men missing in action is that it could be misconstrued to mean that we are not steadily, regularly, and constantly concerned for these brave Americans and not just concerned during 1 week.

There can no longer be any doubt in the minds of the leaders of Hanoi that the American public is concerned—deeply concerned—about the Americans who have fallen into the hands of North Vietnam and have never been even properly accounted for since.

Petitions, letters, and other expressions signed or joined in by millions of individual American citizens ranging from schoolchildren to elderly, retired persons have been obtained and delivery attempted to sources which would bring them to the attention of Hanoi.

We can no longer tolerate Hanoi's ignoring of our petitions on behalf of these men.

We are told that Asiatics do not place the same value upon the lives of individual humans that we do and that Hanoi just cannot believe that our country is really excited about a few hundred prisoners of war.

Let me say that in my judgment, the average American would support this war more strongly and be far more insistent upon military victory than he now is if he were told that we seek to liberate American prisoners than he does when he is told that we are fighting for abstract principles.

Not that we do not believe in abstract principles or are unwilling to fight for them, but above almost everything else, we believe in the dignity, the value and

the worth of an individual human being. This is true partly and largely because of our belief in God and God's concern, revealed through Christ, for every individual. But it is also true because we long ago, as a nation, rejected the idea of slavery, of royalty, and a "class society," and embraced the concept that all men are created equally free.

I have joined my colleagues in the House in a letter to Ton Duc Thang, President of the Hanoi government urging him, in the name of humanity and truth, to grant a request that a representative group from the U.S. Congress be permitted to inspect the POW camps in North Vietnam.

I hope that he takes our request seriously. I can assure him that we are serious in making it.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak out on an issue that we must seek to keep in the headlines as long as it remains an issue—the tragic situation of American/POW/MIA's in Southeast Asia. In designating this week, March 21-27, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action," we are focusing world attention on the plight of more than 1,500 men who have been either prisoners or missing over a 7-year period; this is the longest period that any American soldier has been imprisoned.

I have signed this resolution, along with many of my colleagues; however, I am not satisfied by this display of concern alone—concern is certainly essential, but it does little to help our POW's. We have over 40 families in Maryland whose child or husband is either missing or being held prisoner, and they are fed up with words of condemnation from Congress and the administration—they want action and I cannot blame them as I, too, share this same desire. We have the legislation before us, both in the House and in the Senate—we need only to get it moving.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today to protest the treatment and continued incarceration of our American prisoners of war.

What is most discouraging to me is the lack of known prisoner information or indication of status provided families of men missing in action. Mr. Speaker, regardless of our views on the war, what we are talking about here is basic human decency and basic human emotions. Hanoi has nothing to win by further concealing the names of prisoners; yet it contemptuously continues to do so to the distress of families and loved ones of American servicemen.

I add my support to the activities of the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia as they inform the American public about the condition of the prisoners and men missing in action. I am pleased to add my name to the National Week of Concern and I urge all Americans to be mindful of this week and to express their desire for fair and humane treatment of all war prisoners.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on March 26,

1964, Air Force Capt. Floyd Thompson was captured by the North Vietnamese in South Vietnam. For nearly 7 years he has been held in a North Vietnamese prison.

Captain Thompson and others have been subjected to imprisonment longer than any other prisoners-of-war in modern history. It staggers the imagination that North Vietnam, which has 35,000 men in South Vietnam's prisons is not willing to make a complete transfer of all prisoners of war for the 3,000 American and South Vietnamese prisoners whom they have. It would only require a modest amount of humanitarianism to see the value of such an arrangement.

Even more poignant is the case of the men who are missing in action. The limbo of doubt and apprehension which afflict the families of these men as a result of the refusal of the North to provide us a complete list of Americans held is even less understandable and more cruel.

Meanwhile, this country must do everything in our power to comfort and encourage the 1,600 families whose sons, husbands, and fathers are prisoners-of-war or missing in action.

I am glad the Congress and the President have declared this a National Week of Concern for these men and their families who have suffered so much through this tragic affair. I sincerely trust that an increased public concern in this country will result in more fruitful negotiations on these matters in Paris.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, during this National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action, I join in focusing public attention on the tragedy of our servicemen who have been unduly detained by the enemy, separated from their loved ones by the cruel circumstances of war.

The feelings of many of us vary considerably on our involvement in Southeast Asia, but we are all united in urging Hanoi to assure humane treatment of our prisoners-of-war, release complete information about them, and arrange for their immediate release.

I hope that world consensus will convince Hanoi to reconsider its position of intransigence. Some Americans have been held captive for more than 6 years, longer than any other prisoners in our history, and certainly longer than can be justified by any possible political or military consideration. At present, 1,500 Americans are prisoners of war or missing in action. Their families face courageously the strain and uncertainty which has become their daily burden, but relief of their anxiety is long overdue.

War in itself is tragic. The day when mankind learns to settle problems by other means cannot come soon enough. But the Geneva Convention has provided guidelines for limiting some of the evils and atrocities of war, and in the name of human decency, all nations should honor these rules.

I join in calling upon Hanoi to heed the international voice of conscience being raised this week, and to accept the President's proposal for an immediate and unconditional release of all pris-

oners in Indochina held by opposing forces.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, what can we effectively do to obtain a complete listing of those brave American young men who are held as prisoners of war in Indochina? What can we effectively do to obtain for them the meager privileges which the Geneva Convention accords them? What can we do to effectuate their parole? The North Vietnamese have accounted for some of them, but less than half the number of prisoners and missing in action presumably in their custody. Not all our prisoners and missing are in North Vietnam. Some are in South Vietnam, in the hands of the Vietcong. Others are in Laos, prisoners of the Communist Pathet Lao. Neither the Vietcong nor the Pathet Lao have been heard from at all.

Members of this House and of the other body would do everything within the power of this Government to obtain a return of these young men. We support the efforts of their families to win a wide public concern for their plight, and we support the efforts of our Government to secure their release.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, all of us have met at least a few of these heroic ladies, the wives of American men held prisoner of war or missing in action. Perhaps not so many of you know personally an individual actually held captive by the North Vietnamese today. I do. His name is Donald Waltman, an officer in the Air Force, and a fraternity brother of mine at the University of Idaho. He has been a captive of the enemy for over 5 years now.

But Don's family is among the lucky ones. They know he is alive and that he is reasonably well. Still, the loss and the grief remain with them. For Don, he has missed the chance to see his children grow up, cheer as his son wins a varsity letter on the Kellogg High football team, or help that son as he enters the Air Force Academy.

Such things cannot be dismissed by saying, "Well, at least the man's alive." We honor the dead and we try to bring the rest of our fighting men home. But it is so easy to forget those who languish in the filth of a North Vietnamese jail.

We are all familiar with the cries of those who would pay any price for peace. They say that world opinion is against us. Yet, we might also ask where world opinion was when the North Vietnamese refused to reveal the names of all prisoners held and where was world opinion when the families of the captured men asked for assurances of humane treatment? And where was world opinion when this administration asked to negotiate for the release of POW's? I am afraid that world opinion may be something of a myth. But if it does exist, and if it can be mustered in behalf of a decent cause, then surely this week of concern for POW's and MIA's and this special order should provide the beginning. Hopefully it is in fact a real beginning for those who have waited so long for their families to be joined as one again.

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, it was 7 years ago this month, on March 26,

1964, that the first American, Capt. Floyd J. Thompson, was taken prisoner by the North Vietnamese. Since then, more than 1,600 Americans have been listed as prisoner of war/missing in action.

I am confident that this "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action" will serve to intensify American and world attention on the plight of these Americans and Hanoi's flagrant violations of the 1949 Geneva Convention.

The President has said:

War and imprisonment should be over for all these prisoners. They and their families have already suffered too much.

The President's words are true. Let us hope that this week of national concern will serve notice on the world and particularly to Hanoi that this Nation has not forgotten and will not forget her sons who languish in the filthy confinement pens of Southeast Asia. I would also hope that Hanoi will recognize the fact that this Nation will not rest until its men are returned to their homeland and their families.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with my colleagues in the House today for this period devoted to the prisoner of war/missing in action situation in an effort to objectively evaluate the issue.

As one deeply concerned for our missing and detained men, I have directed correspondence to our negotiators in Paris imploring these gentlemen to make the POW/MIA situation of the highest priority. We have also addressed our feelings to the leaders of North Vietnam. We have cosponsored resolutions documenting the sense of concern of Congress in this matter and we have supported legislation providing expanded GI bill benefits to the families of missing or captured servicemen.

Our approach to the issue has basically been internal in nature. We have tried to emphasize the fact that Federal efforts to alleviate the situation must be underscored by public concern and community action at America's grassroots level.

We recently joined with the Ohio Chapter of the National League of Families of Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia to sponsor a 1-day, 300-mile, four-stop speaking tour of the 10th Congressional District. The key speaker was Col. Norris Overly, a former prisoner of the North Vietnamese. We were accompanied by Mrs. Robert Smith, the wife of a missing Marine aviator. It is estimated that either directly or through the media more than 2 million Ohio Valley citizens heard our story on that eventful day. Also, I am pleased to have cosponsored the resolutions setting aside this week as a period of national concern for the POW's/MIA's and I am indeed heartened by my colleagues' response to this particular special order focusing attention on the problem.

I mentioned that our efforts to date have largely been internal in nature. During the past 2 years there has been an overwhelming upsurge of public sentiment in behalf of the prisoners and their families. Tons of mail has been

delivered to the North Vietnamese and Vietcong delegations in Paris. Petitions have been signed, rallies held, and state-house sessions have been devoted exclusively to our captured and missing men and the means by which the American people can help them home again.

You can be sure that Hanoi has heard us. An increase in the flow of mail, periodic propaganda films and the November list containing POW names—whether complete or not—all validate my contention that Hanoi is, indeed, hearing us loud and clear.

In spite of our letters, however, differences between North Vietnamese and American interpretations of this delicate issue continue to exist and, as a result, the men are not home yet.

To us, the question is humanitarian. To the Communists, the issue is political.

The American public is justifiably concerned about the physical and mental well-being of our servicemen locked in Hanoi's prisons while North Vietnam's leaders view these men as trump cards to be played to full political and military advantage in arriving at a final settlement in Indochina.

Our Nation maintains that U.S. servicemen in detention camps are unquestionably prisoners in the legal sense and therefore should be treated in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention.

On the other hand, though, North Vietnam—a Geneva signatory—asserts that the convention does not apply because these men are not prisoners but "war criminals" subject to the laws of North Vietnam. This refusal is based on North Vietnam's reservation to article 85 of the convention which states that even individuals prosecuted and convicted under the laws of a detaining power "shall retain the benefits of the convention."

What exists then, is a diplomatic standoff. While both parties wrestle with semantics, the issue wears on and, unfortunately, the patience of those who wait for the most important homecoming of their lives wears thin.

Because I have taken an active part in the many civic POW/MIA projects I mentioned earlier, I will never degrade the efforts of the many people who dedicate one day after another to seeking a solution to the situation keeping them separated from the ones they love. I will continue to share their burden until historians are at last able to write a bright ending to this chapter of an otherwise tragic epic.

But while domestic pressure continues to be mobilized and directed toward North Vietnam, it must be realized that this pressure can push in two directions. While public pressure has evoked some token responses from North Vietnam about POW conditions, it can also increase the political value of the prisoners and may, as a result, lead Hanoi to want—or demand—more than our Government is now willing to accept as conditions for an honorable settlement in Southeast Asia.

There is also growing evidence that Hanoi is attempting to reverse the administration's policy of massive public

pressure by telling the POW/MIA activists that if such national concern were turned on Washington and a date for complete withdrawal of American troops were set by the administration, constructive talks about a prisoner release would follow immediately.

Hanoi's most common answer to families who plead for a prisoner release without this withdrawal pledge from the United States is that the matter is not being stalled by the North Vietnamese, but instead by the failure of the Nixon administration to establish a timetable which adds some credibility to the President's claim that we are leaving Southeast Asia once and for all.

This is but a review of the present state of affairs.

Personally, I believe the President is winding down the war and I feel that Hanoi has failed to capitalize on opportunities which could have bolstered their world image. For example: Mr. Nixon announced in January that the U.S. combat role in Vietnam would be concluded by May 1. North Vietnam could have reciprocated with an announcement to the effect that a POW camp would be opened to inspection by an impartial team on, or shortly after May 1. They did not.

Essentially, the leaders of North Vietnam must be convinced of our intent to turn over the task of defending South Vietnam to a government selected by the Vietnamese people. Second, Hanoi must realize that a release—or at least some partial compliance with the Geneva provisions—would be politically wise and could be accomplished without a loss of stature within the Communist bloc.

Predictably, Hanoi will not respond positively to table-pounding demands or threats or proposals which deplete Hanoi's political and propaganda arsenal without something of equal value to replenish it.

At the present time, we are grappling with this issue without the direction of one, unified council comprised of knowledgeable individuals who represent all aspects of the problem. As I have pointed out, the issue involves much more than emotion. The situation warrants consideration from differing angles.

To this end I am today submitting a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should create a Prisoner of War/Missing in Action Commission which would conduct an extensive in-depth analysis of the issue and ultimately offer workable recommendations.

Of course, the primary aim would be to expedite the release of these men interned by Hanoi and other Communist forces throughout Indochina. Equitable alternatives must also be presented to expedite the release of prisoners held by allied forces.

I realize this is a difficult objective. But then, worthwhile endeavors are generally difficult.

My bill proposes that this commission be comprised of knowledgeable individuals from a wide variety of backgrounds whose eventual findings would represent the most realistic approaches to the prisoner/missing problem.

If the commission is to study the is-

sue in-depth and if it is, in fact, to analyze the contrasting points of views, I would suggest that the following interests be proportionately represented on the commission.

First, POW/MIA families;

Second, representatives of world church councils;

Third, representatives of the academic community—specifically individuals world-renowned in international studies, political structures, and ideologies;

Fourth, representatives of the American political spectrum;

Fifth, representatives of the International Red Cross; and

Sixth, representatives of commercial, business, and civic organizations with international networks.

In addition, the Commission should include provisions for a direct channel with the U.S. delegation at the United Nations.

At the beginning of my remarks I mentioned that our efforts to date have largely been internal. We have not, I feel, sounded out international ears with the vigor that the problem warrants. It is becoming apparent that American outrage alone over inhumane POW treatment will not soften Hanoi's hard line. But an outraged public in a third nation—especially a nation which North Vietnam recognizes diplomatically—would prompt Hanoi to take a second look.

Because the missing and captured servicemen are our fathers, our brothers, our classmates, and our countrymen, we are quite naturally expected to bombard Hanoi, Paris, and Stockholm with letters and petitions inquiring about their welfare and asking for their release. North Vietnam, however, does not expect this reaction from third nations and, to date, there has been little movement in other countries to match the public concern exhibited here.

The proposed Commission—properly composed and working on the premise that third nation pressure is a vital untapped resource with great possibilities—could eventually produce alternatives favorable to both Hanoi and Washington.

Col. Frank Borman, in his round-the-world POW-MIA tour last year, found some nations eager to help us. Some of these nations are rarely mentioned in conjunction with finding a solution to the prisoner problem and yet, if made aware of our sincere desire for assistance, they may just provide the diplomatic nudge needed to prod Hanoi from its callous stance.

For this reason, I underscore the fact that the proposed POW-MIA Commission be both internally and externally oriented.

This proposed Commission would help bring to bear the united concern of the legislative and executive branches on this vital issue. The administration is determined to resolve this situation, I know, and creating a Commission of this sort might well provide the answers which have eluded us for so long. Let us hope so.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 212, an amendment intro-

duced by my colleagues, Mr. LEGGETT of California and Mr. RIEGEL of Michigan, calling for "proportional repatriation." I have cosponsored this resolution and believe that it allows us to focus in on the real issue concerning American prisoners of war in North Vietnam—and that is, the only sure way to gain their freedom is to withdraw all our troops from Indochina.

The Paris talks have long been stalemated; letter campaigns have been waged to North Vietnamese officials; demonstrations have been held to dramatize our concern for the POW's; private groups have been established to negotiate with the North Vietnamese for the release of prisoners. None of these efforts have proved fruitful.

This week, the National Week of Concern for POW-MIA's, should be a week for all of us to renew our commitment to end this tragic war. The Congress must move ahead promptly to bring all our men—both from the battlefield and the prison camps—home from Southeast Asia. I urge my colleagues to join in the support of this resolution.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege to join with my colleagues on this occasion to speak for and in behalf of our nearly 1,600 young men of the Armed Forces of the United States who are prisoners of war or listed as missing in action.

In considering what might be most appropriate in the way of remarks as we launch this National Week of Concern for these men I thought of them not as a group of Americans, imprisoned collectively behind the bamboo curtain. Rather, I thought of them as individuals, Americans one by one, separated from his family and his loved ones.

In so doing I was reminded of an article by Maj. Jimmy K. Kilbourne which appeared in *Airman*, the official magazine of the U.S. Air Force entitled "He Is America." It seems to me that Major Kilbourne's article is most appropriate on this occasion and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

HE IS AMERICA

(By Maj. Jimmy K. Kilbourne)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Nearly 1,600 young men of the Armed Forces of the United States are Prisoners of War (POW) or Missing in Action (MIA) as a result of the war in Vietnam. Locked in bamboo cages or filthy cells by an enemy who refuses to follow the rules of the Geneva Convention, these are men who have paid a dear price for their country and now ask that country not to forget them. They will not be forgotten!)

Who is the Prisoner of War or the young man who is Missing in Action?

Simply, he is the Nation—an American fighting man dedicated to the principles which made us free.

Collectively, he is a man of many faces . . . the guy next door . . . the fellow across the country. He is near and he is far.

He is of many Faiths and philosophies. He worships as a Catholic, Jew, Protestant, or maybe a Buddhist—or maybe he does not worship at all, in the formal sense of the word.

His home is the car-choked streets of New York from Park Avenue to Harlem, the wooded hills of Appalachia, the brown-white sands of Miami Beach or the sun-splashed

shore of Malibu—every state and territory is his own.

The American POW or MIA is every creed and color. He is a black man, white man, red, brown or yellow. His education ranges from the elementary school dropout of the ghetto to the high school graduate from suburbia. He could have worn the black gown and mortarboard of a graduate from USC, Harvard, "Ole Miss," Notre Dame, Purdue, Air Force Academy, West Point or Annapolis.

Back home his political philosophy may have been conservative or liberal. He may have voted Democratic, Republican or Independent—if indeed he was old enough to vote at all.

He is the son of a man who migrated from town to town picking grapes, or walked the halls of the Senate, or held a scalpel, or taught school. His father may have worn a badge, the eagle insignia of a colonel, gold stripes of an admiral, the chevrons of a sergeant, the blue suit of a banker—or the uniform of a serviceman now fighting in Southeast Asia.

He is the last of a dozen children. He has a family of his own or a girl who waits alone.

He is the teenager who life the drive-in hamburger stand for the rice paddy, or a career soldier with 25 years of service. His average age is 29 years.

Before volunteering or being drafted, he clerked in banks and grocery stores, sat at office desks, pressed parts in a giant factory or picked cotton and tobacco.

Serving with distinction during World War II, he knew later of Checkpoint Charlie. He waded ashore at Inchon, flew the Berlin Airlift, blockaded Cuba and advised in Thailand, Laos and the Republic of Vietnam. He has been in and out of prison camps in Germany, Japan or North Korea.

In Southeast Asia, he served aboard Navy patrol boats or carried a rifle as a Marine or Army infantryman. He flew helicopters, transport aircraft and fighters for the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps and Navy. As one of the nearly 1,600 POWs or MIAs he was shot down, ambushed, mined, cutoff or kidnapped. He has lived in captivity for as long as six years.

But he continues to serve. Despite deprivation and often inhumane treatment, he continues to serve—in solitary confinement, shackled, abused.

And, he keeps faith. Refusing to participate in activities which might be harmful to his comrades, to himself or to the United States, he keeps his faith. Occasionally, but rarely, he returns to friendly lands and home.

He has won every combat decoration his country can bestow. He has been recommended for the Medal of Honor for extraordinary heroism. He has won the Air Force Cross, the Army Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, the Silver Star and the Legion of Merit.

His uniform is decorated with the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart.

The POW/MIA represents distinguished service in the cause of freedom. His unparalleled contributions, achievements, sacrifices and decorations span an entire generation and encompass the broad spectrum of our free enterprise system.

He is America!

Mr. Speaker, we as a nation and as individuals have made every effort to let the Communists know we have not forgotten these men. We have in the past and again today urge and plead that these men are extended humane treatment and consideration to which they are entitled by the terms of the Geneva Convention and to which they and their families have a right to expect. We ask

the Communist captors of these, our sons, that they be given the consideration which they would want and expect for their sons and urge their earliest possible release and repatriation.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we are now in the second decade of involvement in Vietnam. With each day's passing, the plight of the American prisoner of war becomes more critical.

The need to call worldwide attention to the inhumane treatment these prisoners are receiving at the hands of our Communist enemy is greater today than ever before. Therefore, I am pleased to have been a cosponsor of the House joint resolution which authorized the President to proclaim the week of March 21–27 as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action."

We must not for one moment allow ourselves to forget these prisoners of war and missing in action as well as their loved ones who can only wait and hope. Nor can we let the world forget the inhumane actions of the North Vietnamese.

Let us hope that the continued concern of so many Americans will help bring pressures of world opinion to bear on Hanoi for compliance with the Geneva Convention on the humane treatment of prisoners.

We call upon the North Vietnamese and their allies in South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to follow the elementary rules which civilized countries are expected to follow in their dealings with prisoners or war. In signing the Geneva Convention Accords, North Vietnam agreed to: First, identify the prisoners they hold; second, permit impartial inspection to their POW camps; third, release prisoners who are seriously ill or injured, and fourth, permit the free flow of mail between prisoners and their families.

Yet North Vietnam and her allies continue to violate these basic rules of humane conduct.

I have had the privilege, on several occasions, to meet with the families of servicemen who are either missing or imprisoned. I am inspired by their courage and their unshakable determination to carry on in the face of tremendous adversity. These brave families deserve not only a great deal of credit but our untiring efforts to relieve them of the great burden which they shoulder.

Let us pledge our best efforts toward securing proper treatment and the earliest possible release for our imprisoned servicemen.

I call on all Americans to join in prayerful hope that these men will soon be returned to their loved ones.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the resolution authorizing a "National Week of Concern" for our American prisoners of war, I am joining with my colleagues in this expression of support for the nearly 1,600 American prisoners of war.

I have discussed this matter with my colleagues and we want to make certain the American public is continually informed as to how long this war has continued and the suffering by our servicemen which has occurred. On March 26,

1964, Capt. Floyd Thompson was captured in South Vietnam and became the first American prisoner of war in Southeast Asia. On March 29, 1971, 7 years and 3 days will have elapsed since his capture. We must move to end this tragedy.

I would hope that the President would make it a primary objective to negotiate immediately in Paris for return of American prisoners of war and would authorize the negotiators to explore an immediate cease-fire and establish a definite series of troop withdrawals on the basis that our prisoners of war would be returned on an immediate schedule.

It is vital that the U.S. policy in Southeast Asia provide for the return of our prisoners of war at the earliest possible date.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to take part in the observance of "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action," an observance proclaimed last Friday by President Nixon.

Over 1,400 American servicemen are prisoners of war, or are missing in action in Southeast Asia, fighting to preserve freedom. Although the U.S. Government has frequently appealed to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front to comply with the provisions of the Geneva Convention, the appeals have been deliberately ignored. On the other hand, the United States has continuously observed the requirements of the Geneva Convention in the treatment of the prisoners of war.

North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front have refused to identify all prisoners they hold; to allow impartial inspection of camps; to permit free exchange of mail between prisoners and their families; to release seriously sick or injured prisoners; and to negotiate seriously for the release of all prisoners.

All of these violations are not only violations of the 1949 Geneva Convention on Prisoners of War, which North Vietnam ratified in 1957, but are also violations of fundamental human decency. Yet, hope remains—hope that should inspire us to continue our efforts.

At the reception held in the Cannon House Office Building yesterday morning, one of the wives whose husband—a flyer—has been held prisoner of war in North Vietnam for the past 4 years, disclosed that she has not received one letter from her husband, even though there are strong indications he is still alive. She was at the reception with her young son, and although she was very brave, I know she was very concerned about the plight of her husband, who is not even allowed to send his wife a letter. Such inhumanity is almost inconceivable.

Mr. Speaker, along with many other Members, I have helped sponsor a resolution that protests the uncivilized treatment of American prisoners of war and urges their prompt release by the North Vietnamese.

The Subcommittee on National Security Policy, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, is holding hearings on this proposal on Thursday and I hope it is passed swiftly, so that the entire world

knows again that the House of Representatives cares very much about American prisoners of war—that it often thinks of them, and that it is deeply grateful for their sacrifices and their courage.

I have certainly not abandoned hope and I know that our American prisoners of war still have faith in America, and in humanity. Despite all of their problems and perhaps even their despair, I have a feeling they will return safely to those they love and to a Nation that is proud of their great contributions to freedom.

Mr. QUILLLEN. Mr. Speaker, the North Vietnam Government has flagrantly violated the terms of the Geneva Convention in regard to the treatment of American prisoners of war.

The violation of this document is a dastardly act by the Communists and one which no red-blooded American condones or should be allowed to tolerate.

We must do everything possible to focus national and world attention on the plight of these poor servicemen in the hope it will help our cause.

The 1,500 Americans listed as prisoners of war or missing in action in Vietnam and other wars deserve the support of the American people. They must be reassured that they have not been forgotten in these troubled times.

The North Vietnam Government totally disregards the Geneva Convention. At the minimum, the North Vietnamese should provide our prisoners with adequate medical care and sanitary living quarters. By some means, the North Vietnamese Government should be made to adhere to terms of the Convention which plainly provide the rights of prisoners of war.

Mrs. Grace Avery, whose husband has been missing in Vietnam for almost 3 years, lives in my congressional district. This brave young woman, like so many others, still does not know whether her husband is dead or alive. But she has hope that he will come home. The wives and families of these men are the ones being made to suffer by this cowardly behavior by the Communists.

The least that could be done would be to release the names of the prisoners of war. To me, this would be the very common denominator of decency.

I am honored to be a cosponsor of the joint resolution designating this week as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action," and to have the opportunity to speak out on such an important and vital issue. It is my sincere hope that this serious situation can be remedied in the early weeks ahead.

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the hallmarks of a civilized society is the humane treatment of prisoners of war. I join my colleagues this day in denouncing the Government of North Vietnam, both for their failure to afford the prisoners of war humane treatment and for their failure to give adequate notice to the families of those who are missing in action. This latter failure is in itself inhumane treatment because of the anguish that it brings upon these families.

I congratulate all of those in the State of Utah and across the Nation who have written letters to the Government of North Vietnam pleading both for more humane treatment and for adequate notification to the families of the prisoners.

We, of course, have no guarantee that these actions will have any effect on the Government of North Vietnam. However, we must not give up hope. We must not give up faith. We must continue to try to assert pressure in whatever way we can. We must not forget these Americans.

We need both personal and community involvement to develop this campaign to the point where it carries the full impact of American public opinion. I encourage schools, churches, civic clubs, community organizations, and even arms of government to continue to make their feelings known to the Government of North Vietnam and to the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris, even though they refuse to accept our pleadings.

This was the case last week when a resolution passed by the Utah Legislature calling for humane treatment of American prisoners was returned from Paris with the word "refused" penciled on the face of the envelope. I still have a deep belief that these efforts will have a beneficial effect and that, if nothing else, they will indicate to the prisoners of North Vietnam that we have not forgotten them nor do we intend to do so. We must convince the North Vietnamese that no arrangement ending this war will be acceptable to the American people unless it provides for adequate repatriation of these loyal Americans.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this body reflects the variety of views held by our fellow Americans on the conflict in Southeast Asia. It also reflects the unanimity of concern for American prisoners of war/missing in action who are held by the North Vietnamese and allied forces. I am pleased, therefore, that the House of Representatives should take the time to show the world that we are united in our demands for release of captives' names, humane treatment of prisoners, and their early repatriation.

March 23 is a symbolic date. Seven years ago today the first American was captured in South Vietnam. Since that time an unknown number have shared his fate.

We do not know how many men are held captive, or who they are. Hanoi simply refuses to release a list, despite the efforts of private citizens, families, and governments. This is an act of senseless savagery. No possible benefit can accrue to the North Vietnamese, yet they brutally keep American families in a constant state of anxiety—waiting and hoping.

The Nazi's, despicable as they were, not only released the names of American prisoners of war, but also allowed the International Red Cross to inspect their prison camps. Numerous times the International Red Cross has sought permission to enter North Vietnam to merely investigate the condition of American captives. All such attempts have been summarily refused. What have the North Vietnamese to hide? Why should they be

afraid to let the Red Cross visit prisoners? What possible harm could come to the North Vietnamese for showing they are as humane as they claim to be? One cannot help but conclude that either prison camps are horrendous, or North Vietnam enjoys watching the anguish of uncertainty in the minds of prisoners of war/missing in action families and Americans as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, the conduct of North Vietnam with regard to American prisoners of war/missing in action has been brutal, sadistic, inhumane, savage, and disgusting. I urge our Government's continued efforts to explore every channel available to obtain a list of American captives, to procure humane treatment, and to gain their early repatriation.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, Americans throughout the country are united in their concern for the fate of over 1,500 Americans who are listed as being held prisoner by the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front or whose fates are unknown. Our concern for their well-being increases with time as does our determination to somehow insure their speedy return to their families and friends.

From its inception, American involvement in Southeast Asia has been highly controversial—to the despair of our Asian allies and to the delight of their enemies. We have disagreed about everything—from escalation to withdrawal. There is, however, neither disagreement nor dissent from our expression of concern for those Americans who are lost or held captive because of the American commitment in Southeast Asia. These men are not forgotten.

All of us are in complete accord in our insistence that the North Vietnamese abide by the Geneva Conventions with respect to captive Americans. The Governments of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, and the United States have ratified these Conventions as binding international law. The ratifying governments are required to:

First, allow inspection of prison facilities by an impartial humanitarian body such as the International Red Cross.

Second, properly and immediately identify all prisoners.

Third, release the sick and wounded.

Fourth, provide an adequate diet and medical care to prevent weight loss.

Fifth, refrain from subjecting prisoners to mental and physical duress and torture.

Sixth, allow a free exchange of mail between prisoners and their families—two letters and four post cards per month is the minimum.

Worldwide public opinion demands that the Conventions be adhered to.

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, almost 1,600 American men at this moment sit imprisoned in Southeast Asia or have been reported missing in action. These men are paying a dear price for their country, and I ask that their country not forget them.

I am hoping that this week—the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action—will help promote a keen awareness of the men's situation and perhaps bring their plight into

even clearer focus for the American public.

The prisoner-of-war situation is one of the most deplorable in our Nation's history. The refusal of the North Vietnamese Government to follow the Geneva agreement provisions for even basic human rights is an outrage. And our total lack of information about our missing men is one of the most frustrating aspects of the war.

Unquestionably, there is a wide variety in opinions on how the United States should end its part in the war. But certainly we can unite in vocalizing our horror on what is being permitted to happen—the inhumane treatment of the prisoners, the refusal to allow communications with the men and the total rejection of all pleas for information concerning the names and whereabouts of the POW's.

The legislation which has been passed by Congress so far has failed to impress Hanoi, as have countless pleas from families of the POW's and MIA's, government and military officials and others. The millions of letters sent by Americans in the men's behalf have not yet moved the North Vietnamese to more humane treatment.

But in spite of Hanoi's refusal to acknowledge American sentiment, our only hope is to continue to bring pressure to bear. We must do everything we can to indicate to Hanoi that these men who have given so much to their country have not been forgotten.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we are currently observing a "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action" as proclaimed by President Nixon.

As America continues to wind down its involvement in the Indochina conflict which has demanded sacrifices from so many of our young men, it is time for Americans to detach themselves from their feelings about our Vietnam policy and to join together in solemn thought and dedicated effort to bring our men home.

Except for those whose loved ones are either prisoners or missing, life for most of us goes on, day in and day out, without a full realization of the deprivation, maltreatment and other inhuman conditions under which our servicemen are held in captivity.

For us who have escaped the personal sorrow and anguish, this is unfair.

It is unfair because the some 1,600 men who are prisoners or missing and those they leave behind must bear an unproportionate share of this Nation's responsibility to find a durable peace in Southeast Asia.

Yet, all of us who remain unscathed will share the blessing of the peace when it comes, as it must.

I commend our President for his continued focus on the prisoner of war issue at the Paris peace talks, in private negotiations and with the leaders of nations throughout the world.

The President has proclaimed that he will keep a residual force in Vietnam as long as Communist forces hold American prisoners. I take this as a positive statement.

I believe that if we can secure the enemy's assurance of humane treatment of prisoners, the exchange of our sick and wounded and even repatriation and release of our men, that there could be a breakthrough in the stalled peace talks.

I am privileged to be a cosponsor of the resolution which called for the observance of this week.

But I am convinced that all of us must do more during the weeks and months which follow.

While we continuously bring our men home in a manner to protect the declining numbers of men who remain to further Vietnamization of the conflict, we cannot let down on our efforts in behalf of our prisoners and the identification of the missing. Instead, we must seek additional and new ways to help our men who cannot help themselves. Unless help is forthcoming for our brave men, they will continue to suffer and die. North Vietnam already has informed antiwar groups that 23 Americans have died in captivity. These lists cannot be regarded as completely accurate.

The fact is, we do not know how many of our men are dead and how many are alive.

There is no need for me to repeat the inhumane conditions under which our men are held in captivity in violation of the Geneva Convention, a pact which the North Vietnamese signed but fail to honor.

The unfortunate plight of our men and the uncertainty about our missing has been traced and retraced in this body and in the Senate, in details which we can never erase.

This is necessary but not enough.

We must not only strongly protest the actions of the enemy, time and again, but our government must use its power and prestige with governments throughout the world to act in behalf of our men in captivity.

Every citizen has an obligation to manifest his concern—with his fellows, through his churches, his service clubs, wherever and whenever the opportunities occur.

And we are not just talking about prisoners held by the North Vietnamese or the Vietcong. We must be concerned for and exert efforts in behalf of, our men held by the Pathet Lao and the Communists in Cambodia.

In my congressional district in Erie County, N.Y., and in all the districts throughout our Nation, we all know wives, parents, and others who for as long as 5 years have waited for return or word of loved ones. We must all share their impatience and efforts to end the waiting.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include two articles on prisoners of war and those missing in action:

HE IS AMERICA

(By Maj. Jimmy K. Kilbourne)

(EDITORS NOTE.—Nearly 1,600 young men of the Armed Forces of the United States are Prisoners of War (POW) or Missing in Action (MIA) as a result of the war in Vietnam. Locked in bamboo cages or filthy cells by an enemy who refuses to follow the rules of the Geneva Convention, these are men who have paid a dear price for their country and now ask that country not to forget them.)

They will not be forgotten!

Who is the Prisoner of War or the young man who is Missing in Action?

Simply, he is the Nation—an American fighting man dedicated to the principles which made us free.

Collectively, he is a man of many faces . . . the guy next door . . . the fellow across the country. He is near and he is far.

He is of many Faiths and philosophies. He worships as a Catholic, Jew, Protestant, or maybe a Buddhist—or maybe he does not worship at all, in the formal sense of the word.

His home is the car-choked streets of New York from Park Avenue to Harlem, the wooded hills of Appalachia, the brown-white sands of Miami Beach or the sun-splashed shore of Malibu—every state and territory is his own.

The American POW or MIA is every creed and color. He is a black man, white man, red, brown or yellow. His education ranges from the elementary school dropout of the ghetto to the high school graduate from suburbia. He could have worn the black gown and mortarboard of a graduate from USC, Harvard, "Ole Miss," Notre Dame, Purdue, Air Force Academy, West Point or Annapolis.

Back home his political philosophy may have been conservative or liberal. He may have voted Democratic, Republican or Independent—if indeed he was old enough to vote at all.

He is the son of a man who migrated from town to town picking grapes, or walked the halls of the Senate, or held a scalpel, or taught school. His father may have worn a badge, the eagle insignia of a colonel, gold stripes of an admiral, the chevrons of a sergeant, the blue suit of a banker—or the uniform of a serviceman now fighting in Southeast Asia.

He is the last of a dozen children. He has a family of his own or a girl who waits alone.

He is the teenager who left the drive-in hamburger stand for the rice paddy, or a career soldier with 25 years of service. His average age is 29 years.

Before volunteering or being drafted, he clerked in banks and grocery stores, sat at office desks, pressed parts in a giant factory or picked cotton and tobacco.

Serving with distinction during World War II, he knew later of Checkpoint Charlie. He waded ashore at Inchon, flew the Berlin Airlift, blockaded Cuba and advised in Thailand, Laos and the Republic of Vietnam. He has been in and out of prison camps in Germany, Japan or North Korea.

In Southeast Asia, he served aboard Navy patrol boats or carried a rifle as a Marine or Army infantryman. He flew helicopters, transport aircraft and fighters for the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps and Navy. As one of the nearly 1,600 POWs or MIAs he was shot down, ambushed, mined, cutoff or kidnapped. He has lived in captivity for as long as six years.

But, he continues to serve.

Despite deprivation and often inhumane treatment, he continues to serve—in solitary confinement, shackled, abused.

And, he keeps faith.

Refusing to participate in activities which might be harmful to his comrades, to himself or to the United States, he keeps his faith. Occasionally, but rarely, he returns to friendly lands and home.

He has won every combat decoration his country can bestow. He has been recommended for the Medal of Honor for extraordinary heroism. He has won the Air Force Cross, the Army Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, the Silver Star and the Legion of Merit.

His uniform is decorated with the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart.

The POW/MIA represents distinguished service in the cause of freedom. His unparalleled contributions, achievements, sacrifices and decorations span an entire generation and encompass the broad spectrum of our free enterprise system.

He is America!

[From the American Bar Association Journal, January 1971]

RELEASE AND REPATRIATION OF VIETNAM PRISONERS

(By Charles W. Havens, III)

Article 4 of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War¹ sets forth the standards for classifying captives as prisoners of war. This article provides in part that prisoners of war are persons who are members of the armed forces of a party to the conflict. All captured American servicemen, including the pilots and aircrewmembers detained by North Vietnam, were uniformed members of the armed forces of a party to the conflict and are prisoners of war clearly within the provisions of this article.

The United States and the government of Vietnam have accorded prisoner of war status on North Vietnamese and Viet Cong forces even beyond that required by the convention. The right of these captives on both sides to be accorded prisoner of war status should be above question.

There are now more than 1,500 American servicemen who are legally considered "missing" in Southeast Asia and who may be in the hands of North Vietnam or its Pathet Lao and Viet Cong allies. Approximately 460 of these Americans are listed by the Department of Defense as "captured", but since the other side has not provided a list acknowledging all the men who are captured, the total number of men who may be prisoners of war is at this date still not known. Previously, the other side has stated that the total number of prisoners is a military secret which would not be revealed. From time to time we have learned from various sources that men previously known only to be missing were captured. This fact, when coupled with the large number who are known only to be missing, has led many to conclude that the actual number of men captured is significantly higher than the number now listed as "captured". Unfortunately, too, some of the men now believed on the basis of the best available evidence to have been captured probably did not survive. It is hoped the number of families which will receive this crushing news will be small.

Also, there are members of the Free World Military Assistance Forces and the Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam who are in a missing status and may be in the hands of the enemy. Here, however, the basic information is not as readily available.

On the other side of the fence, there are now more than 33,000 Viet Cong and North Vietnamese soldiers held in six prisoner of war camps operated by the Army of the Republic of Vietnam. Each of these has been classified as a prisoner of war. Approximately 7,000 of these prisoners of war are North Vietnamese, and the remaining number are either Viet Cong from South Vietnam or regrouped South Vietnamese who elected in 1954 to go north, later returned to the South and took up arms with the Viet Cong.

The first American pilot known to have been captured by North Vietnam is Lt. Everett Alvarez. He was shot down and captured on August 5, 1964. The best available

¹ Unless otherwise noted, all references to the Geneva Convention are to the Third Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War of August 12, 1949.

evidence today suggests that he is still a prisoner. Last August, Lt. Alvarez had been a prisoner of war in North Vietnam for six years, an unprecedented duration for any American serviceman. The fact that Lt. Alvarez's fate is shared to almost as great an extent by hundreds of other men, many of whom are known to be sick or injured, without any prospect of release in sight, dramatizes the need to effect the repatriation of all captured servicemen in Southeast Asia.

The fate of the more than 33,000 servicemen of the other side who are prisoners of war in South Vietnam is important to them, their families and a resolution of the conflict in Vietnam. Although these latter prisoners are receiving food and treatment generally in accordance with the requirements of the Geneva Convention, years of captivity with attendant separation from family and banishment from society are not productive humanitarian goals. Rather, their imprisonment serves only to delay an ultimate settlement and their assimilation into society.

All parties to the conflict have an easily identifiable interest in the prompt release and repatriation of the prisoners of war. All persons interested in seeing the realization of the humanitarian aims of the Geneva Convention should have an equally strong interest in the realization of this same goal. How do we get there from here?

RECENT CONFLICTS GIVE HISTORICAL LESSONS

At best, the lessons of the more recent international conflicts can serve only as guide posts or danger signs to us in seeking to resolve questions of release and repatriation in the Vietnam conflict. Vietnam is not the 1967 Arab-Israeli War, nor is Vietnam the Korean War of 1950-1953. Vietnam today is not even the French-Indochina war which supposedly was resolved by the 1954 Geneva agreement. Still, each of these historical conflicts has something of value for our examination.

The Arab-Israeli War shows us a relatively good lesson of prompt wholesale repatriation of prisoners of war soon after the formal cessation of continuous hostilities. The fact that Israel promptly repatriated far greater numbers of Arab prisoners than the Arab's side is a good expression of the proper humanitarian intent which should motivate any repatriation. Repatriation is not a "trade", or "barter", or "exchange" in the language of the tradesmen. It is a plain and simple requirement that all parties to a conflict permit all their prisoners of war to return home.

The 1954 Agreement at the conclusion of the French-Indochina War shows us that even a sound agreement requires good faith performance before the results are satisfactory. Article 21 provided:

"(a) All prisoners of war and civilian internees of Vietnam, French, and other nationalities captured since the beginning of hostilities in Vietnam during military operations or in any other circumstances of war and in any part of the territory of Vietnam shall be liberated within a period of thirty (30) days after the date when the cease-fire becomes effective in each theater.

"(b) The term 'civilian internees' is understood to mean all persons who, having in any way contributed to the political and armed struggle between the two parties, have been arrested for that reason and have been kept in detention by either party during the period of hostilities.

"(c) All prisoners of war and civilian internees held by either party shall be surrendered to the appropriate authorities of the other party, who shall give them all possible assistance in proceeding to their country of origin, place of habitual residence, or the zone of their choice."

Since this agreement called for the sur-

rendering of prisoners in the first instance to "the other party", presumably it made no provision for instances wherein a prisoner did not want to return to the control of his own forces. In practice, significant numbers of prisoners of war were released by both sides within the prescribed thirty-day period or shortly after. Nevertheless, there were charges and countercharges that thousands of prisoners of war had not been released. The International Control Commission was ineffective in obtaining additional releases from North Vietnam. Thus, the agreement for release was sound, but its execution left something to be desired because of the significant number of prisoners who did not return and for whom there was no satisfactory accounting.

The 1962 Protocol to the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos dealt with the release of captured personnel in a clear, uncomplicated manner. It simply provided in Article 7 that:

"All foreign military persons and civilians captured or interned during the course of hostilities in Laos shall be released within thirty days after the entry into force of this Protocol and handed over by the Royal Government of Laos to the representatives of the Governments of the countries of which they are nationals in order that they may proceed to the destination of their choice."

Again, execution was less than completely satisfactory.

In Korea, the release and repatriation of prisoners of war was the single most controversial aspect of the negotiations and certainly the agenda item which required the longest time to resolve. Some might say that it was never resolved in view of the large number of Americans who were not satisfactorily accounted for and who were much later classified as "died while captured" or "died while missing". In July, 1951, the Korean armistice negotiations began, and although the fighting continued, there was no major ground offensive. By the end of May, 1952, substantial agreement had been reached on all but one major point of negotiation—repatriation of prisoners of war. In this regard, the difficulty lay in resolving the question of "voluntary" repatriation. In short, would there be forced repatriation of unwilling prisoners? After many months of stalemate, the issue was finally resolved. There was no forced repatriation of prisoners. But in the meantime, all prisoners on both sides suffered the pains of captivity for many more months, and, indeed, many died during this period of internment.

North Vietnam adhered to the Geneva Convention on June 28, 1957. The United States ratified it on August 2, 1955, and it came into force six months later. The government of Vietnam acceded in 1953. The International Committee of the Red Cross (I.C.R.C.) in 1965 declared that the Geneva Conventions are fully in force in the Vietnam conflict and that all parties are bound to adhere to their terms. North Vietnam has stated that it does not consider the convention applicable to Americans because the pilots and aircrews held by it are criminals, or "air pirates", subject to the laws of North Vietnam and not prisoners of war. The relevant article of the convention dealing with classification of captives is Article 4. As previously mentioned, American servicemen held by North Vietnam clearly qualify as prisoners of war under this article and are entitled to treatment in accordance with the precepts of the convention. North Vietnam's contention that the convention is not applicable because there has been no declaration of war is not recognized by the I.C.R.C. or, to my knowledge, by any other non-Communist bloc nation. As a legal argument, it is simply not taken seriously. Article 2 of the convention states that it is applicable "to all cases of declared war or of any

other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the parties to the Convention, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them". As the I.C.R.C. has declared, the Vietnam war is clearly an armed conflict of an international character in which the full convention is applicable. The existence of this international conflict has been recognized by the United States and the XXII Conference of the International Red Cross. Although it claims that the convention does not apply to its captives, North Vietnam has maintained consistently, even in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, that it treats the captured servicemen humanely.

DUE PROCESS GUARANTEES NOT OBSERVED

Any contention by North Vietnam that its reservation to Article 85 of the convention permits it to deny prisoner of war status to captured American servicemen is also without merit. Article 85 provides that "prisoners of war prosecuted under the laws of the Detaining Power for acts committed prior to capture shall retain, even if convicted, the benefits of the present Convention". Initially, the clause presupposes prisoner of war status, which North Vietnam has denied. Secondly, there have been no convictions that, in any event, require certain due process guarantees which North Vietnam would never observe.² And thirdly, there are no known grounds for any such convictions. The bombing policy for North Vietnam observed to an unprecedented degree the laws of war. The targets were military supporting facilities, and the operating instructions were strictly drawn to minimize collateral damage and injury to the civilian populace. In fact, in pursuing such a restricted air war, the pilots were incurring greater risks to their own safety. In short, there has been no verification of North Vietnam's charges that the Americans are war criminals.

The Viet Cong does not claim that the soldiers captured by its forces are other than prisoners of war, but it maintains that it is not a party to the convention. The I.C.R.C. considers the Viet Cong bound by the adherence of both North and South Vietnam.

The United States, the Republic of Vietnam, the Republic of Korea, Australia, Thailand, Philippines and New Zealand have acknowledged the applicability of the convention and assured the I.C.R.C. of their intention to honor it.³

In South Vietnam, prisoners of war, whether Viet Cong or North Vietnamese, are turned over to the Army of the Republic of Vietnam for internment in six prisoners of war camps. This procedure is sanctioned by Article 12 of the convention because South Vietnam is a party to the convention and is willing and able to apply the convention. South Vietnam also permits the I.C.R.C. to inspect regularly the camps where these prisoners are held.

UNITED STATES BEARS SPECIAL CONCERN

As mentioned previously, both North Vietnam and the Viet Cong hold prisoners. Therefore, the critical parties concerned with the actual release or repatriation of prisoners are South Vietnam, North Vietnam, and the Viet Cong.⁴ Of course, in terms

² See Articles 85 and 105.

³ See Joint Manila Communiqué, October 24, 1966.

⁴ Prisoners held in Laos by the Pathet Lao forces may be subject to control by the more than 40,000 North Vietnamese forces there. To the extent that they are not, the Pathet Lao forces might be held bound by the Geneva Convention by Laos' adherence to the Convention in 1956. In any event, those North Vietnamese forces held as prisoners by the Royal Lao Army are now acknowledged as falling within the convention's protection.

of humanitarian interest as well as governmental and public preoccupation, the United States bears a special concern.

If we look to the convention as the principal authority, Article 118 states simply that "Prisoners of war shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities." It provides that this should be done with or in the absence of any agreement. Article 118 also deals with the costs of repatriation.

Article 119 and Articles 46-48, which it references, deal primarily with the obligations of a party to see that repatriation is effected in a manner that is in the best interests of the prisoners of war, e.g., the captor must provide sufficient food and water to maintain their health, provide proper care of sick and wounded and return designated personal items. The last three paragraphs of Article 119, however, provide for the retention of prisoners of war against whom criminal proceedings for indictable offenses are pending or whose punishment for these offenses has not been completed.

The preceding articles dealt with repatriation at the close of hostilities. Articles 109 through 117 cover direct repatriation and accommodation in neutral countries even when the hostilities may very well be continuing at an active pace between the belligerents. These articles could apply to the Vietnam conflict now, and to what many believe will be the prevailing situation for the foreseeable future.

Article 109 requires a party to return to their own country all willing "seriously wounded and seriously sick prisoners of war after having cared for them until they are fit to travel". The succeeding article provides further definition of these categories of sick and wounded who are entitled to direct repatriation: "(1) Incurably wounded and sick, whose mental or physical fitness seems to have been gravely diminished. (2) Wounded and sick who, according to medical opinion, are not likely to recover within one year, whose condition requires treatment and whose mental or physical fitness seems to have been gravely diminished. (3) Wounded and sick who have recovered, but whose mental or physical fitness seems to have been gravely and permanently diminished."

Article 110 also provides that the following may be accommodated in a neutral country: "(1) Wounded and sick whose recovery may be expected within one year of the date of the wound or the beginning of the illness, if treatment in a neutral country might increase the prospects of a more certain and speedy recovery. (2) Prisoners of war whose mental or physical health, according to medical opinion, is seriously threatened by continued captivity, but whose accommodation in a neutral country might remove such a threat."

If the parties do not agree on a method for determining which prisoners qualify for direct repatriation or accommodation in a neutral country, Article 110 provides that the principles enunciated in the Convention's Model Agreement and Regulations Concerning Mixed Medical Commissions shall be applied.

The provisions of the convention relating to direct repatriation at the close of hostilities and those covering repatriation or internment in a neutral country of certain sick or wounded prisoners of war are straightforward and clear. If the war is over, prisoners of war should be given the opportunity to return to their home country. During the war, the seriously sick or wounded who are willing should be repatriated directly or interned in a neutral country for the duration of the hostilities.

The convention does not establish equally detailed principles and procedures for the general release or repatriation of healthy prisoners of war while the hostilities continue. Article 109 does state that the parties to a

conflict may conclude by agreements for direct repatriation or internment in a neutral country "of able bodied prisoners of war who have undergone a long period of captivity". This provision does not seem necessary because the parties could repatriate all prisoners at any time with or without an agreement to that effect. The result in any event clearly would be in keeping with the humanitarian purposes which the convention was designed to effect. Apparently, however, it was beyond the realm of the realistic to include within the coverage of the convention requirements whereunder the combatants were expected to release able-bodied soldiers during the course of hostilities. Yet we have Article 117, which declares flatly that "no repatriated person may be employed on active military service". The scholars have suggested that this applies only to prisoners of war repatriated because they are sick, wounded or long-time prisoners of war who might return to battle their former captors. The United States, however, as a matter of policy does not return former prisoners of war who have been released to combat against their previous captors.

OBLIGATION TO RELEASE PRISONERS AFTER 18 MONTHS

Assuming that the present state of hostilities in Vietnam continues indefinitely, what obligation does the convention place on the parties to release or repatriate prisoners of war? Literally read, the convention might lead to the conclusion that the only obligations would be for those who qualify as sick or wounded. Yet the convention's anticipation that the duration of some hostilities might warrant the repatriation or internment in a neutral country of "long-time" prisoners of war, permits me to conclude that the very basic humanitarian principles which underlie the entire convention require that prisoners of war not be kept interned indefinitely.

When there is no end to hostilities in sight, all prisoners of war who have remained in captivity longer than eighteen months should be repatriated by the captor so long as the other party agrees to honor the requirement of Article 117. There are now thousands of North Vietnamese and Viet Cong and hundreds of American prisoners of war who have been interned for more than two years, and there is no end of their captivity in sight.

To achieve fully its purpose, the Geneva Convention should provide a solution for this situation. It is reasonable to conclude that eighteen months of captivity with no likelihood of release in sight is sufficient to require accommodation in a neutral country under Article 110 and the model agreement. Indeed, the evidence that we have concerning the Americans held in North Vietnam and those held by the Viet Cong in South Vietnam would support a finding that many of them are seriously sick or wounded and entitled to direct repatriation under Article 110. The fact that the other side does not permit impartial inspection of its prisoner of war camps, when added to the information we have, e.g., significant weight losses, intestinal and skin diseases, use of crutches years after capture and confinement in isolation, provides a sufficient basis for a presumption that the American prisoners of war should be repatriated or at least interned in a neutral country immediately. To conclude otherwise, would constitute a gross step backward in the evolution of basic principles of humanitarian law.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our American prisoners of war and servicemen missing in action in the Indochina war.

The week of March 21-27 has been proclaimed as a National Week of Con-

cern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action, and I feel it is the duty and obligation of every American to do all he can in support of proper treatment and earliest possible return of the personnel involved.

These brave men are not forgotten Americans. By our actions Congress is serving notice that our Nation and world opinion will not tolerate continued abuse of those held prisoners.

I have sponsored and supported congressional resolutions to obtain treatment of these men in accordance with internationally agreed standards as to living conditions, medical treatment, identification to and communication with families, and other matters. Yet these humanitarian appeals have gone unanswered.

I feel it is our Nation's duty to exert the maximum effort in every possible approach toward assisting the POW/MIA's. By the current week of concern, we are demonstrating to their captors and to the world that we have the highest commitment to obtain just treatment and swift release.

It has been 7 long years since the first American was held in captivity. The number of prisoners and missing has now reached nearly 1,600. It is absolutely essential that our Nation not let them down in their ordeal. We must continue our attempts to aid and assist these men and their families.

I am proud to join with my colleagues in backing this overriding objective.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has proclaimed this week of March 21 through 27 as the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War.

It is fitting that a special week be set aside to recognize the plight of our men who languish in enemy prisons and again rededicate ourselves to use all possible means by which to secure their safe release. But, we must make clear to ourselves, our friends in foreign countries, and even our antagonists abroad, that the American consciousness does not limit itself to a brief 7 days of official dedication to the freedom of captive American fighting men. The release of the captives of Hanoi, and the other soldiers who we suspect are imprisoned throughout Southeast Asia, must be constantly on our mind and conscience.

No matter how we feel about this war, we must emphasize this concern constantly. I deplore this war. All Americans deplore the war and grieve at its continuing devastation. It has divided the country, wasted precious resources, and destroyed South Vietnam. Yet, our feelings about the current policy cannot diminish our concern for the prisoners.

In many ways, our engagement in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia is not a military operation alone. It is a political war—a political war of words as well as deeds. The North Vietnamese and Vietcong seek support in the court of world opinion, and are attuned to the reactions of people the world over. We must make it abundantly clear that the doves and the hawks are united on the question of prisoner release. The strength of American conviction has already borne fruit

in the release of some film showing a small number of prisoners. This may very well be a staged presentation, not indicative of the true condition of our men and the true conditions of their confinement. However, it is a breach in the wall of silence that Hanoi has kept erected for so many years. The limited knowledge we have is testimony to the unity of the people of this country and the insistence that humanitarian concerns override questions of military policy.

We must widen this breach and convince Hanoi that all our interests would be served by speedy release of prisoners of war or at the very least, firm evidence that they are being well treated. To this end I and a number of my colleagues in this Chamber have written to Ton Duc Thang, President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in Hanoi. We have asked that a group of Congressmen be allowed to inspect the detention centers in North Vietnam and meet with the American prisoners of war. Such inspection would not immediately insure the release of the prisoners, but would help to allay the concern and questions of millions of people in the United States and throughout the world—serious questions about the fate of all our men, not merely those few we have been able to see through the release of carefully controlled motion pictures released through the auspices of North Vietnam.

We must also salute the valiant wives and families of the POW's. These people have suffered inordinately, often not knowing if their loved ones are dead or alive. They have worked incessantly to alert the world to the plight of the prisoners and attempt to secure the release of the men, or at least contact them. Much of the progress that has been made has been the result of the tireless efforts of the wives and families, their trips to Paris to see the Vietcong and North Vietnamese delegates, and their attempts to fly Christmas presents to North Vietnam.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I must emphasize that in all probability the final release of all the prisoners will not be realized until all American forces are withdrawn from Vietnam. It is as clear and simple as that. Our continuing appeals to the conscience of the captors may result in better treatment and more information, but freedom will not be gained until all the boys are brought home.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be one of the cosponsors of the resolution proclaiming this as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action."

I hope that today's program in the House, and the many activities planned this week by the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, will not only focus the eyes of the world on the plight of our more than 1,500 imprisoned or missing men, but will move its conscience as well.

Let us prayerfully continue these efforts beyond this week of official observance. For the benefit of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and would like to join in this nationwide effort, I am reprinting the names and addresses of the State coordinators of the National

League so that they may be contacted directly by any citizens wishing to join in this great cause:

STATE COORDINATORS

Mrs. R. H. Fauser, 7-710 "J" Street, Apt G, APO Seattle 98742 (Anchorage, Alaska).
Mr. Cleve Harris, 1421 27th Street (205) 788-3449, Ens. Station, Birmingham, Alabama.

Mrs. James L. Lamar, One La Fever Lane (501) 225-5671, Little Rock, Arkansas 72207.
Mrs. George E. Day, 4317 W. Ocotillo Rd. (602) 934-7572, Glendale, Arizona 85301.
Mrs. William Butler, 64 Cottonwood Dr. (415) 457-2125, San Rafael, California 94901.
Mrs. Ben Pollard, 2212 N. Chelton Rd., Colorado Springs, Colorado 80909.

Mrs. Crosley J. Flitton, Sr., 33 Summit St (203) 523-1675, Newington, Connecticut 06111.

Mrs. Philip A. Hoge, 1016 Faun Rd (302) 764-8919, Wilmington, Delaware 19803.

Col. (R) David J. Andersen, 16 Longwood Dr. (904) 651-0829, Shallmar, Florida 32579.

Mrs. Thomas V. Parrott, 1230 Valencia Dr. (404) 226-1456, Dalton, Georgia 30720.

Mrs. Donald G. Waltman, 102 East Market (208) 786-8081, Kellogg, Idaho 83837.

Mrs. Dorothy Bodden, 5707 Walnut Ave. (312) 968-9392, Downers Grove, Illinois 60515.

Mrs. Sam Beecher, 122 Bluebird Dr., Terre Haute, Indiana 47803.

Mrs. Robert J. Naughton 605 Tenth St. (712) 324-4016, Sheldon, Iowa 51201.

Col. Arthur K. Harrold, 408 Madison St. (913) 682-0179, Leavenworth, Kansas 66048.

Mrs. Don I. Williamson, 3817 Burning Bush Rd. (502) 425-5481, Louisville, Kentucky 40222.

Mrs. Stan Olmstead (Betty), 2049 Horton (318) 865-6194, Shreveport, Louisiana 71105.

Mrs. A. R. Carpenter, 40 Jackson St. (207) 324-5705, Sanford, Maine 04073.

Mrs. Carroll E. Flora, Jr., 209 E. 6th St. (301) 662-6407, Frederick, Maryland 21701.

Mrs. Paul Getchell, 48 Ryder St. (617) 759-4792, Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts 02532.

Mrs. Virgil O'Connor, 31319 Rosenbusch Dr. (313) 293-1063, Warren, Michigan 38093.

Mrs. David Everson, 2408 119th Ave., N.W. (612) 421-8615, Coon Rapids, Minnesota 55433.

Mrs. Doris Brickell, 1529 Meadowbrook Rd. (601) 982-3221, Jackson, Mississippi 39211.

Mrs. R. D. Martin (Elaine), 8 Grim Ct. North (816) 665-9096, Kirksville, Missouri 63501.

Mrs. Arvin Knutson, 604 O'Malley St (406) 248-6371, Billings, Montana 59102.

Mrs. Clifton E. Cushman, 725 N. 57th St (402) 551-9480, Omaha, Nebraska 68132.

Mrs. Gene Smith, 5424 Bentley (702) 737-2449, Las Vegas, Nevada 89109.

Mrs. Ronald E. Storz, 251 Thaxter Rd (603) 436-9324, Portsmouth, New Hampshire 03801.

Mrs. Muriel Egan, Fairview Drive (201) 232-6635, Mountainside, New Jersey 07092.

Mrs. Samuel C. Maxwell, 414 Mariposa St (505) 887-1966, Carlsbad, New Mexico 88220.

Mrs. George Brooks, 16 Cresthaven Dr (914) 561-9447, Newburgh, New York 12550.

Mrs. James E. Hiteshew, 308 Redwood Trail (919) 734-6817, Goldsboro, North Carolina 27530.

Mrs. Leland Torkelson, Box 155 (701) 965-6890, Crosby, North Dakota 58730.

Mrs. Phyllis Farrow, 95 May Court (216) 247-7144, Chagrin Falls, Ohio 44022.

Mrs. Clifford W. Fieszel, 10 S. East Place (918) 437-4826, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74128.

Mrs. James E. Sehorn, 1705 Willamina Ave (503) 357-9198, Forest Grove, Oregon 97116.

Mrs. Mark J. Ruhling (Pat), 3520 Mare Dr (412) 882-3945, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15234.

Mrs. Ronald Messier, 29 Wood St (401) 828-6873, Coventry, Rhode Island 02816.

Mrs. Fred H. McMurray, Jr., 350 Cobell St. (803) 766-3300, Charleston, South Carolina 29407.

Mrs. Leo K. Thorsness, 2316 S. Blauvelt (605) 332-8070, Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57105.

Mrs. Wayne Fullam, 3424 Betty Lane (615) 624-2056, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37412.

Mrs. Samuel R. Johnson, 3204 Greenbriar Lane (214) 231-7807, Plano, Texas 75074 (Northern Texas).

Mrs. M. O. Sadler, 7723 Pagewood (713) 781-0486, Houston, Texas 77042 (Southern Texas).

Mrs. Franklin A. Caras, RFD 2, 207 (801) 798-2654, Spanish Forks, Utah 84660.

Mrs. Donald G. Cook, 12 Home Avenue (802) 862-4665, Burlington, Vermont 05401.

Mrs. Eugene McDaniel, 1716 S. Woodhouse Rd. (703) 428-3380, Virginia Beach, Virginia 23454.

Mrs. Peter J. Frederick, 6602 80th St. S.W. (206) 584-8471, Tacoma, Washington 98499.

Mrs. Joseph A. Rose, 1476 Saratoga Ave. (304) 599-0237, Morgantown, West Virginia 26505.

Mrs. William Metzger, 1791 Smith (715) 423-1216, Wisconsin Rapids, Wisconsin 54494.

Mrs. Theodore W. Gostas, 1445 S. Main (307) 672-2850, Sheridan, Wyoming 82801.

INTERNATIONAL

Mrs. Russell David, 323 Ave De Tervueren, 1150 Brussels, Belgium.

Mrs. Robert R. Craner, 26 Longton Dr., Freshfield, Lancashire, England.

Mrs. Mary Winn, National Committee Chairman, 4911 Sunnyside Rd., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55424.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, this week has been declared by Congress as the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and those Missing in Action. It is an honor to have cosponsored legislation for this week to focus attention on this situation.

Within my own Fourth District of Florida, I correspond with some 16 families who have loved ones listed as missing in action or who have been designated prisoners of war. One fine gentleman who writes me regularly, has heard nothing of his son for the past 2 years. Two ladies from our area learned that their husbands had been shot down within 2 months of each other. That was in 1967. Now, 4 years later, they are deeply concerned that their children are growing up without knowing their fathers. Neither family has heard a word about their missing loved one during these long months that are dragging on into years and years.

These are just some of the cases. All the others are equally distressing.

During this week, let us ask all Americans to join with us in writing letters, objecting to the treatment of our men, and asking Hanoi to abide by the Geneva Convention with regard to our prisoners. So that all our concerned countrymen can readily send their letters, I am listing persons they can write:

Ton Duc Thang, President, Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi, North Vietnam.

Pham Van Dong, Premier, Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi, North Vietnam.

Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, Minister of National Defense, Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi, North Vietnam.

Minister Xuan Thuy, Delegation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, 8, Avenue General Leclerc, 94, Choisy-le-Roi, Paris, France.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Nguyen Huu Tho, Chairman, National Liberation Front, c/o 19 Hai Ba Trung, Hanoi, North Vietnam.

Huynh Tan Phat, Chairman, Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam, c/o 19 Hai Ba Trung, Hanoi, North Vietnam.

Mme. Nguyen Thi Binh, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, 39, Avenue Georges Mandel, Paris 16, France.

LAOS

Prince Souphanouvong, Deputy Prime Minister, Chairman of Lao Patriotic Front, Sam Neua, Laos (Via Moscow).

M. Sot Pethrasi, Representative of the Lao Patriotic Front, Vientiane, Laos.

Olaf Palme, Prime Minister, Stockholm, Sweden.

Aleksey Nikolayevich Kosygin, Chairman, USSR Council of Ministers, Moscow, USSR.

Nikolay Viktorovich Podgornyy, Chairman, President of USSR Supreme Soviet, Moscow, USSR.

Semen Andreyevich Skachkov, Chairman, Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, Moscow, USSR.

Dr. Vy Dinh Tung, President, Red Cross of Vietnam, 68 Ba Trieu, Hanoi, North Vietnam.

A part of America is missing today—the man next door—husband, sweetheart, son—is missing in action or being held prisoner somewhere in Vietnam or close thereto. Nearly 1,600 young men of America are being deprived of years from their lives by captors who refuse to treat them like human beings. This part of America which is missing deeply disturbs me. These men have fought and paid a dear price for their beloved America and we dare not forget them. Indeed, we will not forget them.

Let me urge every American to show his concern during this week by writing letters to Hanoi. And especially by his prayers for the safe return of our prisoners. Let every American take the families and friends of these brave men into their hearts and, Mr. Speaker, in the name of justice and freedom, let us all renew our efforts to see that these men come home soon and safely.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to join my colleagues in observance of the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action. The war in Vietnam has produced considerably more than the usual amount of horrors connected with all armed conflicts and certainly the worst is the one we concern ourselves with today. Death in war may be understandable, but doubt is unbearable. The agonies suffered by the loved ones of these brave men is a legacy of this continuing conflict which all men of good will must do all in their power to alleviate.

We have already had some indication that the constant outpouring of concern has had some effect within the circles of power in Hanoi. Certain lists have been made available and while there is dispute over their accuracy, it is a fact that at least some of the people in doubt about the fate of their sons, husbands, or friends have received valid news. For this reason, among others, it is very fitting that Members of Congress keep the issue steadily before the American

people, as well as those who flout all international decency abroad.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, my able and distinguished colleague on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Honorable CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, held a hearing on this problem with his Subcommittee on National Security Policy. I commend my friend, CLEM ZABLOCKI, for this timely and important move. I also believe that those hundreds and thousands of private citizens, among them many of my own constituents, are to be praised highly for their efforts in behalf of our prisoners of war and those who are missing in action.

Mr. Speaker, words may seem a sorry substitute for direct action in this matter, yet foreign leaders have shown they are slightly responsive to constant public pressure here in the United States. And so I hope and pray that the words uttered on the floor of the House today may convince the other side of our unshakable determination that the Americans who are now serving so far beyond the call of duty as prisoners will not be forgotten. And it is important to emphasize that no matter what one may think of the justifications advanced for the war in Vietnam and no matter what disagreements may exist on the rate of withdrawal of American troops, both hawks and doves fly together on bringing back all prisoners of war. It would be well for the other side not to confuse the arguments about policy in Southeast Asia with any basic disagreement on this issue.

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, our remarks here today should carry weight with world opinion—not because we, as individuals, make them, but because they represent a further reflection of the deep feeling of an entire people.

The world should note—and Hanoi particularly—that the people of the United States, through their representatives in the Congress, have authorized the proclamation of this week as a "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action."

The President, by proclamation, has lent his leadership to this solemn commitment.

We are engaged in a reemphasis of our determination that the fates of these courageous men will not be written off as no more than a regrettable consequence of war. We speak, and speak again, in this House on this subject to prick the conscience of a world that calls itself civilized.

Let it be understood that our concern for known prisoners of war, and for the thousands listed only as missing in action with fates unknown, transcends a broad spectrum of views on the Vietnamese war. Whatever our domestic differences may be as to national policy in that part of the world, we are united in behalf of humane treatment of those taken by an enemy in time of battle.

As we reduce our military commitment in Indochina, we maintain our level of involvement in the cause of the war prisoners. Their freedom is a key prerequisite to our final disengagement from the conflict.

What we seek is not unreasonable. It is consistent with widely accepted minimum standards of human decency which have been given expression in the Geneva Convention.

An accounting of prisoners held; adequate food and medical treatment, to be confirmed by impartial international international inspection; free interchange of mail between prisoners and their families; release of severely wounded or ill prisoners; serious negotiations toward exchange of all prisoners held by either side—these are the simple considerations we seek.

There are, certainly, thousands of families who live under the Hanoi regime who hope, as so many of our people do, to see again the faces of loved ones who have gone off to war and have been reported taken prisoner or missing in action.

Concern, grief, hope—these are human emotions which are common to all people—and so is compassion.

Prisoners of war have lost their military effectiveness, but they have not lost their human worth, and this is a national resource, whether the nation be the United States of America or the Democratic Republic of Vietnam centered at Hanoi.

We ask again, therefore—not in a military or diplomatic cause, but in the name of essential human dignity—a return to reason, to decency and to compassion.

The coin of our good faith is on the table for the world to see.

It can be no less than a matter of honor and face that Hanoi match it.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, all too often, as the debate on the war in Indochina continues, the men who have made important sacrifices in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia have not been paid the tribute they so obviously deserve. Whether we are "hawks" or "doves" this Nation must do all that is in its power to see that our prisoners of war are returned to us quickly and safely. The desire for the safe return of these men are the fervent hopes of their family, friends, and this country. Those men who have become prisoners deserve the same dedication from our citizens as they themselves have given to the country.

This is the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action. I hope our dedication and energies carry over until every prisoner of war, from America, North and South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos has been safely returned to their homes and families.

No higher priority can be given to any other task until we see an end to the war and that our men are safely home. The 1,600 American prisoners of war and missing in action represent one of the most inhumane sides of this war. We have made every effort to see that the North Vietnamese prisoners are treated humanely and that we abide by the Geneva treaties. We ask the same in return.

I strongly support any effort whether it be legislative, executive, or judicial that will help to release the prisoners of war held by North Vietnam.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I am hon-

ored to be able to participate today in the observance of a "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action." It is important that we pause at this time to consider the plight of our prisoners of war and to pray for their safety and the safety of those who are missing in action. Despite the emotional debate over our future course in Southeast Asia, these brave men must not be forgotten. Whatever our views on the overall conflict, we must continue to do all we can to insure that these men are found and are brought home safely.

When we speak of prisoners of war and those missing in action, we must never forget that we are speaking of tragedy. Our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE), seeks to remind us of that fact when he says:

A child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?" ... How long?

I make this point, Mr. Speaker, because I fear that some groups and individuals have forgotten the human tragedy involved here and that some have sought to make this their own, private ideological issue. This is a national tragedy, Mr. Speaker, and it is a national issue. Let no one say that a person's desire for an end to the tragic conflict in Southeast Asia indicates that he is not concerned about the plight of our prisoners of war and those missing in action. Let no one base an individual's concern upon his support of or opposition to Vietnamization, or the Cambodian invasion, or the Laotian operation or on any other aspect of the overall conflict. Those who do so impugn the dignity, the morality, and the compassion of all Americans.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, desirable expressions of concern for these brave men have all too often been smothered in pagentry to the point that the solemnity of the occasion has been forgotten. I am reminded of the comments of columnist Jimmy Breslin, who appeared on the "Tonight Show" following the bowl games on New Year's Day. He said, as I remember it:

I am disgusted by these exhibitions. Have any of you been in jail for one day? Can you imagine what it must be like to be in prison for five years? This is a tragedy, and yet people are using it as a subject for half-time shows at football games.

I think it is important for all of us to understand and appreciate what Mr. Breslin was saying.

Finally, of course, we must recognize that, regardless of our good intentions, our efforts in behalf of prisoners of war and those missing in action have been, in most cases, exercises in futility. As our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) said last week:

I have talked a great deal with many POW-MIA wives. They have told me they have had more than enough of being patted on the head and praised for their bravery. They have had enough of writing letters to Hanoi. None of this has brought their husbands one step nearer to release.

Let us face the fact that our attempts to free these men and to bring them safe-

ly home have met with little success. More importantly, let us realize that it may take a resolution of the overall conflict to bring about the conditions under which these men can be returned home. To do less is to ignore the reality of the situation.

I, for one, am convinced that the time has come for the United States to disengage from the tragic struggle in Southeast Asia. It is my firm belief that withdrawal may result in the freeing of our prisoners of war and the return of many of those missing in action. I shall continue to support this step as the most realistic in terms of bringing these men home.

In the meantime, however, I urge my colleagues and the American people to remember the significance of this week. This is a time for national concern, for national reflection, for national prayer. Let us pray for the deliverance of these brave men, and let us pray that others will never have to repeat their tragic ordeal.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has signed into law a resolution declaring this week—March 21–27—as National Week of Concern for Our Prisoners of War and Our Men Missing in Action.

Although there may be differences of opinion as to the conduct of the war in Indochina, there should be complete unity in the purpose of obtaining an early and honorable release of our men held in captivity. Each day adds an additional burden for these men who have suffered so long.

Recalling the words of Gen. Douglas MacArthur: "Duty, honor, country."

I cannot help but feel that these men have performed the ultimate duty for their country and that in our small way we should accord them the honor that they deserve.

I wish to join in the Nation's deep sympathy and concern for the wives, the children, the parents, and the loved ones of those prisoners. The agony of the long separation has not prevented them from showing determined courage.

As a cosponsor of the resolution, I believe we should not only have concern but that we should forcefully register our protest over the inhumane treatment our men are receiving at the hands of the North Vietnamese, in violation of the Geneva Convention. These brave men are not forgotten. The Hanoi regime must be made to realize that it has nothing to gain by its continued barbaric policy toward our prisoners of war.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker I am happy to have this opportunity to join with our colleagues in the House of Representatives in this special observance of the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

The plight of American servicemen who are held captive in Southeast Asia is a problem of pressing national concern and must be constantly on the minds of our people as we contemplate the future of American involvement in Southeast Asia.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years it has been the task of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Na-

tional Security Policy and Scientific Developments, of which I am chairman, to conduct hearings on the prisoner-of-war issue and to consider the resolutions relating to that problem which have been sponsored by many Members of Congress.

In November 1969, the subcommittee held the first series of hearings in Congress dealing directly with the situation of American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia.

As the result of those hearings, the subcommittee reported out a resolution which was approved by the House of Representatives by a vote of 405 to 0 and subsequently passed by the Senate, again by a unanimous vote.

The text of that resolution follows:
[H. Con. Res. 454, 91st Cong., second sess.]

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas more than one thousand three hundred members of the United States Armed Forces are prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia; and

Whereas North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam have refused to identify prisoners they hold, to allow impartial inspection of camps, to permit free exchange of mail between prisoners and their families, to release seriously sick or injured prisoners, and to negotiate seriously for the release of all prisoners and thereby have violated the requirement of the 1949 Geneva Convention on prisoners of war, which North Vietnam ratified in 1957; and

Whereas the twenty-first International Conference of the Red Cross, meeting in Istanbul, Turkey, on September 13, 1969, adopted by a vote of 114 to 0 a resolution calling on all parties to armed conflicts to ensure humane treatment of prisoners of war and to prevent violations of the Geneva Convention; and

Whereas the United States has continuously observed the requirements of the Geneva Convention in the treatment of prisoners of war; and

Whereas the United States Government has repeatedly appealed to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front to comply with the provisions of the Geneva Convention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress strongly protests the treatment of United States servicemen held prisoner by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, calls on them to comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention, and approves and endorses efforts by the United States Government, the United Nations, the International Red Cross, and other leaders and peoples of the world to obtain humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war.

Executive branch officials have assured me on numerous occasions of the value of that resolution in official United States representations on the POW issue.

The resolution demonstrated that whatever Members of Congress may feel about involvement in Southeast Asia, they are united in their concern for the prisoners, many of whom will begin their seventh year in captivity soon.

In 1970, the subcommittee once again held hearings on the prisoner-of-war problem. Those hearings had several objectives:

First, to demonstrate the continuing, deep concern of the Congress over the fate of the prisoners of war;

Second, to bring the Members up to

date on developments and events relating to the POW problem which had occurred in the months since the 1969 sessions;

Third, to consider several resolutions relating to the prisoners of war which had been introduced in the interim; and

Fourth, to create a hearing record—a document to which interested persons might refer in order to be informed about the scope of the problem.

As a direct result of the hearings, the subcommittee took two additional actions:

First, it arranged for the printing of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, including the reservations to the convention filed by nations participating in hostilities in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. That document previously had not been available for distribution to interested Americans; and

Second, the subcommittee took ownership of a display on POW's which was on view in the crypt of the Capitol last summer and fall.

Because of its understanding of the seriousness of the problem of our prisoners and missing in Southeast Asia, the subcommittee is conducting a third series of hearings which began today.

This morning the subcommittee heard from one of the nine American prisoners released by the North Vietnamese, Col. Norris Overly. Colonel Overly, now attending the War College here in Washington, described his capture in October 1967, after his aircraft had been shot down just north of the demilitarized zone in North Vietnam, his treatment at the hands of his captors, and his ultimate release.

We also heard testimony from representatives of the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia. Statements were given by Mrs. Carol North of Wellfleet, Mass., president of the league and the wife of a prisoner; Mrs. Joan Vinson of Alexandria, Va., national coordinator of the league, whose husband is listed as missing in action; Mrs. Evelyn Grubb of Colonial Heights, Va.; and Mr. Charles Havens III, legal counsel to the league.

Tomorrow the hearings will resume in the House Foreign Affairs Committee room 2172, with our witnesses being Col. Frank Borman, the President's special representative for prisoner-of-war affairs, and representatives of the American National Red Cross.

Two days have been set aside for Members of Congress to testify—Thursday, March 25, and Tuesday, March 30. I invite all Members of this body who wish to participate to do so—either by attending the forthcoming sessions or by providing testimony, either in person or by submitting a statement for the record.

There will also be sessions on Wednesday, March 31. Appearing at that time will be representatives of the Committee of Liaison with Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam. They will include Mrs. Cora Weiss, Mr. Stewart Meacham, and Prof. Richard Falk. Also appearing will be Dr. Michael Jacobson of the Washington Committee to Put

the POW Issue Into Perspective. We have invited testimony from these groups because the subcommittee is interested in hearing every point of view on the POW issue. On Thursday, April 1, the subcommittee will hear representatives from the Department of State and Department of Defense.

Following the end of hearings the subcommittee will immediately work to bring out a resolution on prisoners of war/missing in action which will allow this 92d Congress an opportunity to again express its view on the problem.

Mr. Speaker, ultimately it will be deeds, not words, which will lead to the release of our prisoners of war. But words of discussion must precede the decisions on how the United States must proceed in this situation. Through the current hearings, as well as through observances such as this special order, we hope to provide some of the words that will lead to a decision which will ultimately reunite the prisoners of war with their loved ones here at home.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are 1,600 men rotting alive in ratholes in North Vietnam. These are American fighting men. Many have now been reduced to the physical and psychological level of the inhabitants of Dachau and Buchenwald. Some have been there for as long as 7 years—twice the entire period of World War II. All attempts to retrieve these men have been rejected by a ruthless and cruel regime in Hanoi. But we in Congress must not forget, nor must we lessen our efforts to free these brave men who have endured so much for their country.

On this day in Congress we must reaffirm and rededicate our efforts on their behalf.

We must arouse in the American people a renewed awareness of the plight of these men.

We must tell Hanoi and the world in a single national voice—loud and clear—that the Members of this body remember the perfidy of the leaders of that bandit nation.

It was 25 years ago that one of the more perceptive of our enemies wrote of a similar act of brutality, in effect: I am afraid that all we have accomplished is to awaken a sleeping giant and install in him a terrible resolve.

Let Hanoi know of the resolve of the U.S. Congress at this atrocious handling of a group of men who now represent a cause for millions upon millions of American people.

Let Hanoi know that the sleeping giant is reaching the end of its patience.

Let Hanoi know that, just as the massacre at Malmedy steeled the resolve of the American soldier to avenge his murdered comrades, the mental and physical torture of our 1,600 POW's, rather than crushing the will of the American people, will make us more determined than ever to stop the aggression of North Vietnam, restore a just peace to Southeast Asia and free our heroic prisoners of war.

We have begun to weaken the seemingly impenetrable barrier of ignorance Hanoi has put up to defend herself from the siege of pleas from this country and

other countries in behalf of our brave men. Hanoi is not unresponsive to the pressure of world opinion and to the flow of millions upon millions of letters, and to the efforts of so many people in this country to free our men. In my district alone we sent over 200,000 letters to North Vietnam in behalf of our men.

Based on the small successes and responses from Hanoi over the last year, I know now that Hanoi is not deaf. Hanoi will respond.

We must redouble our efforts.

We must continue to show the concern the American people have for our countrymen.

Hanoi shall yield.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in the House today in expressing concern for the American servicemen being held by North Vietnam.

I know that our proclamation of March 21-27 as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action" comes from our own deep concern for the plight of these brave men as well as from tremendous resolve on the part of every American.

Mr. Speaker, as an expression of that resolve the citizens of Hudson County held their own prisoner of war rally on March 7, sponsored by the Hudson County Committee of the American Legion at Martin Luther King High School in Jersey City, N.J. I was privileged to address that rally and, as part of this congressional observance, am including my remarks in the Record. I am also including the remarks of the Honorable Thomas J. Whelan, mayor of Jersey City; the Reverend James Schneider; and Joseph F. Ward, past State commander of the American Legion Department of New Jersey.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOMINICK V. DANIELS OF NEW JERSEY

Ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored today to have been asked to join in this expression of unity. In these troubled times it is gratifying to see that Americans will come together—together to support prisoners of a war which has caused so much dissension, mistrust, and violence at home as well as on the battlefield.

There is no other issue upon which so many Americans are as unified. There is no national issue which stirs as much grief as that for the condition of the prisoners, as much resolution and defiance against the North Vietnamese, or as much horror at the brutal disregard for basic humanitarianism upon the part of their captors.

In the Congress, in spite of division on other issues of the war both the House of Representatives and the Senate were unanimous in their resolution that the North Vietnamese be forced to live up to the basic principles of the Geneva Convention.

In spite of the unity of the American people and their leaders on this issue, North Vietnam, which has continuously parlayed the dissent in this country into a propaganda advantage, has refused to acknowledge the humanitarian entreaties of both hawks and doves. Both Senators Edward Kennedy and William Fulbright, opponents of our presence in Vietnam as well as Senators Robert Griffin and Robert Dole, avowed hawks, have been rebuffed by Hanoi.

Entreaties on behalf of the prisoners have been made by His Holiness, Pope Paul, by Swedish Prime Minister Olaf Palme, by

Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, as well as Iron Curtain leaders. All have been coldly and heartlessly rebuffed.

We have not only made humanitarian appeals. We have attempted to negotiate directly on the issue in Paris. We have appealed to international leaders and heads of state to intercede. Wealthy private individuals have even offered a ransom of a hundred million dollars. All who have sought to obtain justice have sought in vain.

In spite of the otherwise consistent American position that Hanoi must negotiate with South Vietnam on all issues, we have directly appealed to the North Vietnamese government and to its delegation in Paris in order to obtain the release of American POWs.

The then American ambassador to the Paris Talks, David Bruce, has offered to exchange ten prisoners for every American returned by Hanoi. The Hanoi delegation response was cold and cruel silence.

We have done everything humanly possible, short of outright destruction of North Vietnamese cities, to obtain release of these men or, failing that, assurances of their decent treatment.

It is apparent to the entire world that Hanoi violates not only the spirit but the letter of all international treaties and codes on the treatment of prisoners. Hanoi's actions are in violation of all civilized law and justice. By holding our servicemen hostage, North Vietnam violates every rule of international law, every tenet of human decency.

There is no longer any question before the world, but that North Vietnam has branded itself an international outlaw.

It is apparent that, in spite of Hanoi's propaganda, attempts to martial American public opinion to its side, its actions against American prisoners of war have hardened even many of the so-called doves against the North Vietnamese.

Public opinion is weapon to Hanoi. It is one they both fear and use. We must therefore stiffen our unity and our solid support for our servicemen. We must be resolute in our condemnation of the Hanoi government for their barbaric disregard for human worth and law.

Holding our servicemen hostage will do Hanoi no good. We are not going to desert our men. We are not going to leave them unprotected in a hostile and alien land, prisoners of a people who have already shown so little regard for human life. I tell you here and now, I would not support—nor will there be—a cessation of hostilities against North Vietnam until the Communists are prepared to provide for the release of all American servicemen.

REMARKS OF HON. THOMAS J. WHELAN

Mr. Chairman, Comrades and Fellow Americans: Let me say at the very outset that it is a privilege and an honor to join you here today in this demonstration of solidarity.

There can be no more noble thought or action by Americans than to join in this grand movement . . . to effectuate the speedy release of our prisoners of war by the Hanoi government . . . and to guarantee their humane treatment while we await that happy day.

Please do sign your name to the petitions . . . and urge your family members, your friends and neighbors to do likewise.

We want those deprived Americans back on American soil, back with their parents, wives and children. . . . And we can help to bring that about.

My message is brief. But I wish to offer this prayer for our country . . . which I recently read, and which I think speaks for all of us here today. It goes:

Dear Father of all mankind, Thank You for our great country and its splendid heritage. Bless America and grant that she may remain forever free, strong and true to her

ideals. Bless the President, congress and all the public servants of our nation. Guide and lead them that they may faithfully serve Thee and the people who elected them.

Grant them true judgment, clear vision and great daring that they may right wrong and minister to the suffering and forlorn.

Consecrate our time, our energy, our talents that we may dwell in peace, honor and love, and that in all things our nation may be pleasing to Thee.

We especially ask Thy blessing for those families who grieve and sorrow for their loved ones who have fallen into the hands of our nation's foes.

Reach out and gather to Thy heart these suffering families, comfort them with the knowledge of Thy loving presence and care. Be with them now in their hour of sorrow and need. . . . Amen.

I commend the American Legion's Hudson County Committee for sponsoring this truly patriotic program. And I offer my congratulations, humbly, to Commander Elder and to Comrade Pisano for their efforts.

I do earnestly hope this work will not have been done in vain. Let this message go out loud and clear to the butchers of Hanoi: America will not stand idly by and let our boys be brutalized and murdered by the Communist butchers.

We must—you and I and all Americans—we must stand united today behind our boys . . . just as all America stood behind each of us in earlier wars.

With our united will and our firm resolve, we can get our men home safely.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF REV. JAMES SCHNEIDER

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, My Comrades-in-Arms, and Fellow Americans: This rally today is long over-due. It is about time that we laid aside all our personal and partisan differences and came together, as we have today, to tell the world that we are not only sick and tired, but that we are justly outraged over the criminal and inhumane treatment afforded by the Communist enemy of our prisoners of war. All the duly proclaimed rules and regulations for the treatment of war prisoners, rules and regulations commonly agreed to under the Geneva Convention and subscribed to by all civilized peoples throughout the world, have been scuttled by the Reds in the unimaginably cruel treatment which are meting out to our fellow Americans.

In World War I and in World War II, we were proud of our fighting men. We were deeply concerned over our prisoners of war, taken by the Nazi Germans and the Japanese. Everyone, then, seemed to see the threat of Fascism engulfing the world. And, to a man and a woman, we were united in the struggle to end the spread of Hitler and his Axis allies.

Our Jewish Americans were aroused over the cruelties which the insane Hitler was inflicting on their co-religionists. What about threat of Communism? Is not anti-Semitism rife in Soviet Russia today? Is not the Soviet Union behind the attacks on the State of Israel? Isn't Soviet Russia arming and supplying the Arab states? Is not Soviet Russia which stands up on the floor of the United Nations, at every opportunity, and apologizes for the unjust and unprovoked incursions and invasions of the Jewish homeland?

The threat of world Communist domination is just as real and just as dangerous as the threat of Hitler and Fascism ever dared to be. If you have any doubt about it, read the Communist Bible: Communist Manifesto and Das Capital by Karl Marx, read the writings of Lenin, read the speeches of the more recent Communist statesman, and recall the ringing words of the jolly little Red who cried: "We will bury you."

And, do not be misled by those who would have you believe that present day communism is different from the old brand. The leopard never changes its spots. Its program is still world conquest. Its tactic is still divide and conquer. The Kremlin still believes that it can take over free nations, by creating disorders within them and bush-fires all over the world. They are still Anti-Church, Anti-Family, Anti-Freedom, and Anti-God.

There is room in this free land for legitimate protest and for the right to petition government for a redress of grievances. Our laws provide for the rights of those who hold that to fight in any war is against their religious scruples. But, there is no room in this land for those who seek the protection of our Constitution and our laws, while trampling on the American flag, burning draft cards, and marching down our public thoroughfares carrying the Viet Cong Flag—the banner of the enemy—while our American boys are fighting and dying in the rice paddies of Viet Nam. I declare such conduct to be outright treason.

And, I boldly state today that the division in our country, the careless utterances of some of our highly placed American public officials that the Viet Nam war is "immoral" and that we should withdraw, at once and unilaterally, in short, that we should hoist the white flag and abjectly surrender, is giving aid and comfort to the enemy in time of war. And, I charge that it is this kind of public utterance that is encouraging the Red High Command in North Viet Nam, advised and backed by the Red Chinese, to hold our young Americans incommunicado. It is a war of nerves. It is psychological. They want to wear down our American mothers and fathers, and force them in desperation to cry out to Washington: "We can not stand it any longer. Let them have their way, at any cost. For God's sake, bring our boys back home."

But, I remind you of a gallant young American standing on the steps of our capitol in Washington. I hear him saying: "Americans will endure any sacrifice to contain the enemies of freedom." These words in John F. Kennedy's Inaugural Address were toasted from The Washington Post to The New Yorker and back, as the essence of American chivalry. I reiterate them today, at the expense of embarrassment to some of his former friends. They want the United States to go out of the business of defending other countries, who want to defend themselves against aggression. Aggression by totalitarian powers. Apparently, they do not care if the whole world is put behind the Iron and Bamboo curtains. Thirty odd years ago, they would be called America Firsters Isolationists. And these terms were used by the Liberals as expressions of derision.

But, Jesus the Christ, who I accept as my Lord and Master, taught that "We are our brothers keeper." And, Thomas Paine, one of our first great American crusaders for freedom, wrote: "He who would make his own liberty secure, must guard even his enemy from oppression, for failing in this, he establishes a precedent that may reach even unto himself."

So, say this is not just another patriotic meeting—though God knows, we need a big dose of patriotism these days, for what is patriotism but love of country. And, if we do not love our country, who will?

But, this is more than just another patriotic gathering. It is a genuine protest rally—A conclave of outraged Americans. Gathered here in this beautiful new school house, named in honor of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who fought and died for equal rights for his people, we, Black and White, young and old, Democrats and Republicans, but Americans all, cry out in One Voice the Biblical chant of old: "Let Our People Go."

Let the determined voice of Jersey City and Hudson County, on this holy day, be joined with the prayers and the outcries of similar rallies being held today from one end of this State to the other. We say to our Government in Washington, stand firm and make positive demands of the Red foe to give us a complete list of Americans held prisoners of war. Give us the right to have them correspond with their loved ones back home and give their mothers, their wives, their sweethearts the right to freely correspond with them held in your war prisons. Stop your blackmail, of denying humane treatment of our boys who are in your clutches, because it won't work. Americans are not easily intimidated. We come from a long race, which historically has declared to all the world: "Millions for defense. Not one cent for tribute."

Your ill treatment of our boys will unite us, not divide us. Your making us mad. And, when Americans get really mad, and become united, watch out. Then, we will fight until hell freezes over.

As a Christian clergyman, as a veteran and a past County Commander of the American Legion, and as a plain American, I feel privileged for the opportunity you have afforded me today to join in this appeal on behalf of our fine American boys, suffering and rotting in Red prison camps, thousands of miles removed from their loved ones and home.

Oh, God grant us the strength to endure these outrages. And, in the words of the Great Abraham Lincoln:

"Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk. And, until every drop of blood drawn with the lash, shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousands years ago. So still it must be said: That the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

REMARKS OF JOSEPH F. WARD

Can you imagine how it must feel for a woman for over five to six years, not knowing if she is a wife or a widow?

How it must feel for a five year old child who has never seen his father and doesn't know if his father is alive or dead??

Or how a mother or father must feel not knowing if their son is alive or dead???

Well, over 1,600 families feel like this today. Over 1,600 American Servicemen are prisoners of war in Communist prison camps. The condition of their confinement is so inhumane that these men are frequently referred to today as "the forgotten Americans."

Some of these American prisoners-of-war have been held in captivity as long as six years. The enemy in Hanoi treats these Americans as little more than political pawns. The enemy affords these Americans little, if any, of the civilized treatment and dignity they are deserving of as a prisoner of war under the Geneva Convention.

The provisions for the treatment of prisoners of war in the Geneva Convention of 1949 has been signed by more than 120 nations, including the United States, South Vietnam and North Vietnam. The humanitarian standards spelled out in that document call for:

1. Immediate release of sick, injured and wounded prisoners.
2. Impartial inspection of prisoner facilities.
3. Complete identification of all men held.
4. Allow the rights of prisoners to correspond freely with their families.

The North Vietnamese, the Viet Cong and the Pathet Lao have consistently violated each one of these simple international standards of conduct.

Prisoners have not been allowed to write to their relatives. Although prisoners may write two letters per month, a letter has never been received by a prisoner of war family in the United States.

There never has been an impartial examination of prisoner facilities and Hanoi has never released a list of captives.

The neglect, brutality and even murder perpetrated on the prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese is the most inhumane treatment of prisoners of any known war.

Approximately two and one half weeks ago, at the Legion's National Mid-Winter Conference held in Washington, D.C., I had the opportunity to hear a former prisoner of war, Colonel Norris Overly describe the treatment he received as a prisoner of war of the North Vietnamese. It was shocking to hear the treatment he received. Captured in September 1967, it took him more than six weeks to travel from the point of captivity to his final prison camp in Hanoi. Traveling by truck at night and staying in local villages by day, he was at the mercy of the villagers each day. Tied in the center of a village, all villagers had opportunity to pass by and review and do anything they wanted. Some hit the officer, some would spit on him, children would hit him in the face with rocks and even went to the point of urinating on him.

Why the Colonel was released six months after capture is unknown but most believe that since he was in better physical condition being held captive for six months than other prisoners held for three, four, five and six years, his health condition would make a better impression on world opinion as to the general health of prisoners being held in North Vietnam.

At the present time, North Vietnam will not bargain with our government to release or fairly treat the prisoners.

But they are sensitive to popular criticism and might release them if they heard and believed a mass of protest directed to the North by the American people.

The posture of Communist is that they are at war with our government, not the American people and are engaged in a battle of the minds of Americans.

They have nothing but contempt for captives—their own and ours; and they do not believe that we—Americans—care for those of our own who have been captured.

What is needed is every possible evidence that Americans in general hold the North Vietnamese is repugnance for their inhumane treatment to prisoners.

That is why we are here today in this school in Hudson County and Legionnaires and interested citizens from our other 20 countries are holding rallies similar to this at this very moment to show that "WE DO CARE".

We of the American Legion believe that these prisoners who have endured so much in the uniform of their country, deserve a better fate than has been theirs to date.

The National Commander of the American Legion, described the plight of these Americans as "a shock to the conscience of all civilized". We have placed top priority on the task of focusing public attention on the plight of these Americans.

The American Legion's total effort in this area will be the emphasis on the issue that when it comes to the Prisoner of War issue, that we are a united nation . . . and we will demonstrate this fact to the Communist world.

We are asking you, the American public, every one, whether you are a dove, or a hawk, for or against the war. Democrat or Republican—that when it comes to the inhumane treatment of the Prisoner of War that we will all join together and build up public support and interest for our Prisoners of War by signing petitions, writing letters and supporting public demonstrations.

The Communists are now starting to carry an embarrassing burden of worldwide ill will for the treatment of Prisoners of War. The foreign press is now starting to criticize North Vietnam for the inhumane treatment to Prisoners of War.

The Communists can ride the tide of criticism if it is only a 7 day wonder but if the criticism keeps up, it will become an albatross around their necks.

They are trying to sell themselves to the "people" of the world but what they are doing to our Prisoners of War is repulsive and inhumane. Never let them or the world forget it.

The name of the game will have to be persistence. Keep writing letters, keep up the protest, never let this die but continue to make it grow.

We ask you to help swell the public interest in every way that we in the American Legion and other organizations will suggest from time to time.

We call upon you to help in this humane cause and your efforts will be so important. Every effort no matter how small will be important.

In closing I would like to quote a young man, a former graduate who attended American Legion Boys State and who addressed this county committee convention in August:

"I am only one but I am one. I can't do everything—but I can do something."

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of House Joint Resolution 20 authorizing the President to proclaim a Week of Concern for Prisoners of War, I am glad to have the opportunity to participate in this program to focus world attention on the plight of those brave Americans who are believed to be prisoners of war in North Vietnam or are still listed as missing in action in the Vietnam conflict.

We must not forget the heartbreak and anguish of the families and loved ones of these men who must suffer through the uncertainty of a situation unparalleled in our Nation's history. My heart goes out to them as they wait—and hope—and pray.

Because of my deep and continuing concern, I have also joined in sponsoring a resolution calling for the humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war held by the Vietcong and North Vietnam. A similar resolution was passed by the Congress last year, but I feel we must not relax our efforts now. The Defense and State Departments have said that Hanoi is sensitive to American public opinion—and it is felt that the adoption of a similar resolution this year will be helpful in our continuing efforts to focus world opinion on Hanoi for its refusal to abide by the Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War to which it acceded in 1957.

Certainly, every possible action must be taken through all available means to arouse world opinion to insure that the tenets of fair and humane treatment be accorded those who are held as prisoners of war and that the Government of North Vietnam and its allies identify these prisoners—release those seriously injured or chronically ill—permit impartial inspection of all prisoner-of-war facilities—and allow the free exchange of mail with their families. These are not unreasonable requests. They are required by the Geneva Convention. The convention calls for

nothing more than humanitarian conduct—and that is what we must continue to insist upon.

I am hopeful that actions such as we are taking today will demonstrate to the Government of North Vietnam the strong feelings of the American people about the prisoner-of-war issue. There no longer should be any doubts about the unanimity of our feelings on this matter.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to those of my colleagues who have expressed concern, alarm and indignation over the deplorably inhumane treatment being given our gallant servicemen who are held captive in Southeast Asia. Of all the major problems and difficulties now confronting us in Southeast Asia none is more agonizing and frustrating.

Only the enemy knows how many Americans have been taken prisoner in Southeast Asia. At the present time, there are 1,500 Americans listed as prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia. Some of these men have been held prisoner by the enemy for more than 6 years and some 300 of them have been imprisoned longer than any U.S. serviceman was held prisoner during all of World War II.

As chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security, I have become personally acquainted with the problems of the prisoners of war. Navy Lt. Robert Frishman and Navy enlisted man Douglas Hegdahl in testimony before the committee vividly portrayed the cruel and inhumane treatment given American prisoners of war in North Vietnam—prisoners confined in cages; prisoners being hung from the ceiling, beatings, and grossly inadequate medical care. There is also evidence that some prisoners have been subjected to diabolic psychological torture in order to extort false confessions from them. The enemy has shown us what happens to a man held in isolation for long periods of time. Such isolation in some cases reduces a man to a state of half-animal, half-human, battered with lies until the truth is wholly unreal. This was the fate of naval officer Richard Stratton, for one, who when put on display by his Communist captors, behaved like a robot, bowing deeply on command, otherwise standing motionless, eyes blank. These atrocities are primarily aimed at disrupting the morale of our Armed Forces. All of our brave men fighting in Southeast Asia are keenly aware that they face torture and inhumane treatment if taken prisoner.

North Vietnam, a signatory to the 1949 Geneva Convention, obviously has no respect for the provisions of the convention and has nothing but contempt for those who question its actions. In a feeble attempt at explanation, the North Vietnamese have insisted that captured American servicemen are not war prisoners but "war criminals" and as such are not subject to the provisions of the Geneva Convention. This claim is patently absurd. Article 4A of the convention defines prisoners of war as "members of the armed forces of a party to the conflict." Article 2 specifically states that the convention applies "in

all cases of a declared war or of any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the high contracting parties even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them."

In contrast, the U.S. Government and the Government of South Vietnam have carefully complied with all provisions of the Geneva Convention. North Vietnamese forces captured in South Vietnam by the allies are detained in prisoner-of-war camps which are inspected regularly by the International Committee of the Red Cross. In accordance with the Geneva Convention, sick and wounded prisoners have been released and repatriated to North Vietnam. Such treatment has been provided not only because it is required by the Geneva Convention but also because it is the civilized thing to do. Regrettably, the North Vietnamese have not followed our example.

Important propaganda victories have been won by the militant antiwar forces in the United States whose leaders have taken custody of some American prisoners released by the North Vietnamese. In addition, the North Vietnamese from time to time have released incomplete lists of captive Americans to militant antiwar groups in a further propaganda effort. These devices are utilized by the enemy to lower the morale of the American people by showing that the antiwar forces in the United States have been more successful in negotiating than our State Department.

Another propaganda technique utilized by the enemy has been "staged" film activities in prisoner-of-war camps in a barbaric attempt to deceive the world that our prisoners were being well treated and were permitted to correspond freely with their families. In addition, some of the grief-stricken wives of our prisoners of war have been subjected to a barrage of Communist propaganda and to a series of false promises. It has been particularly tragic that the enemy, in addition to the inhumane treatment of our prisoners of war, has chosen to exploit their loved ones.

We can look through the breadth and scope of world history and we shall not find an example to compare with the despicable behavior of the North Vietnamese. Their persistent refusal to furnish a complete list of all U.S. prisoners of war, to release those who are sick and wounded, to permit inspection of prison facilities, and to permit the regular flow of mail to prisoners continues to cause untold grief for thousands of American families. The failure of the Hanoi government to disclose the names of prisoners of war in addition to evidencing a callous disregard for other provisions of the Geneva Convention provides a basis for suspicion that the North Vietnamese do not wish to be held accountable for the prisoners they capture.

The deplorably inhumane treatment of our captive servicemen must be brought to an end. I do not agree with those who contend that any people barbaric enough to commit such atrocities against our prisoners of war cannot be forced to engage in acts of humanitarianism. I am certain that the North Vietnamese are

sensitive to world opinion. The growing involvement by large segments of American people concerned about this despicable circumstance, which causes unnecessary anguish to our gallant men and their loved ones, is having its effect on the North Vietnamese. World opinion—even among European Communist nations, is beginning to pressure the North Vietnamese Government to abide by the Geneva Convention and the law of human decency in providing humane treatment of our prisoners of war. This is an encouraging sign, but we must continue to aggressively pursue the objectives of humane treatment and repatriation of our valiant men at the earliest possible time. We must never permit our prisoners of war and their families to become the forgotten people of the war.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in this observance of a National Week of Concern for our Prisoners of War and those who are Missing in Action, as designated by House Joint Resolution 16.

The Department of Defense now estimates that there are some 1,605 Americans either held prisoner by the Communists or missing in action. The families of those men know little, or in most cases nothing, about their husbands, sons, or fathers, and some of these men have been missing as long as 7 years.

Every conceivable effort has been brought to bear on the Communists to release these men, or at least to release the information about them that is required by the Geneva Convention. For 5 years there has been intense American diplomatic effort, yet North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front still refuse to give even minimal cooperation, though in the past year they have released more information than they have ever done before, but still not what is required by the Geneva accord.

National and world opinion agree that the treatment of our men by the Communists is outrageous and an affront to human decency. The United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution on December 9 which calls on "all parties to any armed conflict to comply with the terms and provisions of the Geneva Convention Relative to Prisoners of War."

Here in the House we have repeatedly reflected our sense of outrage and concern by activities such as this week's special observance. In December, I was an original sponsor, with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), of a resolution praising the attempt to rescue American POW's at Son Tay in North Vietnam, and calling upon our negotiators in Paris to make some progress on this prisoner-of-war issue before any permanent agreement is entered into.

That resolution, which also charged North Vietnam with inhumane treatment of American POW's, passed the House 347 to 15. I am proud to say, and was forwarded to the North Vietnamese in Paris.

In December of 1969 both Houses of Congress also passed legislation, which I too cosponsored, urging the North Vietnamese Government and the National

Liberation Front to comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention and pressing the administration to take all appropriate steps to obtain the prompt release of prisoners. And last August I joined in signing a letter with some 400 other Members demanding that America POW's receive humane treatment and that Hanoi abide by the Geneva Convention Relating to Treatment of POW's. That letter was hand delivered to the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ZION).

In addition to these official efforts, hundreds of thousands of letters and petitions have been presented to the North Vietnamese and families of the POW's and MIA's have organized massive efforts which include acting as personal diplomats by going to Paris to plead with the Communists negotiators.

This public opinion, as I have observed, has had some effect. Hanoi has now released 368 names and, whereas a year ago letters from only 100 POW's had been received, now about 330 have been allowed to send some mail.

But these Communist concessions are still minor and are obviously designed more as propaganda moves than real concessions as they continue to use our American prisoners primarily as political hostages. The list of names that has been released does not contain all the names or all the information. The Department of Defense knows the names of at least 40 more men held prisoner whose names are not on the list. Apparently it takes about 100,000 letters to protest from the free world to squeeze one additional letter out of the prison camps. So that is awfully slow going. The sick and the wounded have not been released, and neutral observers have not been allowed to inspect the prisons, both actions required by the Geneva Convention.

The pressure certainly must continue, even though the results have been skimpy and slow in coming. But there are, I believe, two other points to remember. First, we must constantly be on the alert for reasonable opportunities to rescue these men; and, second, we must make it clear, as the President has done, that until these prisoners have been released, America will keep some residual force in South Vietnam.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, we are grateful to all those in the Congress and around the country who have helped to spearhead this "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action." It provides an opportunity for all our countrymen to focus world attention upon the desperate condition of those kept behind enemy lines in Southeast Asia. It gives us a chance to renew our commitment to secure the early release and humane treatment of these brave men as well as to offer what comfort we can to their suffering families.

Many times here in the Congress we have reminded the Government of North Vietnam of its obligations as a signatory of the Geneva Convention. That convention obligates the Hanoi leadership to observe a number of humanitarian practices in their treatment of prisoners of

war. They are supposed to release promptly the names of all prisoners. They are obliged to allow free access to prisoners by such neutral international intermediaries as the International Red Cross Committee. They are to provide adequate food and medical care to all prisoners. They are to repatriate the seriously sick or wounded captives. They are to protect prisoners from physical abuse or public humiliation. They are to permit prisoners to send and receive mail.

To date, these obligations have been ignored or sadly abused by the North Vietnamese Government. Despite this callous disregard for international principles of human dignity and decency, President Nixon has repeatedly attempted in a variety of ways to bring about the release of incarcerated Americans. Among these initiatives, on October 7, 1970, he proposed the immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of war held by both sides, including journalists and other civilian victims of the conflict. He asked that these prisoners be released without exception and without prior condition. Such an act "would serve to establish good faith, the intent to make progress, and thus improve the prospects for negotiation," he pointed out.

Sadly, the North Vietnamese have ignored every plea from whatever quarter, however. So it is to the court of world opinion that we now address ourselves. We believe that united world support to remedy the plight of our men can work a miracle. We devoutly hope that it will.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to concur in the sympathies expressed here today, and to congratulate our colleagues who have worked so hard to put this special order together calling attention to National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

Certainly it should be obvious to the world—both Communist and non-Communist nations—that North Vietnam is violating the articles of the Geneva Convention which she agreed to abide by in 1957.

I know that the President is bending every effort to obtain compliance with the Geneva Convention by the North Vietnamese. I would like to point out, however, that the inherent dangers in allowing these violations of international law to go unchallenged is that it makes a mockery of these agreements.

Every nation on this earth—including those that provide support to North Vietnam—should be made to realize that it is in their own interest to see that each nation follows these agreements relating to the treatment of prisoners of war, for every violation weakens the entire fabric of the convention.

The International Committee of the Red Cross declared in 1965 that the Geneva Conventions are fully in force in the Vietnam conflict and that all parties are bound to adhere to its terms. For North Vietnam to contend that the American prisoners which it holds are "war criminals," or "air pirates," is a flimsy subterfuge.

I pray that we find the way to bring about the cooperation of North Vietnam

in respect to these prisoners, and extend my deepest sympathy to the families of those brave men.

Mr. Speaker, the California Legislature passed a joint resolution expressing its concern in regard to the prisoners held by North Vietnam on February 24, 1971. I would like to include that resolution at this point in the RECORD:

Joint resolution relative to prisoners of war

Whereas, The government of North Vietnam is a signatory to the Geneva Conventions, which embody the morality of world citizenship with respect to the treatment of prisoners of war; and

Whereas, The humane treatment, in accordance with the Geneva Conventions, of American men held prisoner by the North Vietnamese is the goal of the American people; and

Whereas, The American people, cognizant that these prisoners are being held under conditions far less than humane, seek adequate food, housing, and medical treatment for these prisoners, as well as inspection by an organization such as the International Red Cross and the constant exchange of mail between the prisoners and their families; and

Whereas, In addition to being a violation of the Geneva Conventions, the policy of the government of North Vietnam of not revealing the names of prisoners being held imposes a cruel situation on American families, in that they have no way of knowing whether members of the families who are missing in action have been taken prisoner or their whereabouts or condition when it is known they are prisoners; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California memorializes the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to take whatever diplomatic steps that may be appropriate to urge the government of North Vietnam to comply with the Geneva Conventions with respect to the treatment of American men who are prisoners in the Vietnam conflict; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join today to express support for the American men being held as prisoners of war in Southeast Asia.

While there are conflicting points of view on the policy to be following in an effort to end the war in Vietnam, there is unanimous agreement that the United States cannot and will not neglect or forget its young men who are prisoners of war.

President Nixon has made it clear that the commitment of this Government to the prisoners of war is unshakable. The President has my unqualified support in this area.

All Americans should pause this week to reflect on the sacrifices the American prisoners of war have made. They should not be forgotten.

They deserve our prayers and support.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, this week we see America united to express its concern over our prisoners of war and men missing in action. This united expression of support for our men and concern over their welfare should serve to

indicate to the world and to Hanoi that America does care about her own, and will not desert them.

I am proud to say that many of my constituents in the 27th District of California have been in the forefront of this concern for several years, and have been unflagging in their efforts to express to Hanoi the American determination that these men shall be treated properly and not used as pawns in the negotiations.

During this National Week of Concern, these efforts have been increased even more. And I know that they will continue. We have awakened the American spirit, the American will to persevere, and the deeply ingrained sense of justice for all men. Hanoi does not realize the strength of our determination on behalf of these men.

Hanoi does not realize that each injustice to our POW's, each maltreatment, each denial of their fundamental human rights is a blow to 200 million Americans, and a blow that does not pass unnoticed. We will not leave Vietnam without these men, and we will not tolerate their continued mistreatment. May this week stand as witness to our determination to that cause.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, this week has been designated National Week of Concern for the Prisoners of War and for the Missing in Action. It is most appropriate for President Nixon to so designate it, and for Congress to observe it, because the plight of the prisoners of war and those missing in action is something which concerns me, and I am sure I speak for every other Member of Congress, every day of the year.

There are few people on earth more helpless than those who become prisoners of war. Even the very term is descriptive of a situation which seems to be unreal—men prisoners of that ugly thing we call war. They are entrapped in circumstances, not of their own personal making, but fashioned by the painful conflict among nations. They are victims of political decisions which seem to be impersonal; but their imprisonment is not impersonal. It is a terribly personal thing, depriving them of liberty and all that goes with liberty, depriving parents of a child, a wife of her husband, children of their father.

Nor has there been any way to tell these men how long their imprisonment might endure. They do not even have the privilege of parole or mandatory release enjoyed by criminals convicted of felonious crimes.

For all these reasons, and for other humanitarian, ethical, and moral considerations, the Geneva Convention governing the treatment of prisoners of war was written.

Mr. Speaker, the observance of the convention concerning prisoners of war is a mark of civilization which every nation should seek to achieve. It is a recognition that the victims of war may just as easily be the fighting men as well as the civilian populace. It is a further recognition of the fact that in every tragic national confrontation there still remains the obligation to dispense mercy where it is possible and where the dispensation of that mercy will in no way

hinder the war effort of a nation which is party to the conflict.

We are asking the leaders of North Vietnam to assume all the obligations of the Geneva Convention concerning the treatment of prisoners of war.

We ask that they supply a complete list of all prisoners held in captivity and that the names of new prisoners be supplied the International Red Cross promptly. There is no dignity in imposing unnecessary and cruel suffering on innocent wives, mothers, or children, who will certainly suffer enough in the simple knowledge that their husband, son, or father is a prisoner. To add to that suffering the agony of uncertainty is beneath the dignity of any nation.

We ask the North Vietnamese to provide the prisoners with decent food, decent clothing, decent shelter. It is a cruel thing for a man to be a prisoner. It is an ignoble thing to attempt to add debasement to the suffering he endures.

We ask, also, for a program of mutual exchange of prisoners, particularly of those who have been wounded or who have become ill, and who are in need of very special treatment or medication. We ask for the beginning of negotiations aimed at the eventual exchange of all prisoners. Surely these requests represent the minimum levels of humanitarianism and decency in international relations.

I urge the leaders of North Vietnam to consider these matters favorably. I do so because of the immense concern I have over the plight of the prisoners of war, and because of my own care over those who are listed missing in action. But in doing so, I would counsel the leaders of North Vietnam that they could accede to these requests out of a motive of self-interest.

No nation, if it is to endure in the international civilized community of man, can afford to have about it the aura of barbarism. To give the prisoners of war treatment less than that prescribed in the Geneva Convention would be barbaric, just as the holding back of the names of those missing in action, but who are in truth prisoners, would be. I would ask the leaders of North Vietnam to remember that, and to remember that history will judge them on many accounts, not the least of which will be the decency they exercised or did not exercise in the treatment of the prisoners of war.

It is indeed a splendid thing that the Members of Congress should remember the prisoners of war and those missing in action through this action today. More than that, however, I would join my voice in a plea to the leaders of all other nations to express their concern over the treatment of these prisoners of war to the North Vietnamese leaders. Other nations, not party to the present tragic conflict in Southeast Asia, may have more persuasive voices in the councils of the leaders of North Vietnam. I would urge them, from the bottom of my heart, to join the people of America in asking those leaders to give the prisoners in North Vietnam the treatment outlined in the Geneva Convention. This is not merely a national concern. It should be

of the highest international concern, because the treatment of any prisoners of any war is a matter that must be studied with deep interest by the entire community of nations.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues that Sunday, March 21, was the start of the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

Last week, Mrs. Donald E. Shay of Linthicum, Md., a constituent of mine and a member of the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, visited me in my office along with Mrs. Menges of Columbia, Md., to brief me on "The Week of Concern for POW's and MIA's."

It is my understanding that there are around 40 families in the State of Maryland with relatives in either the POW or MIA category.

Let us hope and pray that the significance of this week will call to the attention of North Vietnam the provisions contained in the 1949 Geneva Convention for fair and equitable treatment of our POW's and MIA's, to release the names of POW's, to permit the regular flow of mail to or from those prisoners, and to permit inspection of the facilities in which those prisoners are held, and a further hope for the end of this war so that all of our American servicemen can be reunited with their families.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, our wholehearted support for a "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action" springs from our natural sympathy for the grief and suffering of these men and their families and loved ones. Their tragedy is indeed our tragedy, the Nation's tragedy. We will not soon forget the price extracted from them for this terrible war. Their sacrifice magnifies many times and brings close to home the cost of this war in broken lives, desolation, betrayed ideals and loss of faith in the righteousness of our Nation's conduct toward the so-called emerging nations. We have been given a bitter lesson by our mistakes and the lesson has been paid for with their suffering. That is our debt to them. The debt can never be paid in full. We cannot compensate dead men or repay men for prime years lost in the lonely solitude of an enemy prison. But we can at least acknowledge our debt and we can best do this by assuring that other lives are not so wasted in this war, and by assuring that the prisoners be returned to their families and homes as quickly as possible. The first we can accomplish by speedy and complete withdrawal of all our military forces from Vietnam, by a date certain as has been proposed by some of my colleagues and myself. The second we can accomplish by making the return of the prisoners our principal concern—as it is indeed our only legitimate concern—in negotiating the conditions of our withdrawal. Our military involvement in Southeast Asia was a grave mistake, perhaps irremedial. The time is long past due to admit our error and to get out, forgetting hollow slogans about our national honor which some of our leaders falsely claim to be

at stake there. The destiny of Asia will be decided by Asians. Our honor would be best preserved by getting out, bringing those unfortunate prisoners with us.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as one of the Members of the House who has expressed constant interest and concern over the plight of American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia, I appreciate this opportunity to participate in this special order during the "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action."

This Week of Concern will help to bring the POW problem front-stage in the arena of world opinion. It is certainly our hope that during this week the pressures of world opinion will be brought to bear on Hanoi for compliance with the 1949 Geneva Convention on the humane treatment of prisoners. We know that, although North Vietnam ratified that convention in 1957, it has refused to abide by its provisions in the treatment of American prisoners. It has refused to release the names of those being held captive, it has refused to release the sick and wounded, it has refused to permit impartial inspections of prisoner facilities, and it has refused to permit the free exchange of mail between prisoners and their families. We would hope that the other members of the international community, over 120 of whom have signed that convention, will press Hanoi for full compliance with the convention.

Mr. Speaker, may I also advise the House that as President of the U.S. delegation to the U.S. Interparliamentary Union, our U.S. delegation will do all we can to carry this message of concern for POW/MIA to the 70-member nations of that organization. A spring conference of the Interparliamentary Union is scheduled in Caracas, Venezuela, from April 13 through April 18, and we will distribute material to emphasize the points being made in this special order urging that they use the influence of good will they might possess to bring pressure on the North Vietnamese to meet the humanitarian standards of the Geneva Convention.

Mr. Speaker, I especially commend our colleagues, the Honorable Roger H. Zion of Indiana, the Honorable John T. Myers also of Indiana, and the Honorable John B. Anderson of Illinois who have organized this special order and who have given the subject priority attention. Tremendous interest has been generated through the various activities developed in conjunction with the National League of Families and, hopefully, their efforts will be productive.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in observance of the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action. As a cosponsor of the resolution setting this week aside for Americans held captive or missing in Southeast Asia, I wish to lend my voice to the millions of persons throughout the world who are appealing to Hanoi for humanitarian treatment and release of American prisoners of war.

In recent years, our Government has repeatedly appealed to North Vietnam to comply with the 1949 Geneva Convention

on the treatment of prisoners. The 91st Congress passed a resolution condemning the uncivilized brutality inflicted by Hanoi on American prisoners and on their loved ones at home. I have joined many other members of Congress in sponsoring a similar resolution in the 92d Congress.

Thus far, all our efforts seemingly have been in vain. Both the Vietcong and the Government of North Vietnam have refused to identify all prisoners they hold; to allow inspection of prison camps by impartial groups; to permit the unhindered exchange of mail between prisoners and their families; to release seriously injured or sick prisoners; or to negotiate in good faith for the release of all prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, observances like this one in the House today and others throughout the Nation this week serve a twofold purpose. They offer a small measure of reassurance to the families of prisoners and those missing that their fathers, brothers, and sons have not, and will not, be forgotten by the American Government. Second, they put the Government of North Vietnam on notice that the United States will not relent in its efforts to secure proper treatment and eventual release of all American prisoners of war.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the fate of our American prisoners of war now being held in North Vietnam is a matter of deep concern to all Americans.

No matter what our political inclination, we cannot help but share a common bond in our anxiety over the fate of these men.

Violations by the North Vietnamese of the Geneva Convention are shockingly commonplace. I recently cosponsored a resolution protesting these violations and endorsing all national and international organizations in their efforts to affect a release of American prisoners.

As the war continues, the situation in the camps is deteriorating. More and more deaths are being reported and the overall treatment shows no sign of improvement.

One of the cruelest violations of the Geneva Convention provisions is the fact that the Communists will furnish no information on those of our men carried as "missing in action" who they, in fact, know are deceased. The wives of these men do not know whether or not they are widows.

The wives and families of these men—many of whom have endured being separated from their loved ones for as many as 6 years—have suffered tremendously. Children have literally grown up without knowing their fathers. Wives have been forced to rear their families without the benefit of a husband's help. All of this continues without the people at home even knowing if their loved one is still alive. Can you imagine the agony they endure?

Simple humanitarianism is certainly not such a great thing to request. Being able to communicate with his family, receiving adequate medical care, being given sufficient food and clothing, and freedom from cruel and brutal punish-

ment are basic rights of a human being, regardless of whether or not he is a prisoner of war.

The recent effort of our troops to rescue prisoners is commendable. Unfortunately it failed. The bravery displayed in the rescue attempt was of the highest order and it is indeed heart-breaking that no prisoners were found.

The American people must present a united front of support for the POW's since our greatest weapon against Hanoi, at this point, is a show of solidarity. Public opinion in the past has been one of the few levers able to move North Vietnam.

Our cries of outrage in opposition to atrocities committed against American prisoners of war should and must continue. Hopefully, sometime soon they will be heeded.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my distinguished colleagues in paying tribute to our prisoners of war and our many soldiers who are missing in action.

Next Friday, March 26, will mark the 7th anniversary of the capture of the first American still being held by North Vietnam. Today, nearly 1,600 Americans are either being held prisoner or are listed as missing in action in Indochina. Their plight, and the plight of their families, are the source of great sadness for the Nation.

At the beginning of this Congress, I joined over 170 of my colleagues in introducing a resolution to designate the week of March 21 through 27—this week—as a "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action." I indicated at that time that, while it is appropriate to set aside 1 week to register our protest over the treatment our men are receiving at the hands of the North Vietnamese, we must continue our concern for them the other 51 weeks of the year.

Rather, we must take advantage of every opportunity to focus world attention on the plight of the POW's—the refusal of the North Vietnamese to release a complete list of the Americans being held captive, their refusal to release the seriously sick and injured, their refusal to permit the impartial inspection of all POW facilities, and their failure to permit the free exchange of mail.

I hope that all Americans will take advantage of this week of concern to demonstrate their support for our Prisoners of War and Missing in Action, and that all our servicemen—including our prisoners—will soon be home from Indochina.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a prime sponsor of the resolution designating this week, the week of March 21 through 27, as National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action, I urge my colleagues to promote and participate in ceremonies and activities that will help to focus public opinion on this vital issue.

If the concern of the American people about the plight of our 1,600 valiant countrymen who are known prisoners of war or missing in action is focused and

mobilized it may well provide the catalyst necessary to break the resolve of their Asian captors.

In my personal dealings with the North Vietnamese on this very issue, I have learned that one thing the Communists are very susceptible to is American public opinion. Given this susceptibility, it remains for us the elected representatives of the American people working together with administration officials, interested organizations and concerned citizens to rivet the attention of the American people on this issue.

Just this morning, together with about 100 of my colleagues, I attended a POW briefing held by representatives from the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and various branches of the Armed Forces. Among the important things stressed by the briefers was the great potential for agreement with the Communists on the POW issue to be created if the American people could cast their differences about the conduct of the war aside and join together on this one issue.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the plight of our countrymen who are helpless prisoners of an alien enemy demands that the people of this Nation cry out with one voice for justice. Freedom for our fellow Americans and reunion with their loved ones will take nothing less.

Please help make this very special week a success, I beseech all of you.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, somewhere in North Vietnam there are hundreds of American prisoners of war. No one knows exactly where all these men are being held. In fact, no one knows exactly who all the men are. All that is known is that the Government of North Vietnam continues to violate the more basic precepts of civilized behavior by refusing elementary contact with these men.

They have refused to release the names of the men who are being held. They have refused to permit inspection of their quarters by neutral representatives. They have continuously refused to talk seriously about a prisoner exchange.

As a result of these policies, hundreds of American families must live with the fear of the unknown, unsure of their loved one's existence, of his safety, or his health.

Whatever the motives of our enemy, one fact is clear—the American presence in Southeast Asia will continue until our men are returned. This Congress and this Nation shall not forget them. Furthermore, my mail indicates unmistakably a profound conviction that Hanoi is making a grave mistake if it relies on American public opinion to remain docile.

But it is not enough merely to praise their bravery under the most trying circumstances. Nor is it sufficient merely to admire their patriotism. These men need to be returned to their homes and loved ones, and if American public opinion will hasten that return, then it should be focused as rapidly and as massively as possible on the problem.

I endorse the concept of writing to the leaders of North Vietnam and request-

ing a return of our men. I hope every American will take the time to do this. And I stand ready to be of assistance to those who wish information explaining the methods available for writing these men.

Mr. Speaker, someday our men will be home and will be greeted in this Chamber and throughout this Nation with heroes' welcomes. We honor them and their families today with our statements and our prayers. And we look to a merciful God to protect them and bring them safely home to their loved ones.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS) for arranging this discussion of the plight of the hundreds of American servicemen who are either prisoners of war or missing in action as a result of military operations in Southeast Asia.

The occasion, of course, coincides with the observations of the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action designated as a result of House Joint Resolution 16.

There has been considerable effort by many individuals and groups over the long period of time to organize a significant message to Hanoi of the deep concern of our citizens.

Hundreds of individual letters and appeals have been sent both to Hanoi and to the North Vietnamese delegation at the Paris peace talks calling upon North Vietnam to observe the Geneva Convention of 1949 regarding the treatment of prisoners of war.

Whether there is one individual involved or hundreds—as is the case here—the current disregard of the Geneva Convention cannot be tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, I know well of the grief, concern, and frustration which has been inflicted upon so many families by the imprisonment of their loved ones.

Hopefully, the outpouring of sentiment by the American public soon will register with the North Vietnamese and will result in corrective steps that eventually will result in the release of these brave men so they may be reunited with their families.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in an expression of deep concern for the welfare of American soldiers languishing in prison in a distant land while a cruel and costly war grinds on year after year.

It is essential for us to recognize the need for bringing this war to an end so that all of our men can return home and the destruction can be brought to a halt.

But in the meantime, we must work to guarantee the basic right to decent and humane treatment of prisoners of war in Vietnam.

The Geneva Convention offers a sound and proper basis for standards of treatment of prisoners of war, and we must insist that the Government of North Vietnam complies with those provisions.

Names of all the prisoners should be released so that families of these men can know of the condition of their loved ones. Transmission of mail should be guaranteed. Gifts should be permitted. Ample food and medical treatment should be guaranteed.

North Vietnam should be required to submit to unscheduled and scheduled inspections of prison facilities and prisoners by the International Committee of the Red Cross. The Geneva rules require these inspections, and they are a basic, humane guarantee.

The United Nations General Assembly has passed a resolution supporting the contention of the United States that the Geneva system provides the basic measuring rod for the adequacy of treatment standards accorded prisoners of war. All nations should insist upon compliance by North Vietnam with the Geneva requirements.

The International Committee of the Red Cross complained to the Government of South Vietnam last year about keeping prisoners of war at Con Son and other civil prisons. Keeping prisons open to inspection should be required of North Vietnam as it was in South Vietnam.

Such groups as the American Friends Service Committee and the Fellowship of Reconciliation have published accounts of torture being carried out in numerous prisons throughout South Vietnam. These groups should be permitted to make inspections of prisons in the North as well.

We must continue to insist upon humane treatment of prisoners of war, the best of care for the over 300,000 Americans wounded in this war, and meaningful steps to reintegrate our Indochina veterans into American society.

We must seize every opportunity for bringing this long war to a reasonable and honorable end. And we must insist upon the return of all prisoners of war. The welfare of these brave men must not be sacrificed to any cynical disregard in international politics.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, a House joint resolution, proclaiming this week as National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action, was passed unanimously by the House. Thus, it is fitting that we pause today to express our great interest in those of our countrymen who have had to pay the most grievous consequences for doing their duty in the most unpopular war in this country's history.

As a nation, we have, and are paying, numerous prices for our involvement in Southeast Asia. Inflation, student unrest, discontent in our cities—all are linked to our war effort. However, those of our servicemen who are prisoners of war pay the penalty in a most difficult, personal way—the loss of their freedom and separation from their families. I am sure they are enduring their imprisonment with the same courage and devotion to duty they manifested in receiving their combat orders.

Unfortunately, there is no way we can legislate their release. We cannot enact bills that are binding on the North Vietnamese. We can, however, tell the North Vietnamese, and the world, that we do care for the welfare of these men, that we have not forgotten them. This we reiterate today.

Recently, there have been signs that Hanoi has heard the message. The re-

strictions on mail and parcels have been lifted somewhat as North Vietnam began to worry about its international image. North Vietnamese officials, in a few cases, even have responded to queries about the status of certain missing men.

Yet, despite our efforts and those of the administration, and millions of our fellow citizens, the North Vietnamese have refused to discuss the issue. While we have indicated a willingness to exchange prisoners on a basis more than favorable to the North Vietnamese, that Government, for whatever reasons, seems to think it maintains more advantages than disadvantages in refusing to reach a meaningful agreement on this point. Hopefully, by continuing to focus attention on our men, we can increase the pressure of world opinion and weaken their resolve.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to single out for tribute the wives and relatives of these men, particularly those who reside in my district and with whom I have personally worked. They courageously endeavor to lead normal lives despite the great burdens they bear. They are a source of inspiration to all of us.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to participate today in the special order during this Week of Concern for Our Prisoners of War and Those Missing in Action. It is my sincere hope that this week of national concern, which gives all citizens an opportunity to express their feelings, will help focus world attention in the plight of the more than 1,500 heroic young Americans who are in the hands of the North Vietnamese or the Vietcong. Hopefully, it will serve as a warning to those leaders in Hanoi that the American people are fed up with Communist indifference in not opening meaningful discussions regarding the return and exchange of these brave citizens.

I have on several occasions met with the wives and other relatives of these men and expressed to them my 100 percent dedication to the immediate repatriation of their loved ones; and I can better understand the daily anguish suffered by those who wait. This anguish, in itself, should motivate all of us to do anything which may be necessary to see to it that the release of these Americans, who were sent to Southeast Asia on behalf of our country, is secured at once.

We must translate words into deeds. Why not today?

My patience is gone. I pledge my full support to our Commander in Chief in any decision which he may make, hopefully this week, in bringing about the desired results.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, as the number of Americans held prisoner of war in Indochina has increased over the past few years, I have been meeting more bereaved families of these prisoners of war, and the volume of mail from concerned people in my district has considerably increased. The number of prisoners of war or missing-in-action Americans is at latest estimate 1,608.

But that is just an estimate, Mr. Speaker, because the methods the North

Vietnamese have employed in dealing with our men have included, among other measures, an unwillingness to provide a complete list of Americans being held captive.

Furthermore, they will not release a list of Americans who are seriously sick or injured. They have not provided adequate food and medical care. They will not permit the free exchange of mail. And of course they will not permit impartial inspections of all prisoner-of-war facilities.

Thirteen years ago, the North Vietnamese signed a treaty that prohibited the foregoing practices. So did we and the South Vietnamese. The North Vietnamese treatment of our men violates the articles of that 1949 Geneva Convention on the humane treatment of prisoners.

These 1,608, and probably more of our men, dared their lives in combat and now we must dare to save them in negotiation.

We must not use these men as pawns in negotiating with the North Vietnamese. Any reasonable proposal from the North Vietnamese to release our men in exchange for concessions must be pursued with tenacity. We must not be delayed in our efforts to bring home our sons by voluntary repatriation deals where the release of our men is held up while North Vietnamese prisoners are indoctrinated and encouraged to remain in South Vietnam. The 1949 Geneva Convention states:

Prisoners of war shall be released and repatriated *without delay* after the cessation of active hostilities.

Screening prisoners from both sides could delay the return of our men for months, as happened during the Korean conflict when prisoner-of-war negotiations dragged along for 18 months.

As a cosponsor of the "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action," I have indicated that the foremost concern is to bring our captured citizens back as soon as possible.

If we truly want to bring back our prisoners of war now, we must offer a concrete proposal to return our men immediately.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise at this time to salute the brave American men now being held by the North Vietnamese as prisoners of war, and those missing in action from the war in Vietnam.

It was my privilege to have been a cosponsor of the joint resolution calling for this National Week of Concern for POW/MIA's, and I am happy to see these efforts come to fruition with President Nixon's declaration that this concern be demonstrated, nationwide, in the week of March 21-27.

It has been said that the Vietnam war has been a war without heroes, but one need look no further for heroes than the roster bearing the names of 1,500 American men who have been taken from the conflict, not by the hand of death and not by the policy of withdrawal, but by a vicious enemy who places scant value on human life and no value at all on the conventions of war.

These are the men who are paying the cost of freedom every day, in the universal currency of courage and suffering.

These are the men who, far from being forgotten, are America's most remembered citizens.

The families of these men have also won a place of great respect and deep admiration in the hearts of Americans across the country. The rest of us cannot know their private anxiety, but we can sympathize with them. We cannot match their remarkable courage, but we can continue to encourage them just the same.

For these reasons, I think it is quite appropriate to honor both the men and their families in this National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Men Missing in Action. It is all the more appropriate when we remember that the first American was captured by the North Vietnamese 6 years ago this week, and he is still being held.

But this week should serve as more than simply a time to honor those men whose courage is so great. We must do more.

We must focus the eyes of the world on the plight of American men being held captive by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong. We must remind the world that the Geneva Convention governing the treatment of prisoners of war—conventions that every civilized nation recognizes and honors—have been trampled on and disregarded by our enemy.

However one views the war, he cannot wink at the barbaric conditions in which American prisoners are forced to exist. He cannot close his eyes to the brutality that is the order of the day—every day—within the walls of Communist POW camps.

One can only look with dismay and with anger at a callous enemy who violates not only international law but the most basic canons of civilization.

I hope and I trust that, during this week of concern, the weight of world public opinion will fall heavily against the tyranny and brutality that are the common enemies of all mankind, and the stock in trade of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong.

Some years ago, Mr. Grady Gallant, now with the Raleigh, N.C., News & Observer, wrote a book dealing with his experiences in the Marine Corps during World War II.

The book recounted the acts of valor by marines engaged in the battle for Iwo Jima, and was appropriately entitled, "On Valor's Side."

Those acts of bravery helped turn the course of that war toward victory for the United States and her allies, and they will never be forgotten by a grateful Nation.

But the men we honor today have demonstrated their own special kind of courage and valor, and we think of a passage from Homer's *The Iliad*, which Mr. Gallant used as a preface for his excellent book:

On valor's side the odds of combat lie,
The brave live glorious, or lamented die;
The wretch who trembles in the field of fame,
Meets death, and worse than death, eternal shame!"

The brave men now held captive by the North Vietnamese will live forever in glory in the heart of America, though

they must presently endure the deprivation and cruelty of an unprincipled foe.

But there is no doubt in my mind that our enemy will live in "eternal shame" for having so mistreated our countrymen. With all reasonable people everywhere, I urge the North Vietnamese and Vietcong to take steps to insure that none of their prisoners is denied the essentials of life and the protection of the Geneva Convention.

And I am honored to join with my distinguished colleagues in this Chamber, and with a nation of millions, who this week as in one great voice are proclaiming their concern for the welfare and safety of American prisoners of war, and who constantly pray for their return.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, during this Week of National Concern for our American Prisoners of War, I want to restate my deep concern for our prisoners and my equally deep concern that their terrible plight not be made a pawn in a cynical political chess game designed solely to prolong the tragic war in Asia.

All Americans, whether they support or oppose our involvement in Vietnam, are united in the desire that our men be released as soon as possible. Unfortunately, I believe that there is a great and dangerous potential for political exploitation of this highly emotional issue. What our prisoners need is a united effort to secure their release, not a callous attempt to play on their plight as a pretext for staying in Vietnam indefinitely.

I believe very deeply that the answer to the prayers of the families of our men held in North Vietnam cannot be found in new "publicity stunt" raids into the North or in threats that we will never withdraw so long as a single prisoner is held in North Vietnam. I think that the answer should instead be found in a more honest, stronger effort to negotiate prisoner release at Paris.

Last January, I joined with 22 of my colleagues in offering a new plan for release of American prisoners of war held in North Vietnam. The essence of that plan was that our Government should suggest to the North Vietnamese at Paris that each time we withdraw a certain percentage of our troops in Indochina, an identical percentage of prisoners of war would be released. This imaginative proposal would tie together Vietnamization and prisoner release, the two major objectives which President Nixon says he is pursuing in Vietnam. It is interesting to note that had this plan been offered and accepted 2 years ago, when the President began troop withdrawals, about one-half of our POW's would now be at home with their families.

Mr. Speaker, the hard fact is that the only way to insure release of our prisoners, and to guarantee that no further prisoners will be taken, is to terminate our involvement in Vietnam as rapidly and honorably as possible. I believe that if we set a final date for our withdrawal, we will then find it easy to negotiate and obtain release of all of our prisoners. I believe that if we terminate our unthinking support of the Thieu-Ky regime and offer the kind of realistic proposals at Paris that I have proposed, we will find that the prisoner-of-war problem will

be solved without further delay. This, surely, is what this week of national concern is all about.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join my many colleagues this week, in expressing the concern of the entire Nation for the plight of American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia.

The war has dragged on now for many, many years, and the Government has foisted upon the public many empty programs and promises to end the destruction. We hear that our troops are being withdrawn, that Vietnamization is solving all our problems, and that the war is no longer an important issue. So, while our mercenaries are invading neutral neighbors one after another, while our air forces are escalating their destruction of helpless villages all over the map, while the regime we support continues to deny democracy to its own people, some of us are being lulled into forgetting the multitude of human tragedies which are still occurring in Southeast Asia every day.

The prisoner-of-war tragedy is one among this multitude.

It is a long and bitter story of young men confined year after endless year, far from home and far from beloved families.

We have many concerns as to the treatment of American prisoners of war by their captors. The administration exploits every means and every person at its disposal to convince us of the alleged barbarism and inhumanity of our adversaries. An elaborate propaganda campaign has cited the worst examples of poor treatment of American prisoners. On the other hand, we have a number of indications that treatment has been adequate in many ways. Some 3,400 letters have been exchanged between prisoners and their families since 1969. Many photos and even television films have convinced families at home that prisoners are healthy in mind and body.

The investigation of the tiger cages in South Vietnam indicate maltreatment of North Vietnamese. Our own GI's, who are seldom trained in the provisions of the Geneva Convention on Prisoners of War, have publicly described the common practices of torture and execution of prisoners taken by our side.

The arguments over treatment of POW's could go on indefinitely. What we must do is to look beyond this quibbling to the vital issue: How can we free all POW's? How can we bring them home?

As long as President Nixon continues his war there will be new POW's as indeed there have been in the recent invasion in Laos and more Americans dead and missing in action. As long as he continues his policy of indefinite involvement and "Vietnamization," more and more of our men will continue to be captured and confined. And as long as no definite end to the war is set, no end to the confinement of POW's will be set by the other side.

I believe we can free our POW's only by setting a date certain by which to withdraw all of our troops from Indochina. I have, therefore, introduced a resolution in this House calling upon the adminis-

tration to set July 4 as the date; other resolutions call for the total withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Southeast Asia by the end of this year. And I might add that according to the latest Gallup poll, 73 percent of the American people agree with those resolutions.

Representatives of North Vietnam have indicated that their Government will start immediate negotiations on the release of all of our men held there, as soon as our own Government will set a date for the ending of hostilities. Historically, the release of prisoners will take place as part of the political settlement of the end of a war.

So I urge the Nation's concern for our long-suffering prisoners of war. I feel that the only hope for freeing them lies in a commitment by our Government to set a date by which all U.S. forces are withdrawn from Southeast Asia.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate have approved House Joint Resolution 16, authorizing the President to proclaim the period of March 21-27 as National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action. The President has also done so, issuing a Presidential proclamation on March 19.

It is essential that our concern be expressed for the men who are being held as prisoners of war and who are missing in action as a result of the tragic war in Southeast Asia. These men have paid a very, very high price for responding to the call of their country. They, and their fellow comrades who have been killed and wounded in Vietnam and in Cambodia and in Laos, have known the fury of war. They have seen the bloodshed, and the grief, and the misery.

Certainly, we must pay tribute to these men. And we must not forget them. We owe them a heavy debt, whatever our views on the war. The sooner this war is over, the sooner will come the day when the courageous prisoners of war will be released. The sooner this war is over, the sooner will come the day when no more American men will die, or be wounded, or be held as prisoners of war, or be reported missing in action. Thus, the occasion of this special debate today expressing our concern for the prisoners of war and the missing in action should make known not only our concern for them, but also our resolve that the U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war must be terminated promptly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of the resolution proclaiming the week of March 21 as National Week of Concern for American Prisoners of War and Those Missing in Action, I am delighted to join with so many of my colleagues today and take part in the efforts of this Chamber, and the various concerned groups and many individuals throughout the Nation, to focus public attention on the plight of these men and to sway Hanoi from its refusal to abide by the principles of the Geneva Convention on Prisoners of War. The treatment of the over 1,600 American citizens and servicemen who are being held by North Vietnam, and the suffering which their families have undergone, weigh on the conscience of every one of us, indeed, of the world. This is

reflected not only in the efforts of our own Government, but also the work being done by humanitarian groups and international organizations, and the increasingly large number of private citizens who have joined in expressing their concern and registering their protest to the Government of North Vietnam. It is reflected in the resolution passed last December by the Social Committee of the U.N. General Assembly, calling for compliance with the Geneva Convention and reaffirming the fundamental principle that prisoners are entitled to basic protection, care, and communication with their families. This action was an important and most gratifying expression of world opinion on this issue.

These efforts must continue, however, and must grow, both at home and abroad, to rectify the grave violation of human rights with respect to prisoners of war.

Because of the overuse of the institution of specially proclaimed "days" and "weeks," it may be tempting to shrug off the observance of this National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action. The intransigence with which so many efforts have been met in the past may make the situation seem hopeless.

Yet, we cannot let ourselves become inured to the situation. No one should dismiss the significance of this week of March 21, which can be the occasion to lift our thoughts up and out of the bitterness and divisiveness which the conflict in Southeast Asia has created. For the sake of the some 1,600 POW's being held in North Vietnam, and for the sake of their families, many of whom have suffered the anxiety of not knowing the whereabouts or welfare of their loved ones for 6 years, this week should be one of deep and conscientious national concern and observance, a week of prayer, a time in which all men unite to express their hopes for the safety of these men and to confirm continued dedication to work on their behalf.

In an editorial comment on March 20, the Christian Science Monitor offered a deep and moving plea for the meaning which this National Week of Concern holds, and I repeat an excerpt from it here in the hope that it will be realized:

If any shred of meaning is left in the symbolism of a week set aside by Congress for special national observance, let it be made manifest this week, in the prayers of all Americans, of whatever political or ideological persuasion.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the House again in efforts to focus world attention on the plight of the 1,644 American servicemen and civilians listed as POW's and MIA's in Southeast Asia. This coming Friday, March 26, 1971, will mark the seventh year since the first U.S. serviceman was imprisoned. It sounds incredible, but it is all too true. Over these past 7 years, the toll has been severe. A total of 1,182 men are listed as missing: 402 in North Vietnam; 505 in South Vietnam; 270 in Laos; five in China. There are 462 men listed as prisoners: 378 in North Vietnam; 79 in South Vietnam; three in Laos; two in China.

This week, March 21-27, has been des-

ignated by the Congress and approved by the President as National Week of Concern for Americans who are Prisoners of War or Missing in Action. I fully support this action and the remarks and statements by all those who have today joined in this special order.

I believe that this week must be observed, as the President has asked, "in heartfelt prayer, and in ceremonies and activities appropriate to voice deep concern for the prisoners and missing men, to inspire their loved ones with new courage and hope, and to hasten the day when their ordeal may end."

Mr. Speaker, within a few days, I will propose to the President, the United Nations, all foreign governments involved, and the Congress of the United States a change in our policy which I hope and pray will hasten that day when this ordeal will end. We have progressed from earlier days when the POW was the forgotten American, but we cannot be satisfied until freedom has been attained for these men.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is most appropriate that we participate in a special order this afternoon observing the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

Many of us, including myself, have personal friends who are missing in action and who are known to be prisoners of war. Our hearts go out to these families who have suffered indescribable mental anguish. I must state, however, that the families have shown extreme courage while not knowing the fate of their loved ones. In this connection, I wish to pay special tribute to the families of POW's/MIA's who, despite their anxiety, have not uttered one word of disrespect to our Government; nor have they marched and demonstrated against the policies of our Nation.

I feel sure that many are disappointed that the executive branch did not seek a resolution to the POW/MIA issue in the early days of our involvement in Southeast Asia. I share that disappointment. Moreover, I am disappointed that our Government did not publicly condemn North Vietnam's violation of the Geneva Convention soon after the first American prisoner was taken.

People around the world are today concerned about American prisoners only because the Congress of the United States has taken the initiative in bringing this matter before the body of world opinion. We must continue to do this and we must continue to seek an early solution to this moral question.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to H. Ross Perot, of Dallas, Tex., for his untiring efforts to obtain information on and release of prisoners. It was my privilege recently to hear Mr. Perot address a rally in Jackson, Miss. He is a sincere man and truly a great American. Reluctantly, and advisedly, I think he may have done more than the executive branch to focus attention on the plight of our POW/MIA's.

I would hope that the State Department, the Department of Defense, and the White House will not relent in their efforts to see that the Geneva Conven-

tion is enforced as it pertains to prisoners of war. As a matter of fact, I would hope the entire executive branch would use every contact at its disposal to persuade other nations to demand of Hanoi the names of all prisoners and demand humane treatment of them and the inspection of prisons by the International Red Cross.

Furthermore, we should make clear in all our negotiations that the United States will not withdraw from Southeast Asia until the prisoners are released and the missing in action have been accounted for.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate with my distinguished colleagues in this special order on behalf of our men held as POW's and the many others who are missing in action in Indochina. There are at least eight families in my district who have loved ones in POW/MIA status and their hardship, plus the concern of the citizens of Rochester, has led to an impressive campaign on behalf of our POW's/MIA's.

Mr. Speaker, as a preface to my account of their activity, I would like to include an article I wrote in January, relating my thoughts on the POW/MIA issue:

SUPPORT URGED FOR LOCAL POW/MIA CAMPAIGN

(By Congressman FRANK HORTON)

On the opening day of this 92nd Congress, I co-sponsored a resolution establishing a "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action." I found it highly appropriate that this bill was among the first legislation introduced this session. Congress obviously recognizes the value of combined, individual efforts for the POWs/MIA's, and is attempting to provide a time for these efforts to be focused even more effectively.

Indeed, one of the few matters on which we in Congress can seem to agree is the need to achieve the release of, and until that release, civilized treatment for our men held prisoner by the enemy.

No one needs first-hand experience with despair to realize that it takes a special kind of courage to endure it. The kind without trumpets or cheering crowds. Our men in enemy prisons have shown that special courage, as have their loved ones here at home.

Getting these men home to their families is, in my opinion, the most important goal for our Vietnam policy. The terms of our withdrawal must include their safe and prompt release. Other priorities include, at least, achieving humane treatment for the prisoners and acquiring more information about them.

But official efforts have thus far had little success. Quiet diplomacy has consumed a lot of time, but solved few problems, despite creative efforts by the Nixon administration. Dramatic military operations supported by professional talent, excellent equipment, and our best intelligence, have yet to release a single POW from an enemy prison camp. The President's commissioning of Astronaut/Col. Frank Borman to travel worldwide to find a way to free U.S. prisoners also led nowhere.

Therefore, we must increase our private, unofficial efforts. Such efforts are largely responsible for bringing the pressure of world opinion on Hanoi, and—in some happy instances—for achieving the release of several POWs. Private efforts deserve most of the credit for what information we have on our men in enemy prisons. In short, the compel-

ling plea of individual, unofficial letters may slowly achieve what official diplomacy cannot.

On January 21, concerned Rochesterians opened headquarters for the "Remember Rochester POWs/MIA's" Committee at the War Memorial. Cochairman Carol Bushart reports overwhelming support for its letter-writing campaign on behalf of our men held prisoner, especially those eight with loved ones here in Rochester.

I urge all concerned Rochesterians to contact the Committee and add their support and letters to the growing mailbags at the War Memorial. The letters will be forwarded to the North Vietnamese delegation at the Paris Peace Talks. Individuals can add their names to petitions or sign prepared letters or write their own, personal letters in support of our men held prisoner by the enemy.

Hanoi is not honoring its obligations under the Geneva Convention. I think all of us should all take this opportunity to express our concern, by supporting the campaign to "Remember Rochester POWs/MIA's."

Between the sacrifice of time by private citizens to show their concern and stepped up official and diplomatic moves, we can assure that these men are not forgotten and increase the hope that they will return to enjoy freedom once again.

Since this campaign was undertaken, Mr. Speaker, the response has been very heartening: 50,000 signatures have been collected on petitions to the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris; another 10,000 individual letters have been written. Next month, a delegation from the committee will fly to Paris to present these expressions of concern to the North Vietnamese. The members of the delegation will be: Mrs. Carol Bushart, Mr. Warren Doremus, Mrs. Peter DeWispelaere, Mrs. Joseph Christiano, and Mr. Mike Demma.

As I said in my article, Mr. Speaker, official efforts have thus far had little success. Diplomacy has accomplished little; dramatic military operations have yet to release a single POW. Astronaut Col. Frank Borman's travel and efforts have had no perceptible success.

It is obvious that private, unofficial efforts, such as those undertaken by the Remember Rochester POW's/MIA's Committee, must be encouraged and increased.

Letters from concerned neighbors, friends, and countrymen have apparently made more of an impact than cautious, diplomatic statements by our officials. It is my fervent hope that a compelling humanitarian plea, from one people to another, will insure that our men in prison are not forgotten and will increase the likelihood of their return to freedom.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to the many others here in Congress and throughout the United States in protest against the treatment of our soldiers taken prisoner by the North Vietnamese. I have great hopes that this week, designated as the week to express our concern to North Vietnam for American POW's, will achieve what has not been achieved in the past—that is, it will finally prick the conscience of North Vietnam about her neglect of the provisions of the Geneva Convention on fair treatment of prisoners of war, it will convey

forcefully America's sentiments and the sentiments of other signers of the Geneva Convention about the importance of following rules and regulations promulgated internationally, and it will re-emphasize America's position that fair treatment of our men is an essential prerequisite to any meaningful dialog of peace in the future.

This country does not intend to forsake her POW's. I was eager to cosponsor the resolution setting up this special week to let Hanoi know we have not changed our stand on the POW issue—and I am eager for the day when our men will be returned to us, be reunited with their families, and be able to put their horrid experiences in the past and start anew.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the eighth year in which American servicemen have been held prisoner by North Vietnam, the Vietcong, and the Pathet Lao, we find no substantial improvement in their condition. The enemy continues to violate international law, refusing to identify prisoners, denying them mail privileges and medical attention, and rejecting impartial prison inspections by the Red Cross. Nor is the enemy any more willing to discuss these matters today than it was 8 years ago. Their intransigence continues as persistent, I trust, as American support for our own prisoners of war.

That support, in fact, is the only weapon we have against their strategy; a strategy based on the assumption that Americans will soon become bored with the whole issue and allow their sons to be left for dead in prison camps all across Southeast Asia.

Let all the world know today that we will never surrender to that strategy, that we will not allow our servicemen to be manipulated like inanimate pawns in an insane chess game, that the American Republic shall never abandon her sons. These men have given too much of their lives to be sacrificed to our own impatience.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, I personally delivered to the North Vietnamese Embassy in Paris a warning that Hanoi's treatment of war prisoners is backfiring. In it I argued that Hanoi's policy serves to maintain American public sentiment in support of the war and I told them more humane policies would hasten U.S. withdrawal.

I have withheld the content of my message until now to give Hanoi time to respond.

Regretfully, the Communist representatives at the Paris peace talks have not seen fit to respond, and indeed, I cannot be sure my message was even read.

My efforts to secure personal interviews with them during my stay in Paris were fruitless. Prior to leaving Washington, I sent a telegram to North Vietnamese delegate Xuan Thuy which stated:

Would like to visit you in Paris February 22 or morning February 23 to discuss certain aspects of war in Southeast Asia. Hope you can meet with me.

I received no response prior to my departure, however, upon my return to Washington I found the following telegram at my office:

Sorry cannot dispose time meet with you concerning POW issue. Please ask Mr. Nixon. DRV DELEGATION.

The North Vietnamese must have deduced that I wanted to talk about American prisoners held captive since I did not mention it in my wire.

Nevertheless, once in Paris I made several efforts to see the North Vietnamese delegation. An interview appointment was suggested by them only after the Hanoi Embassy had first determined that I would have returned to the United States prior to the suggested date. I learned that this was a tactic often used by them to avoid meeting with Americans.

The best I could do was to go alone to the North Vietnamese Embassy in Paris, rap on the door and hand my letter through a small heavily barred opening in the main door.

In my view, this was most unfortunate for all parties to the conflict, because the argument I wished to advance was one which, to my knowledge, had not previously been presented to them.

Hanoi seems to be laboring under the misapprehension that their crude, unjust policies toward POW's work to their advantage, building resentment in the United States against further involvement in the war. Actually, it is working just the opposite. It is the one issue on which almost all Americans unite; we cannot complete our withdrawal from Vietnam until the safe return of all prisoners is assured.

Text of letter follows:

Minister XUAN THUY,
Chief of Delegation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam,
Paris, France.

DEAR MINISTER THUY: Regardless of their varied opinions on the war in Southeast Asia, virtually all Americans are agreed upon one thing—United States military personnel held captive in Southeast Asia are not proper subjects in the political bargaining for a settlement of the war. Evidence of this fact is abundant. While no one would argue that over 80 per cent of Americans agree on anything, including the conduct of the Vietnam war, a survey after the raid of Son Tay of next-of-kin of prisoners-of-war showed that fully 81 per cent approved of the attempt, while only 10 per cent disapproved.

Nothing has so served to maintain American public sentiment in support of the war as the lack of progress on the prisoner-of-war issue. There is a growing, gnawing doubt and pessimism on the part of most Americans, a doubt which serves only to harden public attitudes toward those who are daily accused of violating international law and of mistreating prisoners-of-war. This growing doubt is the single most important factor which tends to build support in my country for a hard-line policy in Vietnam.

Difficult as it is for Americans to contemplate anything but total victory in any military effort of which they are a part, it is utterly impossible for them to consider abandoning their military men to the vicissitudes and uncertainties of a drawn-out settlement—military or political. Never before, not during either of the World Wars nor during the Korean conflict, have prisoners been

exchanged on any basis other than for their opposite numbers held captive. To inject a political element into what for Americans is an emotional, moral and compassionate subject is to infuse the Southeast Asian war with a surrealism which works against any settlement—not in favor of one.

With all respect, I would like to suggest the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the representatives of the National Liberation Front consider adoption of a policy of flexibility on the prisoner-of-war issue and attempt to determine what the reaction of world opinion might be to such a policy.

One very limited step which I would like to suggest for your consideration is the following: North Vietnam has submitted a list of those missing Americans who are no longer alive. It would be an act of great human compassion if your government would provide to the families of these dead men information of a strictly personal nature. It would mean a great deal to them if you could provide them with any personal belongings of their loved ones, information about their remains, and possibly the location of their burial. Surely such information can have no military or political significance to your government. Yet to these loved ones, many of whom still cling to the agonizing hope that their soldier is yet alive, this step would be an act of mercy which would permit them to begin rebuilding their lives.

A second small step which you might consider would involve providing more specific information on the status of certain men whose fate is presently uncertain. For example, some photographs of prisoners have been released by your government from which identification is impossible. While the number is not large, the immense agony caused to families of missing men is best illustrated by a recent occurrence. Recently your government released a film clip containing the pictures of over 60 prisoners-of-war. It has not been possible positively to identify at least 20 of the Americans pictured, yet 800 separate American families have "identified" one of the 20 photographs as being of their loved one. Your assistance in helping to identify these men would be an act of humanity which all the world would applaud.

In other cases, we know, and your government has confirmed, a pilot has gone down over North Vietnamese territory, and his fate has been established. Left unclear has been the status of the co-pilot of the same aircraft. The uncertainty caused the family of the co-pilot is only heightened by the fact that the pilot has been found and is classified as either captured or dead.

In cases such as the above, I would gladly cooperate in providing photographs of identified prisoners, or the names of missing co-pilots, in order to facilitate identification.

I would hope that this second small step might be considered by your government, and I am sure that the rewards at the bar of world opinion would be substantial.

From your own point of view, such an initiative would also enable you to judge the relative desirability of adopting a position of flexibility on the prisoner-of-war issue. I would hope that such a policy would be possible, and that further initiatives could follow leading to an eventual exchange of all prisoners held by both sides.

Thank you for giving this matter your serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, despite the tragic social and political polarization our Nation has undergone since the beginning of American involvement in the Indochina war, we are fortunately

still together in the pursuit of one objective—the safety and release of over 1,600 American soldiers presently listed as prisoners of war and missing in action.

We have alternately pleaded and demanded that the National Liberation Front—NLF—in Hanoi provide our Government or the families of POW's with assurance that our soldiers are being treated humanely and in compliance with the principles set forth in the Geneva accords.

But our pleas and demands have gone largely unheeded. The shreds of information we have received from Hanoi have done virtually nothing to alleviate our concern and have made more painful the nagging uncertainty that has been the source of much of our anguish.

It is for this reason that I join with my colleagues and my countrymen on the seventh anniversary of the capture of the first American POW in Vietnam in this attempt to focus American and world opinion on one of the cruelest aspects of this war.

Letterwriting campaigns, peace delegations to Hanoi, and formal appeals by our Government have made some progress in obtaining information about the POW's and missing in action. But we have made only slight inroads. It is our responsibility to build and maintain a level of public opinion that Hanoi and the rest of the world cannot ignore. We can only hope that some vestige of humanitarian instincts of the North Vietnamese will prevail over the use of these men as a political bargaining position.

The purpose of this National Week of Concern is not limited to the exertion of pressure on North Vietnam. We are also reassuring the prisoners of war and their grieving families that we have not and will not forget their suffering. We called on these men and their families to make a sacrifice for their country and we will not rest until we have secured their safe return home. We are only indirectly responsible for their imprisonment, but we must make ourselves directly and completely responsible for their release.

Until these men are with us again, we and their 1,600 broken families are all prisoners of this war.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join so many of my colleagues in observance of the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action.

To focus attention in this way on one of the truly agonizing aspects of the war in Vietnam, is both fitting and timely, in my judgment. With some 1,600 U.S. fightingmen unaccounted for in Vietnam, and with Hanoi claiming they hold only 339 as prisoners, there should be no doubt about the validity of this expression of concern for our men held captive by the Government of North Vietnam.

From the early days of our Nation's participation in the war in Vietnam, I believe there has been a constantly shifting view in Hanoi relative to the Americans they hold captive. In the beginning, the Government of North Vietnam threatened to prosecute our men as war criminals and to publicly execute them.

Over the years, that hard line position has softened considerably and I am of the view that mounting concern in this country and around the world over the treatment and welfare of our men, has been largely responsible for the change.

In this regard, I believe the group which should be singled out for commendation as contributing most to Hanoi's change of heart, are those wives of the POW/MIA's who have joined together to draw attention to the plight of these men.

In January of this year, at the urging of the National League of Families and other interested groups, I mailed to every household in my congressional district in California, a pamphlet on the POW/MIA problem. In it, I urged my constituents to clip and mail to Hanoi a special appeal for humane treatment and the release of our men held captive by them. According to the postmasters in my district, the response was excellent and I was gratified by the number who wrote me saying that they had responded.

Many of my colleagues inform me that they also joined in this letter-writing effort with similar results and, when combined with the growing movement now underway throughout the country, I cannot help but feel that the word is beginning to be heard in Hanoi.

Following the abortive raid against the Son Tay Prison Camp last fall, many people felt there would be an adverse reaction from Hanoi that could only compound the already deplorable conditions being faced daily by our men. From every indication, however, that situation did not develop. Instead, over the holidays, we witnessed a further relaxing of Hanoi's rigid position with regard to the prisoners. Mail privileges were liberalized and many Americans witnessed a special TV program dealing with the treatment of prisoners at Christmas time.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, would certainly suggest that the many campaigns being waged throughout the United States to draw attention to the plight of our men, are finally beginning to pay off. It is for this reason that I believe all Members of Congress, in fact, all Americans should join in observing this National Week of Concern. But, just being concerned is not enough.

While there is very little that any of us can do to really bring about humane treatment or the ultimate release of American POW's, we can write letters, sign petitions, and make our voices heard. If the Government of North Vietnam is genuinely concerned about public opinion in this country, as they indicate they are, then we can all join in to let Hanoi know how we feel about this issue.

At a time when there is so little that everyone can agree on, here is a problem which knows no partisan or philosophical boundaries. It is not an attempt to divert anyone's attention away from the larger question of the war itself, nor is it a substitute for official Government or diplomatic action to resolve the POW/MIA problem.

Instead, it is an opportunity for all Americans to join together in a humanitarian appeal for decency and, perhaps,

in some way, convey to these brave men, some of whom have been in captivity since 1964, that we do care and that they have not and never will be forgotten.

Obviously, for some American POW's/MIA's—time has already run out and for many more, it is growing shorter with each passing day. But surely, it is not too late to express our personal concern in a meaningful way by joining in observance of this week which the Congress and the President have designated as the "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action."

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, all of us in Government recognize the frustration, the anxiety of this terrible condition in Southeast Asia where more than 1,600 young men are still held in jeopardy.

We, by no measure, can understand the mental anxieties that are faced by the families daily of not knowing the plight of their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, the intent of this resolution is to assist this Government of ours in bringing world attention to this terrible situation, recognizing that all legal means have been used and are continuing to be used to bring an early release, as well as abiding by the terms of the Geneva Convention in the handling of these prisoners.

We recognize the fact that in the past the only success, really, that has been achieved in getting more information about our prisoners has not been by legal means, but only when world opinion has been brought to bear against the Communists.

It is our hope as the authors of this resolution that every community in this country, that every group, every service club, every church and every organization have frequent meetings concerning themselves with this terrible situation as are possible during this week. We hope that every church shall next Sunday, as well as they did last Sunday, hold prayer services for the early release and information about our prisoners. Through these efforts it is our hope and prayer that we can bring about some solution to this terrible problem. This is the reason that the Members of this body have caused to be brought about this action by the special recognition of President Nixon last Friday as he signed this resolution made the comment that of the many bills that he has signed since becoming President of the United States, none has had the significance and the importance that this resolution carried. It was his hope and prayer that we would have an early release of our prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to keep this paramount not only in the minds of the Members of this Chamber, using every power we have at our disposal, but in the minds of the more than 200 million people that claim the United States as their homeland. They must not be forgotten and I am sure they are not going to be forgotten. I think our prayers will be answered. But let us remember to remember our prisoners in our prayers and our every action.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all who took part today in this special order. May our prayers be answered soon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? There was no objection.

WISDOM OF "NO-KNOCK" PROVED

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, during the past week two incidents involving the Metropolitan Police occurred which illustrate, most cogently and most dramatically, the wisdom of this body in approving the "no-knock" provision of the District of Columbia crime bill.

The two incidents to which I refer are the narcotics raid in which a young police officer was needlessly shot and killed because the "no-knock" authority was not used, and the raid later in the week which successfully closed down an illegal gambling operation because the "no-knock" authority was used.

In the first case, a promising young police officer—21 years old, with a wife and 18-month-old child—lost his life in the performance of his duties. A fellow officer suffered a gunshot wound in the head.

These shootings occurred during an attempt by a six-man search party of the Metropolitan Police to search a Southeast Washington apartment for narcotics violations. The six police officers in the search party knocked on the door of the apartment they had been ordered to search, announced that they were policemen, and said that they had a search warrant. When there was no response, they began to batter the door down and the shootings occurred.

This tragedy was compounded because Officer Glen Fisher's death was needless. Had Glen P. Fisher been armed with a "no-knock" warrant rather than the simple search warrant, which he did have, this senseless death may have been averted.

Several days later, the newly authorized "no-knock" warrant was used for the first time in a gambling raid and it proved to be a useful and successful weapon for the police officers in that search party.

In that case, about 90 law enforcement officers raided 15 separate locations in Washington and one in Arlington in connection with a gambling operation which was estimated to be taking in about \$30,000 a day. Fourteen persons were arrested and assorted gambling paraphernalia was seized.

As he announced the arrest of 14 persons in connection with this illegal gambling operation, U.S. attorney Thomas A. Flannery said that without the special "no-knock" and wiretap provisions authorized by the D.C. Court Reorganization and Criminal Procedures Act of

1970, "this case could not have been made."

During the many months last year that the House and Senate District of Columbia Committee members spent formulating this legislation, much of the time was devoted to assuring that the "no-knock" provision would not be abused. Every safeguard was taken to insure that citizens' rights would not be infringed.

The new law merely codifies existing case law and sets forth the general requirement that an officer must announce his identity and purpose before entering the premises to arrest or serve a warrant. The law then sets forth the exceptions—already recognized under Supreme Court decisions—when a police officer may enter without announcing in advance.

These circumstances are: First, when his life or the life of a third party is in danger; second, when evidence is likely to be destroyed if he announces in advance—this is particularly relevant to narcotics and gambling raids, such as those I mentioned previously; and third, if it would be a useless gesture. It would be a useless gesture for a police officer, when pursuing a felon, to pause at a door slammed in his face and knock and indicate his identity which would already be known to the individual fleeing, or to knock on the window of an abandoned car before entering it.

It should be recognized that in these instances, as in all other instances of serving search or arrest warrants, the officer must have probable cause.

It is clear that Officer Fisher had probable cause to believe that the Southeast Washington apartment which he was to search was being used in violation of the narcotics laws and a "no-knock" entry could certainly have been authorized. The police officers who staged the later successful gambling raid, also had probable cause to believe that the premises were being used for illegal purposes and did obtain a special "no-knock" entry.

Any rational person who looks at the record in these two incidents must admit that the much-maligned "no-knock" authority did, indeed, spell the difference between life and death, between success and failure in these two cases.

IT IS 99.99 PERCENT INTACT BUT 100 PERCENT DEAD: CONGRESS MUST PROTECT THE ALASKAN ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing another bill designed to protect the Alaskan environment from those who count their blessings in oily dollar signs. Twenty-nine Members of both parties join me today; on February 25, 16 Members cosponsored an identical bill, H.R. 5059. Our bill, relating to the construction of an oil pipeline in the State of Alaska, would give Congress ultimate responsibility for any decision on such building.

The bill is necessary and proper inasmuch as the executive branch has seen fit to ignore the warnings of its own panel of experts and urged construction of the pipeline. I refer of course to the January 1971 "draft environmental report" from the Department of the Interior. Since the release of that report, the introduction of bills in both Houses of Congress, and since the departmental hearings on the subject, there has been a tiny glimmer of hope that the executive branch may slow down its pell-mell rush to lay pipe across the Alaskan wilderness. Were I naive, or had I less experience with the Federal Government than my 20-plus years in Congress indicate, I would say, "cnack up a victory" for the forces of conservation.

But I cannot do that. I have learned the ways of bureaucracy and therefore know that unless restrictions on the use of Alaska's wilderness are spelled out in public law, bureaucrats will interpret existing regulations to favor the most persistent lobby. We already have an example of one lobby's effectiveness: Convinced or assured that no problems would be put in the way of exploiting the natural resources of the State of Alaska oil companies poured into Alaska \$200 million worth of imported, Japanese, steel pipe to construct the oil line almost before the ink was dry on the leases. The pipe remains stacked. The shame of this extravagance with stockholder money is not that the oil companies jumped the gun on developing Alaskan oil; rather, it was their assumption that whatever they did would not be open to question.

Had it not been for sustained objections by conservationists throughout Alaska and the Nation, the pipeline would now be close to spilling its way across the State. And I mean that literally for we have yet to hear of any foolproof system to prevent catastrophic oil spills in an 800-mile long hot oil line.

Can a simple pipe that takes up less than 1 percent of the land of Alaska create an environmental disaster? That is the question often posed by the oil companies in an effort to justify construction of the pipeline. My good friend Theodore M. Edison of New Jersey looks at the broad picture and demolishes some of the cherished arguments used by the oil industry. In fact, I lifted the idea for the title to my remarks from Edison's statement. He says in part:

Some pipeline proponents have tried to imply that the effect of the pipeline on the wilderness would be insignificant because the whole 50-foot by about 800-mile ribbon right-of-way would occupy less than two thousandths of one percent of Alaska's land (only 8.2 square miles out of 586,412). Using that kind of logic, it could be argued that a man could not be much affected by a bullet hole that would leave 99.99% of his body intact! The trouble is that wilderness is like an organism in which rivers are its veins, and since the pipeline would cross hundreds of streams, in addition to some major rivers, an oil spill could do serious damage all the way from the point of the spill to the sea.

Knowing the interest of all Members in the question of the pipeline itself, and more important, with the question of the environmental impact of the proposed

line, I hope you will closely examine Mr. Edison's full statement recently submitted to the Bureau of Land Management. The statement follows:

WEST ORANGE, N.J., March 5, 1971.

Re Alaska pipeline hearings.
DIRECTOR (Attention 320),
Bureau of Land Management,
U.S. Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I understand that interested persons are invited to submit statements for inclusion in the record of the hearings on the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline, and I request that the following remarks be included in the hearings record:

Terms like "high standards of living", "progress", and healthy economic growth" have become so closely associated with the exploitation of wilderness that it is hard to convince developers that in many cases over-exploitation is leading to "progress" in the wrong direction. The ends of non-replaceable supplies of several important items are coming into view, yet we continue to invent faster and more automatic ways to clean out the last remaining stock! Even replaceable items are being used up faster than they are being replaced.

We are constantly being asked to accept hazards and deterioration in the quality of our environment on the grounds of necessity—but since different forms of "necessity" often conflict with each other, we should be very cautious in responding to such requests. Unduly hasty or improvident developments can lead to a great waste of desirable things that may soon become unavailable at any price.

Inflation worries all of us, and the Government, the war, and miscellaneous gremlins get blamed for the high cost of living. A more basic and irreversible cause of inflation may be found in the exhaustion of our best sources of raw materials. When we first started drilling oil wells, it was only necessary to scratch the surface to bring in a gusher; but that cheap supply is gone, and we must now use extremely expensive technology to obtain oil from great depths, from the ocean floor, or from remote points. Our richest ores have been mined, and we are turning to lower and lower grade sources. We may be approaching the point at which each technical advance that permits one man to do the work of a hundred is more than offset by a one-hundred-and-ten-fold increase in the amount of work that must be done. If, in spite of technical advances, standards of living start to drop, all kinds of protest strikes would probably become frequent; and the consequent reduction in productivity could so aggravate the situation that a truly frightful chain-reaction crash could result. I am convinced that overpopulation lies at the root of our most serious problems, and that, from the point of view of optimum life quality, our numbers already far exceed the long-range carrying capacity of this country.

The demand for all kinds of goods and services is increasing rapidly, and when shortages occur, conservationists are blamed for blocking progress. Suppose the conservationists' objections are ignored and that all of the proposed expansions are allowed to take place: what then? We would, perhaps, gain partial security from blackouts and other troubles for say ten or twenty years, but it is becoming very evident that expansion cannot continue indefinitely. If sacrifice of some of our best remaining natural areas could yield permanent solutions of our problems, it would be one thing, but I fear that the sacrifice would play only a minor stop-gap role in any 100-year development program. And for the world, 100 years is a very short time. If hazards, prohibitive costs, and other adverse factors are soon going to force a halt to expansion anyway, why not take

steps to slow down expansion now, and save some priceless areas as a heritage for our own and future generations?

Why should we act like a chilly man who is willing to burn down his house to gain a few hours of warmth? Would not such a man fare better in the long run if he chose to endure some chill in order to be able to have continuing shelter from wind and rain? Oil, minerals, and other non-renewable resources will not be lost through waiting, and perhaps, as we learn more about the ways of nature, we can make gradual use of them without risking irreparable damage to "renewable" resources such as fish, forests, and wildlife in general.

Some pipeline proponents have tried to imply that the effect of the pipeline on the wilderness would be insignificant because the whole 50-foot by about 800-mile ribbon right-of-way would occupy less than two thousandths of one percent of Alaska's land (only 8.2 square miles out of 586,412). Using that kind of logic, it could be argued that a man could not be much affected by a bullet hole that would leave 99.99% of his body intact! The trouble is that wilderness is like an organism in which rivers are its veins, and since the pipeline would cross hundreds of streams, in addition to some major rivers, an oil spill could do serious damage all the way from the point of spill to the sea.

A booklet of "Questions and Answers", published by Alyeska Pipeline Service Company, answers the question, "How much oil is in Alaska?", with the statement, "It is estimated that at least 10 billion barrels of oil can be produced from the North Slope reserves. That's as much oil as the reserves in Louisiana, Oklahoma, Kansas and half of Texas combined." The booklet also states that "At full capacity, 12 stations will operate to move two million barrels through a day." On dividing two million into 10 billion, it is seen that the estimated reserve should supply oil for at least 5,000 days (about 14 years) at capacity operation. In view of the risks involved, this seems like an incredibly short life for the benefit, so I assume the promoters of the project hope to find more oil on the North Slope later. But even if the life of the oil field should turn out to be three or four times 14 years, it would still be very short.

If the pipeline is built, many people may become dependent on it for their livelihood. What will happen to them when the brief boom ends? If Eskimos and others are forced to adapt to the intrusion of "civilization" into wilderness, may they not find it difficult, or impossible, to return to former ways of life when the project shuts down? There seems to be a good possibility that we would duplicate our sorry treatment of the American Indian.

Finally, in view of world tensions, I ask what thought has been given to military defense? The pipeline would be so vulnerable to attack and sabotage that if it should become as important to our national economy as pipeline proponents suggest, there would surely be demands for its protection—and in wild country, adequate protection would not be cheap. Should not the manpower and expense required for this purpose be included in any calculation of the ratio of benefits to costs? And should not the costs be considered now, instead of being neglected until they can be forced on the general public later through inclusion in our tremendous military budget?

Respectfully submitted,

THEODORE M. EDISON.

THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in 1964, the Congress acted to insure that one of the basic essentials of life—food—should be available to our more needy citizens. The intent of Congress in passing the Food Stamp Act of 1964 was to make sure that those whose incomes were so low that it was impossible for them to purchase both shelter and food would have relief from this dilemma.

Specifically, the act stated that it is "the policy of Congress to promote the general welfare" and "raise levels of nutrition among low income households." Clearly this act was aimed at helping families whose incomes are near or below the poverty level.

In general, this body left the setting of standards with regard to eligibility to receive food stamps under the jurisdiction of the States. However, the legislation did require the States to use income as a criterion in establishing eligibility. Unfortunately, by using income per month as a determinant of eligibility, persons who would otherwise be ineligible are allowed to receive food stamps.

Many Members have received letters from constituents informing them of their outrage over otherwise employable persons who were voluntarily refusing to work by reason of a labor dispute. When two parties, either business or labor, engage in a form of economic warfare against each other, the resources of the Government should not be used to subsidize either party in the dispute.

Another abuse of the food stamp program has been the granting of food stamps to college students. Mr. Speaker, I am more than aware of the plight of struggling students. However, this body must remember that students are receiving financial assistance from the Federal and State Governments, private foundations and scholarships, and from the universities themselves. Since none of this assistance—especially that which comes from parents—can be classified as income, many students are eligible to receive food stamps.

The legislation which I am introducing today would clarify the law in order to assure that these practices do not continue. I would note that this House has adopted language similar to my bill but unfortunately it was rejected by the other body. I would like to urge the Agriculture Committee to favorably consider the language of my bill when the continuing authorization for the food stamp program comes before the Congress.

TRIBUTE TO PHOENIX VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANY ON 100TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, volunteer firefighting organizations are among that corps of unsung heroes that daily risk their lives for others, but rarely are recognized for their outstanding service and contributions to humanity.

One such organization, the Phoenix Volunteer Fire Company of Hollidaysburg, Pa., is celebrating its 100th anni-

versary this year. I would like to pay a special and public tribute to this company for the outstanding service it has rendered to the Hollidaysburg community during the past century.

Few people realize the extent of the firefighters' responsibility in the protection of life and property. Accidents caused by fires and explosions are responsible for the death of 12,000 Americans every year; and during this same period, an additional 2 million are badly burned. And to accompany these frightening figures, the loss in property approaches \$2 billion each year.

Thus, firefighting is a dangerous and serious business. Can you imagine the consequences if firefighting were left to chance—to people not dedicated to such a purpose? The danger of a firefighter's occupation is equaled only by the vital necessity for the service they perform.

If one is not personally acquainted with a volunteer fireman, he might ask, "Why do it? Why risk your life for nothing when others get paid?"

Volunteers represent some 90 percent of all American fire departments currently in existence. Motivation varies with the individual, but you will find that a volunteer fireman is one who sees a job to be done, and pitches in to do it. He is a good citizen, one who will give of his time to make his town a better place in which to live. He is the kind of person who makes a community tick. His roots go deep into the community, just as the values for which he stands go deep into the roots of our Nation. And members of the Phoenix Fire Company are exemplary of this tradition, of this institution, of Americanism.

Whatever their motivation, the effectiveness of volunteer fire companies is uniform in its quality. This is evidenced by fire insurance rates, which are no higher in areas served by volunteer companies than in areas served by professional units.

The Phoenix Volunteer Fire Company has served in the highest traditions of America and community pride since its incorporation on May 4, 1871. During that period, the community benefited, not only in the security of knowing that a well-drilled, competent organization always stood ready to protect them in times of crisis; but also, because these men were members of the community, served in various other capacities, and helped the town to grow, and prosper, and unify.

I recently had occasion to read a statement by Reverend Henzlik former chaplain of the volunteer fire department of Oak Forest, Ill. In his opinion:

When men give of themselves, even to their life-blood, to protect others, they are in the deepest sense acting out, rather than talking about, the Christian command to be their brother's keeper.

Dedicated, conscientious men, such as those of the Phoenix Volunteer Fire Company, deserve the recognition, applause, and respect of all America. I extend to these men my most sincere and hearty congratulations on the observance of this milestone, and offer my wish and

my prayers for their continued health and safety in this noble and glorious task—serving their fellow man.

THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McDONALD) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it has been several months since the House initially began its debate on the issue of whether the 18- to 20-year-old age group should have the right to vote.

Congress debated, considered, and passed a law giving them the right to vote in Federal elections. We are now considering a constitutional amendment which, if ratified, will give them that basic right in State and local elections.

Our display of concern for the 18-, 19-, 20-year-old American has been considerable. But the right to vote is only the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that American citizens between the ages of 18 and 20 be given all the responsibilities of an adult. This age group is compelled to accept the obligation of military service and to pay Federal, State, and local taxes on the salary they earn. Many are married and have children, yet in several States are not permitted to own property or to execute a contract.

There is great incongruity between the responsibilities we have put on this age group, and the rights we have accorded them.

My conclusions and my position on this issue are not directed toward the right to vote, Mr. Speaker.

My remarks today are directed toward all State laws pertaining to the rights and responsibilities of this age group. In order to ascertain exactly what responsibilities they have at the present time, I sent a questionnaire to the 50 State attorneys general regarding the age for assumption of responsibilities by minors. I have received responses from 33 States thus far. I think the evidence will show that full enfranchisement for the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old citizen is long overdue.

The categories in the questionnaire were: Obtaining health and accident insurance, admission to public places, age of emancipation, alcoholic beverages, attorney-client relationships, banking, blood donations, change of name, change of residence, contracts, credit cards, curfew, jurisdictional age in courts, libel, licenses—automobile, and so forth, medical treatment—birth control pills, ownership of property, responsibility of debts, stock ownership and voting, tattooing, weapons ownership and use, wills, and voting.

The first thought that comes to mind when you bring up the topic of enfranchisement for this age group is the right to vote. The second is the right to drink. Both have little relevance in the day-to-day routine of living. What does have relevance is owning property, having re-

sponsibility for contracts and debts, serving on jury duty, getting married, or executing a will.

Of the 33 States responding to my questionnaire, only 24 responded on the laws pertaining to ownership of property. Eight of these States require that all persons must be 21 to own property; one required 21 unless he or she is a veteran or married; three required the male to be 21, the female to be 18—and I wonder what the women's liberation movement would say about that—seven States set 18 as the minimum age to own property; and five have no limit, stipulating that the purchaser if under 21 have the consent of parent or guardian.

On marriage, 29 States responded. Six require both parties to be 21; one requires both to be 19; one requires 19 for the male, 18 for the female; two require the male to be 20, the female 18; four require both to be 18; and four require the male to be 18, the female 16. Several States provide that a pregnant girl can marry at the discretion of the court.

A third important category is the responsibility of debts. Of the 26 States which answered this question, 15 require the person to be 21; three require 21 for the male, 18 for the female; one requires the person to be 20; one 19; and six 18.

It is quite obvious to me that these antiquated laws encourage widespread disobedience, most of the time with our knowledge. Many of our young men and women are married and have families, yet do not have the right to enter into a contract for a home, or many of the amenities which make living comfortable such as major appliances or even an automobile.

I would like to cite a few examples of the more inconsistent laws to illustrate the hodgepodge approach many States have taken with regard to the age of the majority.

In Texas, a male can marry at age 19, but cannot change his residence, own a rifle or pistol, negotiate a contract, or own property until he is 21. In Montana, a man cannot own a rifle or a pistol until he is 21, but he can use either or both weapons when he is 14.

Responsibility for medical treatment is another area where the nonadult suffers greatly. The majority of States require parental consent up to age 21 for medical treatment. One of our newer States, Hawaii, was forward thinking enough to void the parental consent clause in cases of pregnancy and venereal disease.

In Mississippi, a man of 18 is permitted to own property, but cannot leave that property to anyone in the event of his death before 21, simply because the law prevents him from making a will.

I name these States not out of malice, but as examples of a national problem. There are similar discrepancies in all the States, including my home State of Michigan.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we have held these antiquated laws too long. This Congress has responded to this issue by giving this age group the right to vote in Federal elections, and through the proposed constitutional amendment. But the

job has only begun. What Congress has offered this group is a small token of recognition. Our young citizens will vote but once a year at most. And if the right to purchase alcoholic beverages, they will find that drinking is a very minor part of living. What is needed now is a long, hard look at what is really happening in the lives of our 18- to 20-year-old citizens, and doing something about the variety of State laws hampering their growth and progress.

The State of Michigan has recently completed a study of this problem through its special commission on the age of the majority. That commission has recommended that the age of full adult responsibility be dropped to 18. This is not only innovative, but courageous, especially in view of the fact that Michigan voters have twice defeated proposals which would have given the vote to 18-year-olds.

But these are exciting, changing times, and courage is necessary if we are to continue to keep pace in this very serious game of living. Michigan has taken one step, and I have praise and applause for its effort. But I caution them not to stop now, nor to slow their pace.

Establishing laws pertaining to the enfranchisement of individuals by age group is a State responsibility. I wouldn't want it otherwise. But problems in government, like problems everywhere else, have a way of growing out of proportion when left untended. The States are not tending to this problem.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I take this recommendation from the State of Michigan and pass it on to my colleagues. The age of adult responsibility should be 18. It appears to me that the legal rights of some 11 million Americans are being ignored. The incredible incongruity of many of our State's laws defy understanding. I urge my colleagues, as leaders in their communities, to take this message home: Our young people between the ages of 18 and 20 are healthy, intelligent, and concerned Americans. They are eager to take part in this great country. Let us give them that opportunity.

The present laws are a national travesty against our young adults. In the event that a vacuum is created due to inaction on the part of State legislatures, Mr. Speaker, I feel the Congress must take action in the form of a constitutional amendment to put an end to this injustice. Let us hope that the States do not abrogate their responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer at this time for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD various data from my questionnaire on the age of assumption of responsibility by minors.

Following is data from some of the most significant questionnaire categories:

QUESTIONNAIRE

AGE OF EMANCIPATION

26 states responded to this question

- 16 require both male and female to be 21.
- 4 require male to be 21 and female to be 18.
- 4 require both to be 18.
- 1 requires both to be 20.
- 1 requires male to be 18 and female 16.

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE—WHISKEY

30 states responded

- 29 require both sexes to be 21.
- 1 requires both sexes to be 18.

BLOOD DONATIONS

15 had appropriate state laws

- 1 required age of 21 for both sexes.
- 1 required 21 for male and 18 for female.
- 13 required 18.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

12 responded

- 6 require both to be 21.
- 3 require male to be 21 and female 18.
- 3 require both to be 18.

COMPETENCY AS A WITNESS

21 responded

- 9 had a minimum of 10.
- 12—Interesting provision that stated understanding as a decisive factor in determining if person had competency.

CONTRACTS

26 states responded

- 14 requires 21—Arizona, 21 or veteran and his wife.
- 4 require M-21 and F-18.
- 2 require both to be 20.
- 6 require 18.

CREDIT CARDS

16 responded

- 9 requires both to be 21.
- 2 requires M-21 and F-18.
- 1 requires 20.
- 4 require 18.

MARRIAGE

29 responded

- 6 both 21.
- 11 require M-21 and F-18.
- 1 requires both 19.
- 1 requires M-19 and F-18.
- 2 require M-20 and F-18.
- 4 require both 18.
- 4 require M-18 and F-16.

OWNERSHIP OF PROPERTY

24 responded

- 8 require 21.
- 1 requires 21, except war veteran or married.
- 3 require M-21 and F-18.
- 7 require 18.
- 5 have no limit.
- Michigan and Florida require consent of parent or guardian.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEBTS

26 responded

- 15 both required to be 21.
- 3 require M-21 and F-18.
- 1 requires both to be 20.
- 1 requires both to be 19.
- 6 require both to be 18.

STOCK OWNERSHIP AND VOTING RIGHTS

17 responded

- 9 requires both sexes to be 21.
- 3 require M-21 and F-18.
- 3 require both to be 18.
- 2 have no limit, but require consent of parent or guardian.

WILLS

27 responded

- 11 at 21.
- 1 requires 20.
- 1 requires 19.
- 12 require 18.
- 2 are under 18.

VOTING

29 responded

- 24 at 21.
- 1 at 20.
- 2 at 19.
- 2 at 18.

Most States will require an age of 21 for the assumption of responsibilities for one's own self:

ALABAMA

- Age of Emancipation, 21.
- Contracts, 21.
- Marriage, 21—male, 18—female.
- Property ownership, 21; a minor may own, but contract to buy or sell is voidable.
- Responsibility for debts, 21.
- Wills, 21.
- There are some states whose age responsibility laws present striking conflicts.

IDAHO

- Age of emancipation, 18.
- Contracts, 18.
- Credit Cards, 18.
- Marriage, 18—female, 21—male.
- Ownership of Property, 21.
- Responsibility of debts, 18.
- Wills, 18.

RHODE ISLAND

- Age of emancipation, 21.
- Contracts, Credit cards, 21.
- Marriage, 18.
- Ownership of Property, 21.
- Responsibility of debts, 21.
- Wills, 21.
- There are a few States that have set the age requirements at 18:

ARKANSAS AND KENTUCKY

- Age of Emancipation, 18.
- Contracts, 18.
- Credit Cards, 18.
- Marriage, 18; (Females at 16 in Ky.).
- Responsibility for debts, 18.
- Wills, 18.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation. The total amount of horsepower in aircraft has increased more than 22 times between 1940 and 1969—from 7 million horsepower to 14 million horsepower. Mining horsepower has increased as well during the same period—from 7 million horsepower to 44 million horsepower.

THE FINANCIAL CRISIS IN THE AIRLINES INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment as others have recently upon the financial crisis in the airlines industry. The alarming extent of the problem has been revealed by the multiphase ratemaking investigation currently being conducted by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The facts are that 1969 and 1970 were far and away the worst financial years in history for the industry. Even against the backdrop of a general economic decline, the setbacks suffered by the airlines were truly astonishing. Profits in 1969 fell by 74.4 percent, a rate considerably higher than that in any other industry; 1970 results were even worse.

These figures show a net loss of \$178.7 million for 1970 as compared with an airlines industry net income of \$62.8 million in 1969. In addition, the domestic trunks and Pan American in domestic operations experienced their lowest load factors in over 30 years and for the first 2 months of this year three of our major trunk carriers registered losses totaling \$70.8 million. The nine regional and three all-cargo carriers are also facing a bleak future.

	In millions
American	\$17.5
TWA	29.4
United	23.9
Total	70.8

The causes for this crisis are not hard to identify. They naturally include rising labor costs which have virtually wiped out the productivity increases that were expected with the acquisition of new equipment. The unique pressures of competition in the airlines industry have also played a part. The most important factor, however, has been the long-standing reluctance of the CAB to grant the fare increases necessary to cover costs and thus insure stability of financial performance. This last consideration is critical.

We all recognize that the Board in regulating fares must act to protect the public against unreasonable charges. However, the Board also has a statutory obligation to foster sound economic conditions with the airlines industry. If higher fares are required to achieve this goal and thus to insure adequate and efficient air service, then this is what Congress intended when it established the existing framework of airlines regulation. Without earnings, which in my judgment can only be restored through a substantial fare increase, the airlines simply cannot maintain an acceptable level of service to the public. Indeed, it seems certain if the current downswing continues that the public will soon be faced with the same deterioration in equipment and service that has become characteristic of the passenger railroads.

The crux of the problem now before the CAB is that earnings must be raised to a point where the airlines can maintain their existing sources of credit and attract new capital. Contrary to frequently-voiced suggestions, this will not be brought about simply by riding out the current economic decline or requiring further "belt-tightening" in the industry. The airlines cannot save their way into the future. Their need for massive injections of new capital exists now, and it can only be satisfied if investors are assured a reasonable rate of return.

The solution in my opinion lies in the proposals for immediate fare increases in the range of 10 to 12 percent. I earnestly hope a favorable reaction will be forthcoming on these proposals in the near future.

RAILPAX DECISION TO BYPASS CLEVELAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the decision by Railpax to bypass Cleveland on its intercity route system is neither logical nor just. To ignore the transportation needs of the 2½ million people in the eighth largest county in America is not justifiable in any way. In fact, the incorporators have excluded not only Cleveland from their plan, but the entire commercial-industrial complex which surrounds Lake Erie. All of northern Ohio, northwestern Pennsylvania, and southwestern New York has been left out.

I note that in the list of possible rail passenger routes published by Secretary Volpe in January, Cleveland was included in both the Pittsburgh to Chicago and the Buffalo to Chicago lines. Such routes would provide vital links between Cleveland and New York City, Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other metropolitan centers of the East.

This latest decision is a great blow to the economic position of one of the largest industrial centers in the United States.

The incorporators of the National Passenger Railroad Corporation have given nominal and provincial reasons for bypassing Cleveland on this new passenger system.

I, therefore, call upon them to reopen this question by conducting a public hearing in Cleveland at which all segments of the community would be permitted to testify. In this way only can the great economic importance to Cleveland of rail passenger transportation be adequately defined.

GONZALEZ INTRODUCES BILLS AFFECTING FIREFIGHTERS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing today four bills which I have supported for sometime now affecting our firefighters and law-enforcement officers. I think almost everyone will agree that these public servants which protect us on a 24-hour basis need more than just words of praise. This is the reason why I am submitting to this Congress legislation which would not only say "thank you" but would express a reciprocal concern for their well-being, and treatment.

It seems illogical to me, for example, that Federal firefighting personnel are excluded from receiving retirement benefits afforded to persons engaged in hazardous occupations. Statistics show that firefighters lose more worktime due to injuries and suffer a higher fatality rate than any other single occupation.

It is for this reason that I include a package of legislation today: a bill to make Federal firefighters eligible to receive hazardous occupation retirement benefits under title 5 of the United States Code. The bill would further allow Federal firefighting personnel to retire at age 50 with a minimum of 20 years service.

As you know, the 91st Congress overwhelmingly approved this measure, only to have it pocket-vetted by the President

without so much as an explanation of his objections. Since it was a pocket veto, we had no opportunity to reassert the will of the Congress; however, I feel confident that the 92d Congress will fulfill its promise to the Federal firefighters—even if it means having to overcome another block by the President. It is my hope, of course, that the administration will reassess its position.

By looking at the record, we are cognizant of the fact that the Federal firefighters are engaged in hazardous occupations. There seemingly is no question about this. As such, I strongly believe that they be properly and equitably treated with those persons now covered by the law. To continue to exclude them from receiving retirement benefits afforded others engaged in hazardous occupations, it is to practice marked discrimination which must be summarily abandoned.

The 91st Congress concluded that enactment of the bill was essential. I urge my colleagues that we continue to work in this Congress for the execution of our commitment made in the last session.

My second bill is intended to improve working conditions for Federal firefighters by limiting their work week to 120 hours for any biweekly pay period. For hours of duty in excess of 40 hours, the firefighters would be entitled to overtime, night, Sunday, and holiday pay rates. Improving the workweek of these men is a necessity. Not only are they not afforded the same benefits given other groups for performing hazardous duties, but they are required to work a 72-hour workweek for 52 weeks a year, included holidays and Sundays without overtime.

Hearings were held toward the end of the last session on this subject and I trust consideration will be resumed soon. Also considered in the hearings on compensation was my third bill which would hopefully lessen the hazards of both firefighting and law enforcement jobs by making it a Federal crime to kill or assault a fireman or a law enforcement officer engaged in the performance of his duties. There are now several bills pending before the House Judiciary Committee.

And finally, I am reintroducing a preventive measure which would authorize to appropriate up to \$5 million to carry out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1969. It is evident from the many thousands of deaths and injuries attributed to fire each year in the United States that the research and safety programs we approved in 1968 must be given funds soon to proceed with work in this important field.

This legislation would benefit not only our firemen, but our law enforcement officers who must expose themselves to even more dangerous situations; and, of course, the community in general would be the main benefactor.

The Senate passed this bill in the last Congress, but unfortunately, the House was not given an opportunity to consider it. I believe we must seriously consider authorizing appropriations for this act so that we can fund it, if we are to prevent the number of atrocities from rising still further.

I trust early consideration will be given these four bills. I urge my colleagues to keep them in mind during their deliberations so that they can lend their support at the first opportunity.

NATIONAL WEEK OF CONCERN FOR PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION

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

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, in order to adequately commemorate our soldiers who are prisoners of war and missing in action, I would like to include in the RECORD a few remarks on this subject.

I would like to express my wholehearted endorsement of the "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action," the period of March 21-27.

Nearly 1,600 young men of the U.S. Armed Forces are prisoners of war or missing in action as result of the war in Indochina. This is an appalling number. As we continue our withdrawal from this tragic conflict, we must increase our efforts toward the release of those men.

I continue to believe that the very best way to insure the return of our captured soldiers to their homes is to end the war. In the meantime, I shall do my share in creating widespread sympathy for our imprisoned soldiers and those missing in action. The week of March 21 should rally all Americans, regardless of political or economic difference, to the support of these men who are so courageously serving their country. In addition, I feel that the blatant violations of the Geneva Accords must be brought to the attention of the world community.

The "National Week of Concern" should serve both these ends: to stimulate the concern of all U.S. citizens and to arouse the moral indignation of other nations throughout the world.

LOOKING AT HICKENLOOPER

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leo Mindlin, who writes a column for the Miami Herald, is a thoughtful, perceptive person who concerns himself with the major issues of our day. His views merit careful consideration.

In a recent article, entitled "Looking at Hickenlooper," Mr. Mindlin discussed some of the more troublesome aspects of our country's relations with Latin America.

In the thought that his comments on this important subject will prove of interest to my colleagues, I am placing the text of the column in the RECORD at this point:

LOOKING AT HICKENLOOPER

(By Leo Mindlin)

In his ponderous State of the World message, President Nixon talks about the "compassion" we must feel for Latin America.

That is an absurd word to use at a time

when we are being bloodied by Latin nations that have begun to feel the fire of nationalistic enthusiasms and that are expropriating U.S. corporate interests to prove their independence as they see it from "imperialist exploitation."

Like it or not, we are on trial during a transitional struggle away from the image of Latin America as "colonial" and underdeveloped to one proposed by the Andean Pact nations—Latin America in rigid control of its wealth of resources against foreign domination.

We may regard ourselves as investors rather than invaders, but reckoned in terms of the expectation of revolutions seizing the southern hemisphere today, scrapping the Hickenlooper amendment would be a more practical first step we might take than patronizing "compassion" to reduce the impasse between us.

Hickenlooper's provisions are already contained in other less flamboyant statutes empowering the President to deal with the uncompensated expropriation of property owned by U.S. citizens.

Generally, the Latin sees Hickenlooper as an instrument of State Department diplomacy to apply pressure in behalf of the private American investor at the expense of his own national sovereignty.

And so, the Hickenlooper threat is degrading to the Latin's self-dignity, a principle issue in Peru's confiscation of a Standard Oil of New Jersey subsidiary in 1968.

Why suffer this condemnation, particularly in the case of the Peruvian confiscation, when the Nixon administration failed to invoke the Hickenlooper amendment at all?

If Hickenlooper is a major consideration, our foreign aid programs to the Latin nations are no less important in dealing with the impasse.

We may be spending some \$3 billion annually around the world, but the share we allot Latin America is less than half a billion, a cut hardly calculated to demonstrate favorable U.S. interest by comparison.

In his original Alliance for Progress recommendations, President Kennedy proposed \$10 billion in U.S. aid to Latin America through the early 1970's, approximately twice our present allocation. Somewhere along the way, the dream faltered.

Not only did the quantity of aid collapse, but its quality as well. By May, 1969, Latin America found it necessary at the Consensus of Vina del Mar to put President Nixon on notice "that private foreign investment would not be considered as aid or calculated as part of financial cooperation for development purposes" under the Alliance for Progress.

What the Latins feared most had virtually occurred—U.S. intervention in behalf of American corporate investment, an American foreign policy calculated toward "imperialist ends."

But intervention is a double-edged sword. From the days that the United States sent gunboats and marines to support its dollar diplomacy, intervention has had both a shoddy and shiny history in Latin America.

Even without the marines, in 1933 Ambassador Sumner Welles intervened in the internal political affairs of Cuba to contribute to the ouster of the government of Gerardo Machado.

In March, 1938, against the backdrop of his Good Neighbor Policy, President Roosevelt suspended our silver purchase agreement with Mexico in response to the Mexico expropriation of the U.S. oil industry.

Examples abound of our intervention in Latin America. The Charter of Punta del Este, committing the participating republics to action programs on the most intimate internal matters, including land and tax reform, housing, education and health, underscored "the distribution of public funds

under the Alliance for progress," itself a supreme example of U.S. intervention in Latin America.

Revoking the Hickenlooper amendment, readjusting our foreign aid programs to the Latin nations and making some self-sacrificing moves in the direction of expanding the markets for their products in the U.S. would be in this spirit of intervention.

It would also tell the Latins that we are not an imperialist but a democratic society if at the same time we did something about our posture in Southeast Asia, which is an abomination and an impediment we must overcome if we are ever to hope for a second chance in Latin America.

These steps taken together would make the Nixon plea for "compassion" reasonable. Now it is just a word without even the merit of rhetorical splendor.

SEPARATING LAW FROM POLITICS

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, last week over 100 Members of the House and Senate, in a bipartisan effort, introduced legislation to insulate legal services from political pressure.

In recent years, increasing political interference with the OEO program has placed the attorney-client relationship in jeopardy, as far as the poor are concerned. The bill introduced last week is intended to protect that relationship and provide the poor with the same unfettered access to our system of law and government as is available to more affluent persons.

The Washington Post editors, in a March 20 editorial, argue well for "separating law from politics." I ask that the editorial be placed in the RECORD at this point.

SEPARATING LAW FROM POLITICS

One of the major problems of the lawyers in the Legal Service Program is the knowledge—the haunting kind—that the eyes of politicians are always on them. Governors, mayors, the men on Capitol Hill, plus the inevitable private interests—all of these are in positions of power, sometimes used for the good of the people, sometimes not. The temptation to squash or destroy an LSP operation which threatened or challenged the security of this power has often been too great for some politicians. A notorious example is the recent attack of Gov. Ronald Reagan against a major and successful California program (an attack to which the Nixon administration yielded); many other examples exist also. For this reason, a bill introduced Thursday calling for an independent, federally funded National Legal Services Corporation is both needed and welcomed.

Nearly 100 senators and representatives of both parties—including ones called "liberal" and others called "conservative"—support one of the basic tenets of the bill, namely that no political interference be allowed. The proposed corporation—modeled after the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—would be adequately funded. A 19-member board—including five appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, six from the organized bar, six to represent poverty lawyers—would issue grants to programs without concern or fear of the political implications. This is a departure from the current procedures of the program, but the new freedom does not mean that suddenly poverty lawyers would go wild with power. The reverse is

true; politicians would no longer be tempted or allowed to go wild with their power.

There is sense and fairness to this proposal, one which can easily serve as a model for the administration to aim at. As for the poor, why should they have their legal rights interfered with, merely because those rights sometimes interfere with a statehouse or city hall game plan? One would think governors or mayors—servants of the people—would be glad to have lawyers bringing the protection of the law to the very people who have so often been unprotected. Most governors and mayors are glad, of course. The reason for the new proposal is to make sure that the political prejudices of a few—one way or the other—bear no influence on the availability of the law to the poor.

REVENUE SHARING ENDANGERS EXTENSION SERVICE

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's revenue-sharing plan has been tossed out with lots of fanfare and Madison Avenue phrasemaking.

At first look, the revenue-sharing proposals appear to have a political plum for everyone in the economy. But on closer examination, revenue-sharing appears to be more of a delusion and a snare than a solution to the pressing problems of our local and State governments. The proposals are really nothing more than a reshuffling of existing funds which in the end will create only more hopes and fewer solutions.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, the revenue-sharing proposals appear to endanger a great number of important Federal programs which are so badly needed by our local communities and State governments. The revenue-sharing plans will be highly destructive if they become a smokescreen behind which major programs are destroyed.

On March 10, 1971, the President sent the Congress a proposal for revenue sharing in rural community development. While the President's intentions may well be good, I am fearful that his advisers did not take into consideration what the plan would mean to such important rural programs as the Cooperative Extension Service.

The Extension Service has been a great and workable partnership between the Federal and State Governments. It would be tragic if this program and the working relationships between the Federal and State Governments were interrupted in an attempt to sell a so-called revenue-sharing program. Under the proposal submitted by the President, the States could apparently continue the Extension Service as is, or do away with it completely. Or they could alter the program drastically away from its present objective. Such a situation would endanger—or in many cases, destroy—the program.

Great concern about the implications of such an approach to the Extension Service programs has been expressed by John E. Hutchinson, director for the Agricultural Extension Service at Texas A. & M. University. Mr. Hutchinson is one

of the Nation's foremost experts on the problems of rural America and is recognized as one of the great leaders in the Extension Service. His words carry tremendous weight in these areas.

If approved by the Congress, the funds would be made available to the governor of each state in support of rural development programs without restriction, for use in any way that he might choose. The states would not be required to match the funds nor to maintain current programs. This would mean, of course, that the Smith-Lever Act would be superseded.

Mr. Hutchinson goes on to say.

We find it difficult to understand why the Federal Government would wish to abrogate its role in what has been recognized worldwide as the prime example of an effective partnership arrangement among the federal, state, and local governments in support of a cooperative educational venture. The Smith-Lever Act has provided a framework and a set of guidelines that have undergirded success.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that the Nixon administration would propose something that would endanger the future of this great program which already encompasses the concept of local control with Federal assistance. The administration has touted its revenue-sharing plans as increasing local control. But now it is proposing something that would endanger a great partnership among the Federal, State and local governments through the Extension Service.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hutchinson has furnished me a copy of a detailed memorandum setting out the problems created for the Extension Service by the Nixon revenue-sharing proposal. I hope the Members will study this document carefully before any serious steps are taken on revenue sharing. I place a copy of this memorandum in the RECORD:

SOME CONCERNS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE RELATIVE TO THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL FOR REVENUE SHARING

The President's proposal for revenue sharing includes 149 million dollars of the Cooperative Extension Service budget at the federal level under the broad area of rural community development as a part of the special revenue sharing grants. (This is essentially the total amount of the federal appropriation for Cooperative Extension.) Special revenue sharing grants would require no matching funds from state and local governments. The plan appears to propose that federal funds for Extension Service programs be distributed to the states without specific enabling legislation as to how the funds are to be used.

This proposal, if implemented as outlined on pages 37 and 38 of the Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 1972, raises serious concerns and implications as to the future and effectiveness of the Cooperative Extension Service program in each county and state as well as in the Nation. The following are some areas of major concern and possible implications that deserve careful thought and consideration.

The present arrangement of Extension funding through the state land-grant colleges and universities has enabled the Cooperative Extension Service to develop a professionally trained staff that has been relatively free of political pressures and intimidations. In fact, the Cooperative Extension Service has long been considered an ideal model for providing federal financial support

with definite provisions for state and local control. Local people are currently, and have been since its inception, involved in the development and implementation of Extension programs which permit each county to have a program designed to meet the unique needs of its people.

The proposed elimination of the requirements of matching federal funds with funds from state and local sources, which account for approximately two-thirds of the funds supporting Extension programs, could conceivably be a major factor in the destruction of this historically successful educational program by permitting these funds to be redirected to other purposes.

The proposal would require new enabling legislation at the federal, state, and local levels. Without compatibility in legislation between these levels of government, the existing potential of developing educational programs based upon national emergencies, interests, or concerns will be negated. Examples of effective mobilization on a national basis through the Extension Service are the drought and depression programs of the thirties, the organization of rural electric cooperatives, the national emergency food and labor programs of World War II and the present Expanded Nutrition Program.

Without proper enabling legislation to insure some measure of stability in state and local support, the effectiveness of long-range program planning and program development required in the solution of many complex problems would be greatly diminished. Beyond this, there is no assurance that county Extension offices, which have traditionally provided a two-way flow of information from the United States Department of Agriculture and other departments of the Federal Government and from the land-grant universities to the people and the transmission of problems and concerns of the people to these agencies or institutions, could be maintained. Continuing education programs conducted through 4-H clubs, home demonstration clubs, and many kinds of short courses, workshops, and seminars could not be continued without the direction and support of the local county Extension staff. Any substantial reduction in the agricultural programs conducted by the Extension Service could endanger the capacity of the United States to produce food and to maintain the quality and safety of food products for an increasing population.

Without the direction of the present Smith-Lever Act, the federal funds for Extension could be distributed in any manner determined by the state. It is conceivable that the fund could be distributed to numerous state institutions or agencies in such small parcels that the possibility of mounting coordinated attacks on state and national problems would be impossible or ineffective. By distributing the resources in this manner, no one institution could effectively develop a staff of professional resource specialists from enough disciplines to attack complex social and economic problems. The diffusion of the resources to numerous institutions would prevent the effective coordination of staff resources. The results of such an approach would be inefficient program administration, duplication, overlap and omission in program implementation, and loss of program continuity. This kind of allocation of federal resources among numerous institutions has been credited for the failures or limited successes of the former Technical Services Act and the present Title I of the Higher Education Act programs.

Should the federal funds for the Extension Service be distributed to several institutions or agencies within a state, the existing relationship between research, resident teaching, and Extension as now experienced in most land-grant institutions would be

greatly diminished. This would reduce the sensitivity of research and resident instruction to the problems experienced by rural people as presently communicated through the Extension Service.

The present decentralized nature of the Extension Service with its small corps of federal and state staff members in relation to the number of professionals in the counties working with local people is sensitive to the problems and needs of the people at the local and state level. The proposed revenue sharing proposal under consideration could destroy this capability.

As educational needs expand and change, the involvement of local people in Extension program development is sound in theory and workable in practice. However, the combined expertise of a trained interdisciplinary staff, coordinated by one institution at the state level, supported by a resource staff at the federal level collectively can study research facts and trends with the capability of detecting problem situations long before they are apparent at a local level. The proposed revenue sharing proposal under consideration, would destroy this capability.

The Extension Service has a trained and dedicated professional staff with the ability to employ proven methods and techniques to help people solve problems. The Extension Service has the confidence of the people in the educational methods and techniques employed in conducting informal educational programs. The loss of some of the most competent professionals and the loss of the confidence of the people are perceptible outcomes of the proposed special revenue sharing proposal.

Should the anticipated exclusion of the use of Extension funds in cities of 100,000 population or more be made a part of the rural community development special revenue sharing fund, the present demonstrated success of Extension's ability to develop youth programs, Expanded Nutrition Programs, and family living programs in urban areas, particularly as they apply to low-income families, would be negated. For example, according to the 1970 census, people from nine Texas cities with 100,000 or more population would be excluded from the Extension Service educational programs. These cities include over one-third of the population of the State. Other states would be even more critically affected. A further curtailment is indicated by the suggestion that the redirected funds be used only in areas having 100 or less per square mile. This is particularly disastrous when no other agency or organization has been able to demonstrate a high level of effectiveness and efficiency in helping these people solve these problems. In addition, the effectiveness Extension has demonstrated in helping rural and urban people understand each others problem would be curtailed.

The Extension Service has developed methods, concepts and principles of Extension education that are useful in countries throughout the world. They have been adopted in enough countries with varying cultures and technical progress to prove the validity of these principles. It would seem that the changes proposed by the proposed revenue sharing program could destroy the most successful informal adult education model in the world without first objectively testing the possible outcome of alternative models.

PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, it is fundamental that Americans should never lose

their remembrance of those men who are languishing in North Vietnam prisons. The years of suffering that such men undergo in the lonely and sad conditions where they are required to live, are a pain far greater than most people are ever required to sustain in the wide course of their lives. Moreover the loved ones here at home who wait and hope for the return of their soldiers suffer pain that is hardly less.

For those of us who have thought a great deal about the conflict in Southeast Asia, and for some of us who have questioned the need for American involvement over the years, there are many thoughts to be shared concerning the American prisoners of war.

It is my feeling that these American prisoners might be helped best if we were to look at the scene more broadly, and take into consideration the prisoners that have been taken by our side. These must also be living in sad conditions and must be lonely for their own loved ones much the same as the Americans who are prisoners.

The possibilities of prisoner exchange and ultimate release would seem to be more hopeful if the proposals for relief of American prisoners included some kind of equivalent provision for all prisoners on both sides.

Of course there are many of us who would find ways to end the Southeast Asian conflict very promptly. That, of course, would almost certainly free all prisoners and solve the problem soon.

However, no matter how one looks at the merits of the conflict and the tactics of prisoner release, no American can rest easy as long as his countrymen who gave their utmost are suffering torments in a distant part of the world.

LEGISLATION TO EASE LOCAL PROPERTY TAX BURDEN FOR LOCAL EDUCATIONAL COSTS

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

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to fill a vital financial need for elementary and secondary schools. My proposal is a Federal inducement to the States so that they will assume the cost of financing public elementary and secondary education as a State function, and gradually relieve localities of this burden. My plan is that the Federal Government reimburse each State for 50 percent of the increased cost above the local share which it assumes from one year to the next.

The bill's formula is intended to reduce the local property tax, by some or all of the 55 percent of the total cost, nationwide, for public elementary and secondary schools which that tax is now bearing.

Taxes for support of elementary and secondary schools are historically levied on real estate. More and more, this regressive type of taxation is coming under widespread criticism that is not limited to any State boundary.

The present school tax based on real estate contains the unfairness inherent

in the assessment process. Real estate tax assessments are subject to deliberate bias and favoritism, and unrealistically low values from the distant past are often frozen in. The tax assessor's judgment is always in question. Moreover, his judgment is inexact because there is no dollar-and-cents foundation for property assessment. When income is the base for tax, the income is declared and known down to the penny.

Coupled with problem in the method of assessment, is the gross disparity in the tax base available from one community to another. It deprives some children and perhaps even surfeits others. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in their April 1969 report titled, "State Aid to Local Government," points out that the ratio of high to low ability to pay is as much as 66 to 1 in one of our States. In a number of other States the ratio is startling.

The inelasticity of the present system of taxing real estate for school support is a major shortcoming. The property tax base, unlike a tax on income, expands very slowly and does not follow the business or income cycle. Another drawback in the present universal school tax system is the undue burden it has proven to be for elderly people. Many of these come to the end of their days with their sole equity being their homes. Still, they are heavily taxed to hold this precious saving at the period in their lives when they are not sending children to school.

Mr. Speaker, I find a widespread disenchantment everywhere in this country, with the heavy and inequitable burden represented by school taxes on real estate. Practically, this is a problem for each State to solve. Yet the attitude of our tax-paying public in many States is such, and the inequities of the school tax so universal, that I urge a Federal inducement to move this incubus which is so prevalent and to propose a release of localities from their ill-adjusted and inequitable school tax burden.

The inducement formula in my bill is computed from the increased percentage of education assistance for public elementary and secondary education assumed by the State in any year. The Federal Government will reimburse the State for 50 percent of the increase from year to year. Under this plan any State whose educational effort relative to the local effort is increased will gain. The formula would apply whether the State went from providing 8.9 percent of the educational aid as in the case of New Hampshire to any higher percentage.

The significant fact is that to qualify for this aid the local share could not be increased relative to the State share. At the end of my remarks I have enclosed a table for all States which gives the most recent figures of effort expended by all three levels of Government—Federal, State, and local—to demonstrate that the inducement formula will apply in all cases even where there are great variances in the State and local share.

The States would, under my plan, progressively assume more or all of the local school costs in return for a 50 percent, one time, Federal bonus in consideration of their action. Most certainly the con-

sequence would be a rise in the State's income tax levy. This, of course, is a progressive, not regressive, tax and one that falls with some weight and justice on all income earners, including large industrial corporations. Heretofore, these enterprises have been relatively free of school taxes or, at best, subjected to them in a haphazard and incidental manner that relates to the chance locations of industrial enterprises.

Further, such enterprises have been irregularly and inconsistently favored by low assessments inducing them to locate or stay in accommodating communities. This, in itself, is a still further example of shortcoming within the present school tax system. For properties other than the industrial favorites now have to suffer the added burden of the favors so granted.

My bill offers the States the option of electing to move very quickly to assume the total education costs, thereby qualifying for a large Federal payment or gradually, in which case, the Federal assistance would be spread over a longer period of time.

I do not feel that the Federal Government should underwrite the bulk of State education financing. My proposal is directed at the local property tax which is a very inadequate and antiquated vehicle to use for the funding of our educational systems. Local people in many States like New York are seriously strapped by this tax. The percentage distribution of local funds has been more or less constant since the mid-forties. For 1945-46 the percentage distribution was: Federal, 1.4 percent; State, 34.7 percent; and local 63.8 percent. These figures for 1970-71 are estimated to be: Federal, 7.5 percent; State 37 percent; and local 55.5 percent.

The bill, as I have remarked earlier, would encourage States to pick up a greater tax share and discourage reliance on the local property tax. This view is supported by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which has prepared a model bill for State legislatures. The amount of funds that would be required from the Federal Treasury for my proposal would be based on the increase of State contribution compared with that of the local share. To keep the limit within bounds the bill places a ceiling of no more than \$100 per pupil in any 1 year. Therefore, if the total number of pupils in elementary and secondary education, 51,581,000, were each entitled to \$100 the total Federal cost of the bill would be \$5 billion. This would, in practice, no doubt be spread over a number of years. It would be a one time outlay.

State assumption of the primary responsibility for public elementary and secondary school financing is a practical way of achieving a substantial parity of resources behind each pupil within a State. It would eliminate the disparities now prevalent between school districts which are caused by the great variations in both wealth and the willingness to tax.

Continued reliance on the property tax for local school support seriously contributes to fiscal tensions in the intergovernmental financing systems. Since the mid-forties, local schools have increased their share of receipts from local property taxes from less than one-third to

slightly more than one-half of all local property tax revenue. This means that other local services which should be borne by local revenue sources have become secondary claimants in the competition for this tax source.

I feel that this legislation would provide the required incentive to the States to pick up the education burden. The formula in the legislation allows a State to ease toward this goal or move much more rapidly. The key factor being that State tax dollars would be substituted for local tax dollars.

This legislation creates a twofold advantage. It will reduce the pressure on the local property tax while providing public education with a tax base of greater growth potential. A statewide assumption of this burden would tend to equalize the educational advantages provided within the State, yet preserve the local interest demonstrated by local citizens concerned with school board and administrative problems. No student should be denied an adequate educational opportunity merely because he or she resides in a particular area within a State, nor should property-owning citizens be unduly penalized because there is a limited tax base to draw on for educational services.

The local property tax under this proposal would then be freed for those local services such as police, fire, water and sewer, roadways and other municipal services.

In this way, I feel our citizens will better understand who is responsible at each level for providing the services.

As all taxpayers are aware, Government funds are not limitless, they have to come from somewhere. Today our citizens are truly up to their necks in taxes of all kinds. The Federal Government does not have unlimited funds, nor do I believe it should assume more than a fraction of education costs. My bill offers the inducement, the incentive, to shift one cost to the State. It does not create any marked dependence on Washington or Federal moneys but allows for reordering services to the governmental levels that should be responsible.

The principal objection I have heard to the plan contained in my school tax bill is the presumption that local school boards, if no longer responsible for raising school taxes, would lose local control of their educational systems, and that there would be a State takeover. To this criticism, I reply that in my own State of New York the State now provides 45 percent of the school support. With that much leverage the State could exert immense influence on local school decisions, even today; but it does not. Why? It does not for one reason, because the State legislature made up of local representatives would not allow it and, second, that is not the nature of our educational system. Nobody wants it that way.

Moreover, a great part of local school costs are now mandated by State law. At least that is so in New York State. The latitude of local school boards in the fiscal area is not really very great, even as matters are today.

A wholesome State oversight is to be desired and I believe it does exist in the many States which now carry a high

percentage of school costs. But I have not heard that such control is anywhere pre-emptive of all school related decisions.

The States which assume 50 percent of the cost of public education at the elementary and secondary level and comply in other respects, also have the option, under my bill, of electing to take the total of educational programs for which they are now eligible in the form of a block grant and administering the total money to which they are entitled under the separate programs as they feel it can best be utilized.

The text of my bill follows:

A bill to encourage States to increase the proportion of the expenditures in the States for public education which are derived from State rather than local revenue sources

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after title V the following new title VI:

"TITLE VI—STATE ASSISTANCE

"PART A—DIRECT ASSISTANCE

"ELIGIBILITY FOR DIRECT ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 601. A State shall be eligible for direct assistance under this part for a fiscal year if the State educational agency applies therefor and the Commissioner (on the basis of information provided by such agency) determines that under applicable statutory or constitutional provisions, or in practice, at least 50 per centum of the financial support for elementary and secondary education in such State is provided from State revenues. In making his determinations required by this section, the Commissioner shall disregard payments from Federal sources.

"AMOUNT OF DIRECT ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 602. (a) The amount of direct financial assistance to be paid to a State which is eligible therefor under section 601 shall be equal to the amount the Commissioner determines a State and its political subdivisions (including local educational agencies) would receive under the provisions of law listed in subsection (c) for that year but for the decision of the State educational agency to obtain direct financial assistance under this part.

"(b) No payments shall be made under any of the provisions of law listed in subsection (c) to a State or its political subdivisions (including local educational agencies) for any year for which such State receives direct assistance under this part.

"(c) The provisions of law referred to in subsections (a) and (b) are the following:

"(1) Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

"(2) Titles II, III, V, and VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

"(3) Titles III, V, and VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

"(4) The Vocational Education Act of 1963.

"(5) The Vocational Education Act of 1946.

"(6) The Adult Education Act.

"(7) The Education of the Handicapped Act.

"USES OF DIRECT ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 603. (a) Funds granted a State under this part shall be used for support of elementary and secondary education in that State without regard to the purposes for which funds could be used under the provisions of law listed in section 602(c).

"(b) As a condition to the receipt of funds under this part, the Commissioner may require the adoption of such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be neces-

sary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to any other public agency under this part)."

"PART B—GRANTS FOR INCREASING STATE SUPPORT FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION"

"ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS"

"SEC. 611. A State shall be eligible for a grant under this part for any fiscal year if the State education agency applies therefor and the Commissioner (on the basis of information provided by such agency) determines (1) that the State has increased the percentage of its expenditures for elementary and secondary education which are derived from State rather than local revenue sources during the preceding fiscal year over such percentage for the second preceding fiscal year, and (2) the average per pupil expenditure in the State (as defined in section 103(e) of title I of this Act) for such year is not less than such expenditure for the preceding fiscal year.

"AMOUNT OF GRANT"

"SEC. 612. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) and section 614, grants under

this part shall be determined as follows: Where the State school expenditures of a State in the preceding fiscal year exceed such expenditures for the second preceding fiscal year, the grant to the State under this part shall be equal to 50 per centum of such excess, except that such excess shall be (1) reduced by the amount by which local school expenditures of the State in the preceding fiscal year exceed such expenditures for the second preceding fiscal year, or (2) increased by the amount by which such expenditures for the preceding fiscal year are less than such expenditures for the second preceding fiscal year, as the case may be. If both the State and the local school expenditures of a State in the preceding fiscal year are less than such expenditures in the second preceding fiscal year, and the reduction in the local school expenditures exceeds the reduction in State school expenditures, then the grant to the State under this part shall be equal to 50 per centum of the difference between the reduction in local school expenditures and the reduction in State school expenditures.

"(b) The grant to a State for a fiscal year shall not exceed \$100 times the enrollment in elementary and secondary schools in the State in the preceding fiscal year.

"(c) For purposes of this section, 'State school expenditures' means expenditures for public elementary and secondary education in the State from funds derived from State revenue sources, and 'local school expenditures' means expenditures for public elementary and secondary education in the State from funds derived from local revenue sources.

"USES OF GRANTS"

"SEC. 613. Funds granted a State under this part shall be used only for support of elementary and secondary education in that State. As a condition to the receipt of funds under this part the Commissioner may require the adoption of such fiscal control for the accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to any other public agency under this part).

"ADJUSTMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF APPROPRIATIONS"

"SEC. 614. In the event the funds appropriated to carry out this part for a fiscal year are insufficient to make in full the grants to which the States are entitled, the grant to each of the States eligible for a grant shall be reduced pro rata."

TABLE 91.—ESTIMATED REVENUE RECEIPTS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, BY GOVERNMENTAL SOURCE, BY STATE, 1969-70

State and region	Revenue receipts by source (in thousands)				Percent of revenue receipts by source ¹				
	Federal ²	State	Local and other ³	Total	Total		Excluding Federal		
					Federal ²	State	Local	State	Local
50 States and District of Columbia.....	\$2,556,167	\$15,617,379	\$20,078,292	\$38,251,838	6.7	40.8	52.5	43.7	56.0
New England.....	112,171	570,199	1,458,707	2,141,077	5.2	26.6	68.1	28.1	71.9
Maine ⁴	9,400	78,500	87,100	175,000	5.4	44.9	49.8	47.4	52.6
New Hampshire ⁵	4,670	9,400	96,068	110,138	4.2	8.5	87.2	8.9	91.1
Vermont.....	2,432	21,040	50,193	73,665	3.3	28.6	68.1	29.5	70.5
Massachusetts.....	60,000	200,000	738,400	998,400	6.0	20.0	74.0	21.3	78.7
Rhode Island.....	11,969	51,259	85,446	148,674	8.1	34.5	57.5	37.5	62.5
Connecticut.....	23,700	210,000	401,500	635,200	3.7	33.1	63.2	34.4	65.6
Midwest.....	478,034	3,928,170	5,057,350	9,463,554	5.1	41.5	53.4	43.7	56.3
New York.....	160,000	2,071,000	3,329,000	4,560,000	3.5	45.4	51.1	47.1	52.9
New Jersey.....	64,000	429,000	1,010,000	1,503,000	4.3	28.5	67.2	29.8	70.2
Pennsylvania.....	127,631	1,039,369	1,047,268	2,214,268	5.8	46.9	47.3	49.8	50.2
Delaware.....	9,405	87,900	27,200	124,505	7.6	70.6	21.8	76.4	23.6
Maryland ⁶	54,698	300,901	500,182	855,781	6.4	35.2	58.4	37.6	62.4
District of Columbia ⁷	62,300		143,700	206,000	30.2		69.8		100.0
Great Lakes.....	\$336,936	\$2,744,581	\$4,620,394	\$7,701,911	4.4	35.6	60.0	37.3	62.7
Michigan.....	67,000	770,000	870,708	1,707,708	3.9	45.1	51.0	46.9	53.1
Ohio.....	83,000	560,000	1,130,100	1,773,100	4.7	31.6	63.7	33.1	66.9
Indiana.....	41,800	360,000	628,300	1,030,100	4.1	34.9	61.0	36.4	63.6
Illinois.....	116,852	797,649	1,401,217	2,315,718	5.0	34.4	60.5	36.3	63.7
Wisconsin.....	28,284	256,932	590,069	875,285	3.2	29.4	67.4	30.3	69.7
Plains.....	180,113	997,767	1,840,508	3,018,388	6.0	33.1	61.0	35.2	64.8
Minnesota.....	45,000	365,000	431,000	841,000	5.4	43.4	51.2	45.9	54.1
Iowa ⁸	22,100	167,000	365,158	554,258	4.0	30.1	65.9	31.4	68.6
Missouri.....	46,351	255,972	439,000	741,323	6.3	34.5	59.2	36.8	63.2
North Dakota.....	7,400	28,500	69,000	104,900	7.1	27.2	65.8	29.2	70.8
South Dakota.....	12,000	14,500	80,000	106,500	11.3	13.6	75.1	15.3	84.7
Nebraska.....	13,550	42,378	156,000	211,928	6.4	20.0	73.6	21.4	78.6
Kansas.....	33,712	124,417	300,350	458,479	7.4	27.1	65.5	29.3	70.7
Southeast.....	763,700	3,593,323	2,173,370	6,530,393	11.7	55.0	33.3	62.3	37.7
Virginia.....	75,000	300,000	445,000	820,000	9.1	36.6	54.3	40.3	59.7
West Virginia.....	34,500	134,500	110,000	279,000	12.4	48.2	39.4	55.0	45.0
Kentucky.....	61,700	235,000	150,000	446,700	13.8	52.6	33.6	61.0	39.0
Tennessee.....	54,000	257,000	210,400	521,400	10.4	49.3	40.4	55.0	45.0
North Carolina.....	87,146	571,559	147,000	805,705	10.8	70.9	18.2	79.5	20.5
South Carolina.....	52,774	245,000	100,000	397,774	13.3	61.6	25.1	71.0	29.0
Georgia.....	68,157	377,546	197,086	642,789	10.6	58.7	30.7	65.7	34.3
Florida.....	98,435	608,727	370,185	1,077,347	9.1	56.5	34.4	62.2	37.7
Alabama ¹⁰	59,144	257,717	92,000	408,861	14.5	63.0	22.5	73.7	26.3
Mississippi.....	69,000	162,000	83,000	314,000	22.0	51.6	26.4	66.1	33.9
Louisiana.....	61,680	331,890	176,000	569,570	10.8	58.3	30.9	65.3	34.7
Arkansas.....	42,164	112,384	92,699	247,247	17.1	45.5	37.5	54.8	45.2
Southwest.....	270,334	1,176,235	1,034,441	2,481,010	10.9	47.4	41.7	53.2	46.8
Oklahoma.....	35,000	142,934	172,000	349,934	10.0	40.8	49.2	45.4	54.6
Texas ¹¹	176,449	740,000	663,000	1,579,449	11.2	46.9	42.0	52.7	47.3
New Mexico.....	28,659	128,174	47,511	204,344	14.0	62.7	23.3	73.0	27.0
Arizona.....	30,226	165,127	151,930	347,283	8.7	47.5	43.7	52.1	47.9

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 91.—ESTIMATED REVENUE RECEIPTS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, BY GOVERNMENTAL SOURCE, BY STATE, 1969-70—Continued

State and region	Revenue receipts by source (in thousands)				Percent of revenue receipts by source ¹				
	Federal ²	State	Local and other ³	Total	Total		Excluding Federal		
					Federal ²	State	Local	State	Local
Rocky Mountains.....	72,750	332,115	567,258	972,123	7.5	34.2	58.4	36.9	63.1
Montana.....	8,500	45,000	92,000	145,500	5.8	30.9	63.2	32.8	67.2
Idaho.....	9,100	51,000	58,000	118,100	7.7	43.2	49.1	46.8	53.2
Wyoming ¹²	16,200	18,500	38,000	72,700	22.3	25.4	52.3	32.7	67.3
Colorado.....	26,900	108,000	285,800	418,700	6.4	25.3	68.3	27.1	72.9
Utah.....	12,050	111,615	93,458	217,123	5.5	51.4	43.0	54.4	45.6
Far West.....	303,970	2,087,500	3,292,600	5,684,070	5.3	36.7	57.9	38.8	61.2
Washington.....	40,270	400,000	240,000	680,270	5.9	58.8	35.3	62.5	37.5
Oregon.....	27,500	97,000	346,000	470,500	5.8	20.6	73.5	21.9	78.1
Nevada.....	6,200	40,500	56,600	103,300	6.0	39.2	54.8	41.7	58.3
California.....	230,000	1,550,000	2,650,000	4,430,000	5.2	35.0	59.8	36.9	63.1
Alaska.....	22,659	38,489	26,964	88,112	25.7	43.7	30.6	58.8	41.2
Hawaii.....	15,500	149,000	6,700	171,200	9.1	87.0	3.9	95.7	4.3

¹ Percents may not add up to 100.0 because of rounding.² Includes Federal grant programs to State and local school systems, including funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Economic Opportunity Act, aid to federally impacted areas, National Defense Education Act, Manpower Development and Training, vocational education, etc. Funds received from the school lunch and milk program are included, but reporting on the money value of commodities received is incomplete. ESEA revenues have generally been estimated on a cash expenditure basis.³ Includes revenue receipts from local and intermediate sources, gifts and tuition, and fees from patrons.⁴ Includes special State appropriation of \$21,500,000 to change fiscal year of school districts.⁵ Excludes State's share of teacher retirement and social security.⁶ Excludes revenues for public junior colleges as this responsibility was transferred from State department to education.⁷ Estimated by NEA Research Division.⁸ Federal revenue receipts include Federal appropriations for capital outlay, civil defense, Capital Page School, and other federally funded programs listed in footnote 2 above.⁹ Includes State appropriation for area vocational schools and junior colleges not the responsibility of local school districts.¹⁰ State revenue receipts include social security and teacher retirement for all educational agencies and institutions.¹¹ Excludes revenues for kindergartens.¹² Federal revenue includes \$9,000,000 oil royalties which are appropriated by the State Legislature for schools and could thereby be considered State funds.

Source: National Education Association, "Estimates of School Statistics, 1969-70," Research Report 1969 R-15. (Copyright 1969 by the National Education Association; all rights reserved.)

PUBLIC LAW 91-579, THE ANIMAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on December 24, 1970, the President signed into law the Animal Protection Act of 1970, Public Law 91-579. This was a wonderful Christmas present for the many people who worked so hard to see that House Resolution 13957 and House Resolution 18637 became public law.

The goal of this law is to expand the spirit of humane treatment of animals as contained in the "Poage bill," Public Law 89-544. Exactly what we can expect from Public Law 91-579 is not yet known, since the Department of Agriculture has not as yet formulated regulations for its implementation. It is expected, however, that a first draft of the regulations will be ready in the very near future.

The purpose of Public Law 91-579 is fourfold: first, to expand the definition of "animals" so that a greater number can be brought under the umbrella of the law;

Second, to establish by law, standards of veterinary care, Housing, and general treatment for animals;

Third, to regulate a greater number of people who handle animals; and

Fourth, to strengthen enforcement powers by broadening the concept of "commerce," by increasing penalties against persons convicted of interfering with Government inspectors, and by broadening the "discovery" procedures for obtaining adequate information to sustain proper administration.

These are major achievements. However, missing from the bill are provisions I feel are still most desperately needed.

Thanks in large measure to the exposure of various incidents by the news media, we have all been made aware of the inhumane treatment animals have received. You may recall the incident of a

man being so angered by the death of his prize winning dog after shipment by an airline that in his frustration he attacked the aircraft with an ax. The man's actions cannot be condoned, but the cause of his frustration can be understood. Another incident was exposed recently in the March 19, 1971, issue of Life magazine, which showed the horrible ship-board conditions undergone by a group of African animals en route to the United States. Similar situations occur in pet shops, as witnessed by the testimony offered during hearings on the Animal Protection Act of 1970. These situations must be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to do just that. The bill I introduce today will extend the coverage of the law to include pet shops, common carriers, and all terminals, and will expand the definition of animals to include all species of birds as applied to terminal facilities, pet shops, and zoos.

Mr. Speaker, I am also introducing a concurrent resolution seeking international standards for humane treatment. One of the primary reasons for this resolution is to cover situations such as the one described in Life, where the vessel is a non-U.S.-flag vessel, as well as to guarantee to all animals minimum standards of treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope these proposals will receive rapid and favorable consideration.

U.S.A. AND THE SOVIET MYTH

(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, it has been amazing to me and numerous Members of Congress how little weight far too many Americans have assigned in their thinking to the role of Moscow in the protracted Vietnam war. Some 80

percent of the basic hardware for imperialist aggression has been provided by Moscow, and it promises more if we persist in guaranteeing the right of national self-determination for the South Vietnamese. Put another way, the chief and main backer of puppet Hanoi seeks the addition of another free area to the long list of captive nations that it has been responsible for in the past 50 years.

Significantly, the background for this episode and more is provided in the new book titled "U.S.A. and The Soviet Myth." Published by the Devin Adair Co. in Old Greenwich, Conn., the book is authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University. The author minces few words in pointing to the Soviet Russian rulers in the U.S.S.R. as our chief enemy and advances the primary thesis that even with the end of the Vietnam war, whether one way or another, there will be no peace for us unless we come to grips with the realities of the U.S.S.R. The arguments and documentation of this work deserve the studied and careful reading of every sober-thinking American.

The introduction to this new book was provided by our illustrious Member, the Honorable WILLIAM G. BRAY, of Indiana. Representative BRAY is a distinguished author in his own right, having written the widely read book "Russian Frontiers: From Muscovy to Khrushchev." Because of the basic importance and lasting value of this new book by Dr. Dobriansky, I deem it necessary to excerpt certain passages from Representative BRAY's introduction and Dr. Dobriansky's preface, as well as the table of contents, in order that the reader may objectively become interested in the realities that will continue to face us post-Vietnam whatever way.

U.S.A. AND THE SOVIET MYTH

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Introduction by William G. Bray, M.C., author of "Russian Frontiers: From Muscovy to Khrushchev"
The Devin-Adair Co., Old Greenwich, Conn.

HEJNAL FOR THE WEST

(By William G. Bray)

For close to forty years, U.S.-Soviet relations, from the U.S. standpoint, have had many characteristics that lead me to think we have, to a degree, suffered from what I call the "Sweet Alice-Ben Bolt" syndrome. Remember the words to the song:

Oh, don't you remember Sweet Alice, Ben Bolt,

Sweet Alice, whose hair was so brown?

Who wept with delight when you gave her a smile,

And who trembled with fear at your frown?

The song itself is a pleasant little melody but even to the layman it is obvious Sweet Alice was psychotic in the extreme, manic-depressive to the point where Freud himself would have given up and run for the aspirin bottle. I don't know what the eventual outcome of the "courtship" was. The song says Sweet Alice died, and it may have been that Ben Bolt, tired of being plagued, finally dispatched her with an axe on some lonely forest trail.

At any rate, the U.S. has, to a truly shameful degree, played Sweet Alice to the Soviet Union's Ben Bolt for a long time. Played the role, I might add, far beyond what is implied in the old song; anything on the more pleasant side of a snarled threat has, generally been met in the U.S. by reactions ranging from rapturous to mildly hopeful....

The weakness is still with us in what to me is a truly alarming degree. Some years ago, when Allen Drury's novel *Advice and Consent* was first published, he had one of his characters, a U.S. Senator, declaim on the floor of the Senate that "I would rather crawl on my knees to the Soviet Union than die under an A-bomb!"

I thought at the time that Mr. Drury was overdoing it some. Surely, anyone in the United States Congress voicing such sentiments publicly was a sure candidate for either immediate recall or subsequent defeat by the voters he served....

Reflect back into history: being brutally cold about it all, Nazi Germany and Japan both had "aspirations" with a much higher degree of "legitimacy" (if these words may be used to draw a contrast) for their paths of aggression than has ever been enjoyed by the Russian Bear, be it under Czar or Commissar....

But at least, on the surface, the aspirations of Japan and Germany in the '30s and '40s were much more "legitimate" than those of Russia have ever been. Especially so when we consider that from the Polish border to Vladivostok, from Severnaya Zemlya to Samarkand, the little Duchy of Muscovy has grown to take in one-sixth of the land surface of the entire globe. Living space? For whom?....

"National interest," as history shows it to have been viewed by Russian eyes, can be seen as a variation on the ancient maxim *Divide et Impera*—Divide and Conquer. For the Russian, it is Conquer and Combine; into an empire. Divide, first, if necessary, but conquest is the first goal, and combination into empire the second.

The practice began within the Russian border and is still being carried on although there are definite signs, no doubt quite disturbing to the Kremlin, that the subjugated nationalities in the Soviet Empire are getting increasingly restless....

Refreshingly, there is not a trace in this book of the silly "if-only-the-Russians-would-and-someday-they-might-so-therefore-we-should" mentality that permeates many analytical works on the Soviet Union. Dr. Dobriansky's conclusions are drawn from the much more logical and correct premises that what has been done in the past, and what is being done in the present, when

shown to be consistent, are valid indicators of what we may expect in the future. There is no wishing in this book; Lev Dobriansky knows full well that where the Soviet Union is concerned, wishing does not bring a future into existence, nor make it more palatable.

So, this dose of strong medicine, carefully compounded, should help a great deal to rid Sweet Alice of her dual symptoms of manic-depression. For, as Lev Dobriansky makes clear, the American Republic need neither weep with delight nor tremble with fear. We need only retain our own strength, and exploit the weaknesses of our enemies....

CONTENTS

HEJNAL FOR THE WEST, by William G. Bray.

Author's Preface.

1. Is It a Lost Cause?

Free Ukraine, An Integral Factor of World Freedom.

USSR—Ukraine=O.

The Ultimate Key of Nationalism.

U.S.: Sole and Chief Threat.

2. Seeing "Russia" in Toto.

*Some Enigmatic Notions About "Russia".**Institutional Sineus of the USSR.**The Russian and Non-Russian Revolutions of 1917.*

USSR—Russia's Substrate Empire.

3. The Russian Problem.

*Attitudes Toward the Problem.**The Problem Defined.**Scope and Character.**The First Non-Russian Victims.*

4. Nations, Peoples and Countries in the USSR.

*A Few Demographic Strictures.**The Dangers of Aggregativitis.**Some Mythical Preconceptions At Work.**Current Perspectives on Russian Genocidal Policy.*

5. The ABCs on Russia and the USSR.

From Misconception to Policy Distortion.

Lesson A: USSR Is Not Russia.

Lesson B: The Real Enemy Is Soviet Russian Imperio-Colonialism.

Lesson C: The Cold War Never Ends.

6. Captive Nations Week: Ten Years and Beyond

*Some Notes on the Movement.**Typical Misrepresentations.**The Movement Grows.**A Red Nightmare.*

7. U.S. Illusions on the Captive Nations

*A Few Anecdotes on the Week.**The Captive Nations Concept.**Additional Illusions.**The Bind.*

8. The Decade of Confetti Diplomacy

*Background to the Second Treaty of Moscow.**A Nonsensical Confirmation of Moscow's Inner Empire.**Device for Psycho-Political Activity in the Western Hemisphere.**Also a Trade Wedge.*

9. The Russian Trade Trap

*A New Generation of Errors.**Seefing Up The Red Empire.**Russian Economic Strategy.**A Positive Poltrade Policy.*

10. An American Organization at Work

*A Forward Outlook.**Ultimate Source of Global Friction.**The Need for Cold War Education.**Objective: Freedom in the End of an Empire.**Select Bibliography.**Index.*

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

Karl Marx, in a letter in 1864, perceptively observed, "The only ones in this tragic-comedy who imperturbably pursue their old objectives and who play masterfully are the Russians." This observation can be applied precisely to our present global situation. Marxism, communism, socialism and other antiquated philosophical tunes heard today are simply distracting noises and notes of

discordance that only serve to confuse many in the Free World as to the real and sole menace to peace and freedom in our time. As maintained in this work, this chief menace to our security and, inextricably, that of the Free World is totalitarian Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. On the scale of global power politics, Red China still and for some time will continue to be largely a geographical expression....

Quite clearly, this game for global stakes couldn't possibly be played without the captive resources at Moscow's disposal within the USSR. Also, as the Russian rape of Czechoslovakia well demonstrated, and as the Brezhnev Doctrine vividly formalizes, any hope for genuine independence on the part of the peripheral members of the Soviet Russian Empire, such as Poland, Czech-Slovakia, Rumania, and others is clearly negated by the psycho-political sanctuary that Moscow has been permitted to enjoy within the Soviet Union itself. As shown by specific examples and illustrations in this work, one of the chief reasons for this condition is our persistent misconceptions of the USSR and lack of understanding of the forces of nationalism operating within this basic imperial structure....

The propelling dynamics of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, if thoroughly understood, simply disallows illusions of "detente," "spheres of influences," and genuine "peaceful coexistence." From this viewpoint it may be said that this volume, treating of only a few essential aspects of the Russian problem, will have greater pertinence for the unfolding future than for the immediate present, when Moscow's global Troika strategy still is scarcely understood and appreciated in the Free World....

Each of these dimensions of the Russian global Troika strategy enters into the topics treated in this work. Despite arms development, further economic and technological development and other advances, the main Russian forte is in the field of psycho-political struggle, which encompasses these and all else in Moscow's pursuit of world domination. If there was any merit at all to the empire's celebration in 1970 of the centenary of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, a genocidist and prime advocate of conspiracy and terrorism, it was surely because of his superlative transmission and refinements of traditional Russian cold war techniques.

Clearly symbolizing our incapacity to understand this story, the spectacle of the U.S. astronaut, Frank Borman, placing a wreath on the tomb of Lenin, who caused the deaths of tens of millions, is indicative of our grave deficiencies in the ways and means of total psycho-political warfare or, in short, of all phases of the incessant Cold War. The thrust of this work is to contain the struggle in this essential area, with increasing concentration on the strategically-placed non-Russian nations in the USSR—peaceably, knowledgeably and adroitly—in order to secure global peace and maximize the opportunities for world freedom. A determined aggressor, with progressive insecurity within, will not be given to advanced aggressiveness.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., January, 1971.

STOCK OWNERSHIP IN COMSAT

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today would amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 by forbidding ownership of Comsat's stock by communication common carriers, thus eliminating from the Com-

sat board directors elected by the carriers. It would also eliminate the directors now appointed by the President.

When Comsat was created in 1962, it was given a special charter, with Presidential appointed directors, in an effort to assure its success in establishing and operating a global communications system by satellites. Comsat has acknowledged in statements to its shareholders that it has now indeed succeeded in establishing this system. Therefore, it seems to me that the time for special aid to Comsat has passed, and such is no longer needed. Comsat should be reconstituted as a public corporation, without carrier ownership.

All but one of the major carrier shareholders have now divested themselves of Comsat stock. In one case, a very large carrier shareholder stated at the time of such divestment that it was so doing because of a basic policy difference with Comsat. It was referring, I believe, to Comsat's unceasing efforts to compete with its customers—the communications carriers. Such competition was never intended by the Congress when it enacted the 1962 law—review of the legislative history of this act will confirm this.

Thus, it now appears appropriate to terminate ownership of Comsat stock by the carriers and thus carrier elected directors of Comsat. With this, it would also now seem appropriate to terminate the Presidential appointees. Then Comsat can assume its proper role—that of a publicly held corporation, responsible to its shareholders and its customers. In order that existing and future shareholders of Comsat will not be adversely affected by the requirement that present carrier shareholders must divest their Comsat shares, the proposed bill would give the carriers until January 1, 1974, to sell their Comsat stock.

ALLAN NEVINS

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, America suffered the loss of one of her leading historians and biographers when Pulitzer Prize winner Allan Nevins died on March 5. During his long and distinguished career, Professor Nevins wrote more than 50 books, edited at least 75 more, and wrote hundreds of essays and reviews. Twice his works earned him Pulitzer Prizes: In 1933 for a biography of Grover Cleveland and in 1937 for a study of Hamilton Fish.

For 30 years Allan Nevins served as a professor of history at Columbia University. In 1931 he was appointed DeWitt Clinton professor of history. One of his most notable achievements at Columbia was the establishment of the oral histories program, which preserves on tape the observations and recollections of prominent public figures. This program makes it possible for the background of contemporary events to be recorded and preserved for historians to use at a future specified time.

In 1947 his work, "Ordeal of the Union," won the \$10,000 Scribner's

Centenary Prize and the prestigious Bancroft Prize for history.

In 1961 he was appointed as Chairman of the Civil War Centennial Commission. He also served as president of the American Academy of Arts.

The spirit and dedication which Allan Nevins brought to his work is best summed up in the opening paragraph of the New York Times obituary by Albin Krebs which was published on March 6:

Allan Nevins was a prolific writer who brought to his work an engaging style, a profound sense of fairness, a deep humanism and a total respect for the truth.

At this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to include the article by Albin Krebs which appeared in the March 6 issue of the New York Times, describing the life and accomplishments of Allan Nevins:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1971]

ALLAN NEVINS, HISTORIAN, DIES; WINNER OF TWO PULITZER PRIZES

(By Albin Krebs)

MENLO PARK, CALIF., March 5.—Allan Nevins, the historian and biographer who won two Pulitzer Prizes and pioneered in the establishment of the oral history movement, died today in a nursing home after a long illness. He was 80 years old.

One of the most distinguished historians of his line, Allan Nevins was a prolific writer who brought to his work an engaging style, a profound sense of fairness, a deep humanism and a total respect for the truth.

For 30 years a history professor at Columbia University, Mr. Nevins was an indefatigable researcher who could deal with ease with all aspects of American history, from colonial times to the present.

His career was studded with honors, including a Pulitzer Prize in 1933 for a biography of Grover Cleveland and another in 1937 for a study of Hamilton Fish.

One of his major achievements was the establishment, at Columbia in 1948, of the oral history program, designed to aid future historians by preserving on tape and in type-script the opinions and recollections of hundreds of major contemporary figures.

Mr. Nevins's devotion to the interests of American historiography led to his appointment, in 1961, as chairman of the Civil War Centennial Commission.

Mr. Nevins, known as a phenomenally tireless worker, was fond of saying that he didn't really think he had worked hard since he left his father's stock and grain farm to go to college.

He was born on the farm near Camp Point, Ill., on May 20, 1890, the son of Joseph Allan and Emma Stahl Nevins. His father, who was of Scottish descent, sold insurance, but also worked on the farm and saw to it that his five children worked there 12 to 14 hours a day.

The elder Mr. Nevins did not approve of "frivolous" reading, and his 500-book library was devoted to economics, science and history. It was by reading voraciously at home that young Allan acquired an early interest in history.

At 18, the youth entered the University of Illinois, where he edited the campus daily newspaper and graduated Phi Beta Kappa in 1912. He remained in Urbana for another year, teaching English while working for his master's degree in history. His first book, "The Life of Robert Rogers," a biography of the colonial frontiersman, was written shortly before he completed his studies at Illinois and was published in 1914.

BECAME EDITORIAL WRITER

Since he regarded journalism as living history, Mr. Nevins in 1913 joined The New

York Evening Post as an editorial writer. Ten years later he moved to The Sun as literary editor, and from 1925 to 1931 he wrote editorials for The World.

Meanwhile, he continued to build a reputation as a historian. He published "The American States During and After the Revolution" in 1924, and "The Emergence of Modern America" in 1927. His 1928 biography, "Frémont, the West's Greatest Adventurer," served as the basis of the definitive "Frémont: Pathmarker of the West," which appeared 11 years later.

The Frémont work was highly praised by historians and reviewers. "It raises biography to the level of literature," a New York Times reviewer wrote. "Mr. Nevins possesses a valuable combination of gifts. He is careful, accurate, a tireless researcher. He has a style for which his years of newspaper work must be given some of the credit. He has in this book a warmth and at times, a poetic quality which were missing in some of his more formal writing."

In 1928 Mr. Nevins became an assistant professor of history at Columbia. His career in journalism ended in 1931, when he was appointed DeWitt Clinton Professor of History at the university, where he remained until his retirement in 1958.

"Grover Cleveland: A Study in Courage," won Mr. Nevins a Pulitzer Prize in 1933, and his biography "Hamilton Fish: The Inner Story of the Grant Administration," won his second Pulitzer in 1937.

STUDY OF ROCKEFELLER

In 1940, he set out on two projects that were to reflect the central themes of his historical approach. The first was the publication of "John D. Rockefeller: The Heroic Age of American Enterprise" (later revised and published in 1953 as "A Study of John D. Rockefeller, Industrialist and Philanthropist"). The second was his announcement that he would undertake the writing of a history of the United States from 1850 through the Civil War, a project he expected to occupy him the rest of his life.

The history, with the overall title "Ordeal of the Union," was to consist of eight volumes. The first two, published in 1947, won for Mr. Nevins the \$10,000 Scribner's Centenary Prize and the prestigious Bancroft Prize for history.

Other volumes appeared over the years, and the last two in the series are scheduled by Scribner's for publication this year.

The first two volumes, supplemented by two subtitled "The Emergence of Lincoln" in 1950, constituted a sweeping chronicle of the lean years in American history after the Mexican War, when, as Mr. Nevins noted, mediocre men in the White House allowed unbridled sectionalism to carry the country to that point in 1861 when "for Americans, as for many others throughout history, war was easier than wisdom and courage."

NEW APPROACH URGED

In his other books, Mr. Nevins turned squarely to a historical theory to which he had only alluded in his study of John D. Rockefeller. The theory was that it was now time for American historians to re-examine the precepts of history advanced by Prof. Charles A. Beard in his influential "Economic Interpretation of the Constitution," published in 1913. Professor Beard had said that political thought in America had been dictated by the economic self-interest of the Founding Fathers, rather than by reference to abstract political considerations.

Professor Nevins said that American historians should stop apologizing for America's devotion to economic self-interest and start giving due credit and even tribute to industrial giants such as Rockefeller, McCormick, Carnegie and Ford—men who had prepared the country "none too soon and none too fast" for the trials America faced in World Wars I and II.

The Nevins thesis was calmly accepted, except by some of the younger, muckraking historians of the period. There was little of the sort of bitter name-calling that had marked publication of the Beard book. Not unexpectedly, the most violent attack on Mr. Nevins came from the Soviet newspaper *Izvestia*, which accused him of "groveling before Wall Street magnates."

It was an accusation silly on its face. Mr. Nevins, a liberally-oriented historian, was anything but a servant of financial interests. He possessed, however, an integrity respected by corporation executives as well as his fellow historians. Thus he was able to gain unprecedented access to the records of the Ford Motor Company for a three-volume history, "Ford," written in collaboration with Frank E. Hill and published between 1954 and 1963. The work rose sharply above the realm of corporate puffery, and showed Ford warts and all.

INDEPENDENCE STRESSED

A friend recalled in 1970 that while Mr. Nevins was working on the Ford trilogy, which the company had commissioned from Columbia, "Allan was so intent on demonstrating that he couldn't be 'bought' by Ford that year after year, when it came time to get a new car, he'd purchase a Chevrolet."

Mr. Nevins, called by Alfred A. Knopf, the publisher, "the most industrious and hard-working man of my acquaintance," wrote more than 50 books, only a few of them in collaboration, and hundreds of articles. He also edited at least 75 books and wrote hundreds of essays and book reviews, notably for the *Saturday Review*.

In 1965, Mr. Nevins's friends were astounded to learn that he had donated \$500,000 to Columbia for a chair in economic history. During all his years there, he had never earned more than \$11,500 annually. He was able to make the gift because he lived frugally, and put away in investments the income from his books and articles. The gift was anonymous, but Mr. Nevins later reluctantly agreed to Columbia's wishes that the chair be named for him, and the secret was out.

Mr. Nevins's singular devotion to Columbia, which an old friend recently characterized as "a love affair, the grand passion of his professional life," prompted him to arrange, with the aid of his fellow historian Henry Steele Commager, a \$2-million bequest to the university.

The money, left by Frederic Bancroft, a historian and former librarian of the Department of State, went to Columbia instead of any one of several other universities Mr. Bancroft had considered because Professors Nevins and Commager "worked on the old man," as Mr. Nevins said, over a period of years.

"He finally did die, and we found that the two millions had been left to Columbia for the advancement of historical studies," Mr. Nevins said. "I had some ideas about how to use two millions, and one was in instituting our oral history office there."

YEARS IN THE SHAPING

The idea for what is now known as the Oral History Research Office spent many years brewing in Mr. Nevins's mind. In his newspaper days he had met many prominent people whose stories he knew would die with them unless they were recorded. He also knew that such important historical research tools as letters and confidential memos, readily available to the historian in the past, were being replaced in the modern world by telephone conversations "as ephemeral and irrevocable as breath itself."

The oral history collection, considered one of the most widely emulated of Columbia's innovations, was begun in 1948 with Mr.

Nevins as the interviewer of important persons, and his graduate students taking notes. Later the project was expanded with the use of tape recorders, from which direct recordings, from which direct transcripts could be made. As of Jan. 1, 1971, the collection consisted of more than 326,000 pages of transcript of conversations with more than 2,500 witnesses to history.

Louis M. Starr, who is now director of the Oral History Research Office, and who studied under Mr. Nevins, recalled recently that "in the classroom, Allan, though obviously the most knowledgeable of men, was not a fiery, spellbinding lecturer." But, said Dr. Starr:

"When the dread day came for one's 'orals,' or again for defending one's dissertation, Allan Nevins became a lion at the side of the defendant. Colleagues grumbled that he defended his students' work as if he had written it himself—which, I fancy, was sometimes not far from the case. He had never bothered to acquire a Ph.D. himself, but if you were one of his Ph.D. candidates, you were a friend for life, and anyone against you was a pedant who deserved to be put down."

Bruce Catton, senior editor *American Heritage* magazine, yesterday called Mr. Nevins "one of the very greatest historians we have ever had."

"Allan had the idea that history should be interesting as well as solidly researched," Mr. Catton said. "He wanted to make history a living, breathing record, and he succeeded in bringing history alive in this country, presenting it to readers as an intriguing story and not just something to improve their minds. He was one of the guiding forces behind founding of *American Heritage*." (At his death, Mr. Nevins was chairman of the magazine's advisory board.)

"His contribution to historiography was immense," Dr. Commager said. "Allan was the most productive, and in many ways the most creative, of modern historians, and he was an inspiration to other historians, especially the younger ones. He probably turned out more qualified doctoral candidates than anyone else, and his work will live on in his former students in every state."

VIGOR AND HUMOR

Mr. Nevins was a slight man 5 feet 8 inches tall, but he was vigorous well into his 70's, and he liked to take his colleagues on brisk walks that left them panting and him brimming with energy. His nose was prominent, a fact that led him to quip, after a toast had been proposed to him as "our own profile in courage," that he had "more profile than courage." His sense of humor also prompted him to suggest that his series "Ordeal of the Union" would be the perfect wedding gift.

Although he had to retire from Columbia in 1958, when he reached the mandatory retirement age of 68, Mr. Nevins did not slacken his writing and teaching pace. He became senior research associate of the Huntington Library in San Marino, Calif., from which he retired 18 months ago. In 1964, for an unprecedented second time, he left the chair of Harmsworth Professor of American History at Oxford University.

While serving as chairman of the Civil War Centennial Commission from 1961 to 1966, Mr. Nevins edited the 16-volume "Civil War Impact" series. He was president of the American Academy of Arts and Letters from 1966 to 1968.

Mr. Nevins had been married since 1916 to the former Mary Fleming Richardson, who survives. He is also survived by two daughters, Mrs. John Loftis of Portola Valley, Calif., and Mrs. William Mayer of New York; two sisters, Mrs. Lewis Omer of Carthage, Ill., and Mrs. Edgar Wentworth of Asheville,

N.C.; a brother, Gen. Arthur S. Nevins, U.S.A., retired, of Gettysburg, Pa.; and six grandchildren.

A memorial service will be held next Friday in Pasadena, Calif., at the Throop Memorial Church.

HSMHA PHARMACISTS, HAMS, SAVE COLOMBIAN BOY'S LIFE

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the story of a remarkable response to an emergency on the part of personnel serving in the U.S. Public Health Service Clinic in Miami, entitled "HSMHA Pharmacists, Hams, Save Colombian Boy's Life."

I insert the article in the RECORD which first appeared in the January-February 1971 issue of USMHA World, published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It was called to my attention by my constituent, Maj. Duncan T. P. Troutman, U.S. Air Force Reserve, retired, with whom I join in commending these dedicated members of the U.S. Public Health Service for their efforts which saved the life of the Colombian youth:

HSMHA PHARMACISTS, HAMS, SAVE COLOMBIAN BOY'S LIFE

Quick action triggered by ham radio operators and alert HSMHA pharmacists, and the cooperation of commercial airlines, saved the life of an eight-year old, Colombian boy who had been bitten by a fer-de-lance, a deadly poisonous South American pit viper.

The Colombian youth, Saul Cuberos, was treated for the snake bite by physicians at San Juan de Dios Hospital in Cucuta, a city of 175,000 in the mountains of northeastern Colombia near the Venezuelan border. But gas gangrene, a frequent complication of snake bite, set in and doctors at San Juan de Dios Hospital had nothing with which to treat it.

A member of a service organization who knew of an emergency network of amateur radio operators asked a ham operator, Dr. Carlos Bustamante Alvarez, for assistance. He in turn contacted another ham operator, James H. Stiles, a U.S. citizen, in Cucuta. Stiles, using borrowed equipment, initiated a series of contacts, calling for desperately needed polyvalent gas gangrene antitoxin. His plea bounced across Colombia to New Orleans, was relayed to the PHS hospital there, then to the Miami PHS Outpatient Clinic and Braniff International and Avianca Airlines, and the needed antitoxin was rushed to Cucuta less than 16 hours after the first emergency call went out.

The action took place between 11:00 a.m. September 22, and 2:15 a.m., September 23.

"It was merely a case of being in the right place at the right time," HSMHA pharmacist Francis X. O'Sullivan says of the incident. "Eugene H. Treadway, a local ham operator, received the distress call from a ham operator in Colombia and he called the New Orleans police. The police then referred Mr. Treadway to the Poison Control Center here in the hospital," he explains.

The adventure was far from ended at that point, however. Mr. Treadway's request for snake serum raised some questions in the pharmacist's mind. The fer-de-lance is a South American snake and appropriate antivenom would be more likely found there—

not in the United States. Mr. O'Sullivan asked Mr. Treadaway to hold the phone to the sending and receiving units of his radio and—using his high school Spanish—he was able to determine that it was gas gangrene antitoxin, not anti-venom, that was needed.

Mr. O'Sullivan immediately called the airlines to determine where the next flight for Colombia originated. Learning that Miami was the place, he called John Harlowe, chief pharmacist at the Miami PHS Outpatient Clinic, asking him to obtain the antitoxin in Miami.

While Harlow was calling Miami hospitals to locate the antitoxin, another pharmacist at the Miami clinic, Paul Wilkinson, made arrangements to fly the antitoxin to Bogotá on Braniff International Flight #977. He relayed the information to O'Sullivan, who notified Treadaway, and the word went back via ham radio, to Colombia.

Meanwhile Mr. Harlowe had located two ampuls of antitoxin at the Cedars of Lebanon Hospital. The antitoxin was packaged at the clinic and delivered to Braniff Captain R. B. Regis who was on Flight #977. Captain Regis was met in Bogotá by Captain Pedro Muriell who flew the drug aboard his Avianca Airline for the final leg to Cucuta. There, ham operator Stiles met the flight and raced the antitoxin to the hospital where it was administered to the patient, then near death.

The treatment was successful and the Cucuta newspaper *La Opinion* noted the series of quick actions and responses which made it possible:

"Within 24 hours it (the drug) was solicited, sent, and applied—thanks to the remarkable efforts of the colleagues and friends of Mr. James Stiles," the paper reported.

BIG POWER FORMULA

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have been very concerned, as I know many of my colleagues have, with the press reports that have indicated that our Government has been pressuring the Government of Israel to accept a big power formula for the settlement of the critical situation in the Middle East. I have been especially concerned that we seemed to be demanding on behalf of Egypt that the Israel Government renounce, prior to negotiations, all territory acquired as a result of the 1967 conflict.

More recently the reports have indicated that this is not the intention of our Government, and I am very pleased by these reports. It seems to me that insisting on territorial declarations prior to negotiations is putting the cart before the horse. The boundaries which would guarantee the security of the State of Israel cannot be determined until face-to-face negotiations make clear the intentions of the Arab governments with respect to a genuine peace in the Middle East.

I feel this is a majority view in the Congress and in the country, and I, therefore, am inviting my colleagues to join me in reintroducing my resolution of the last Congress which reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the policy of the United States for the promotion of peace in the Middle East should be to exert its best efforts

to arrange for direct, face-to-face negotiations between the State of Israel and the Arab States; and, further, that neither the United States nor any other power should attempt to impose a settlement in the Middle East nor attempt to induce a settlement other than through direct, face-to-face negotiations between the State of Israel and the Arab States.

The State of Israel has experienced bitterly the failure of past international guarantees of its security. The territory in dispute was acquired following the sudden withdrawal of a United Nations peacekeeping at the request of the United Arab Republic. It is not surprising that the Government of Israel is not willing to agree to give up strategic boundary points in exchange for international assurances. Under similar circumstances I certainly would not want my Government to agree to surrender strategic territory on the promise that other countries would honor fully in the future promises which they have been reluctant to honor in the past.

RESTORATION OF CITIZENSHIP TO GEN. ROBERT E. LEE

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if Gen. Robert E. Lee were alive today, he would be my constituent. As a constituent he might well petition me to assist him in his natural desire to have his citizenship restored to him.

One of the more puzzling aspects of General Lee's later life, when he served as president of one of Virginia's finest colleges, is the question of why his citizenship was never restored. I believe it has been generally assumed that General Lee did not take the amnesty oath required by President Johnson's amnesty proclamation, yet those who have studied the life of General Lee have always felt it would have been completely out of character for him to have refused or failed to take the oath.

Mr. Elmer O. Parker, one of the Old Military Records Division of the National Archives, has now resolved a part of that puzzle. He has discovered that General Lee did, indeed, take the amnesty oath, as it has been found among State Department records in the National Archives. Although attempts in Congress to restore General Lee's citizenship have failed in the past because of the assumption that he never swore "to support, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States," I believe Mr. Parker's discovery reveals how severely wronged this great American has been.

Mr. Speaker, armed with this conclusive evidence, and with the conviction that a loyal American is entitled to fair treatment by his Government, I am today asking my Virginia colleagues to join me in petitioning the President of the United States to right this wrong.

Next January 19, the 165th anniversary of General Lee's birth, would seem a most appropriate time for the President to act.

So that all our colleagues may know of

Mr. Parker's discovery, I insert his article, "Why Was Lee Not Pardoned?" at this point in the RECORD.

I also include proclamation No. 37, dated May 29, 1865, which provided "that special application may be made to the President for pardon by any person belonging to the excepted classes—to which General Lee as a West Point graduate, a former officer of the U.S. Army, and the highest ranking officer in the Confederate Army belonged—and such clemency will be liberally extended as may be consistent with the facts of the case and the peace and dignity of the United States":

PROCLAMATION NO. 37

Whereas the President of the United States, on the 8th day of December, A. D. eighteen hundred and sixty-three, and on the 26th day of March, A. D. eighteen hundred and sixty-four, did, with the object to suppress the existing rebellion, to induce all persons to return to their loyalty, and to restore the authority of the United States, issue proclamations offering amnesty and pardon to certain persons who had directly or by implication participated in the said rebellion; and whereas many persons who had so engaged in said rebellion have, since the issuance of said proclamations, failed or neglected to take the benefits offered thereby; and whereas many persons who have been justly deprived of all claim to amnesty and pardon thereunder, by reason of their participation, directly or by implication, in said rebellion, and continued hostility to the government of the United States since the date of said proclamations, now desire to apply for and obtain amnesty and pardon:

To the end, therefore, that the authority of the government of the United States may be restored, and that peace, order, and freedom may be established, I, Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, do proclaim and declare that I hereby grant to all persons who have, directly or indirectly, participated in the existing rebellion, except as herein-after excepted, amnesty and pardon, with restoration of all rights of property, except as to slaves, and except in cases where legal proceedings, under the laws of the United States providing for the confiscation of property of persons engaged in rebellion, have been instituted; but upon the condition, nevertheless, that every such person shall take and subscribe the following oaths, (or affirmation,) and thenceforward keep and maintain said oath inviolate; and which oath shall be registered for permanent preservation, and shall be of the tenor and effect following, to wit:

"I, ———, do solemnly swear, (or affirm,) in presence of Almighty God, that I will henceforth faithfully support, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the union of the States thereunder; and that I will, in like manner, abide by, and faithfully support all laws, and proclamation's which have been made during the existing rebellion with reference to the emancipation of slaves. So help me God."

The following classes of persons are excepted from the benefits of this Proclamation:

1st. All who are or shall have been pretended civil or diplomatic officers, or otherwise domestic or foreign agents, of the pretended confederate government;

2d. All who left judicial stations under the United States to aid the rebellion;

3d. All who shall have been military or naval officers of said pretended confederate government above the rank of colonel in the army or lieutenant in the navy;

4th. All who left seats in the Congress of the United States to aid the rebellion;

5th. All who resigned or tendered resignations of their commissions in the army or

navy of the United States to evade duty in resisting the rebellion;

6th. All who have engaged in any way in treating otherwise than lawfully as prisoners of war persons found in the United States service, as officers, soldiers, seamen, or in other capacities;

7th. All persons who have been, or are, absentees from the United States for the purpose of aiding the rebellion;

8th. All military and naval officers in the rebel service, who were educated by the government in the Military Academy at West Point or the United States Naval Academy;

9th. All persons who held the pretended offices of governors of states in insurrection against the United States;

10th. All persons who left their homes within the jurisdiction and protection of the United States, and passed beyond the federal military lines into the pretended confederate states for the purpose of aiding the rebellion;

11th. All persons who have been engaged in the destruction of the commerce of the United States upon the high seas, and all persons who have made raids into the United States from Canada, or been engaged in destroying the commerce of the United States upon the lakes and rivers that separate the British Provinces from the United States;

12th. All persons who, at the time when they seek to obtain the benefits hereof by taking the oath herein prescribed, are in military, naval, or civil confinement, or custody, or under bonds of the civil, military, or naval authorities, or agents of the United States as prisoners of war, or persons detained for offences of any kind, either before or after conviction;

13th. All persons who have voluntarily participated in said rebellion, and the estimated value of whose taxable property is over twenty thousand dollars;

14th. All persons who have taken the oath of amnesty as prescribed in the President's Proclamation of December 8th, A.D. 1863, or an oath of allegiance to the government of the United States since the date of said Proclamation, and who have not thenceforward kept and maintained the same inviolate.

Provided, That special application may be made to the President for pardon by any person belonging to the excepted classes; and such clemency will be liberally extended as may be consistent with the facts of the case and the peace and dignity of the United States.

The Secretary of State will establish rules and regulations¹ for administering and recording the said amnesty oath, so as to insure its benefit to the people, and guard the government against fraud.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 29, 1865.

SIR: A copy of the President's Amnesty Proclamation of this date is herewith appended. By a clause in the instrument, the Secretary of State is directed to establish rules and regulations for administering and recording the amnesty oath, so as to insure its benefits to the people and guard the government against fraud. Pursuant to this injunction, you are informed that the oath prescribed in the proclamation may be taken and subscribed before any commissioned officer, civil, military, or naval, in the service of the United States, or any civil or military officer of a loyal state or territory, who, by the laws thereof, may be qualified for administering oaths. All officers who receive such oaths are hereby authorized to give certified copies thereof to the persons respectively by whom they were made. And such officers are

hereby required to transmit the originals of such oaths, at as early a day as may be convenient, to this department, where they will be deposited, and remain in the archives of the government. A register thereof will be kept in the department, and on application, in proper cases, certificates will be issued of such records in the customary form of official certificates.

I am sir,

Your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Done at the city of Washington, the twenty-ninth day of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, and of the Independence of the United States the eighty-ninth.

ANDREW JOHNSON,

By the President:

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

WHY WAS LEE NOT PARDONED?

(By Elmer Oris Parker)

Archivists have recently discovered Robert E. Lee's oath of amnesty among State Department records in the National Archives. To those historians of the Civil War and Reconstruction who believe that Lee did not satisfy the requirements for amnesty this may come as a surprise.

Facing an indictment for treason, Lee read in Richmond newspapers President Andrew Johnson's proclamation of May 29, 1865, "to induce all persons to return to their loyalty." Lee immediately informed Gen. Ulysses S. Grant that he wanted to comply with the provisions of the proclamation and enclosed "the required application." It was not in order for it was not accompanied by an oath of allegiance to the United States. Such an oath was required by an order of the President. Lee's action was premature.

General Grant attempted to justify the absence of the oath. He explained to the President that Gen. E. O. C. Ord, commanding the Department of Virginia at Richmond, informed him that the order requiring it had not reached the city when Lee's application was forwarded. Grant, therefore, earnestly recommended that amnesty and pardon be granted the old warrior.

Meanwhile, Lee had been elected president of Washington College and had proceeded on "Traveller" by easy paces to Lexington where he was inaugurated on October 2. This was an important day in his life. Not only did he take up the life of a useful citizen, he also subscribed to the amnesty oath, thereby complying fully with the provisions of Johnson's proclamation. Thus, Lee had every reason to expect he would be pardoned and restored to full citizenship.

But this never happened. Secretary of State William H. Seward gave Lee's application to a friend as a souvenir and his oath was evidently pigeonholed. Although attempts have been made in recent years to have Congress restore Lee's citizenship posthumously, all have come to naught. As far as was known Lee, after laying down his arms at Appomattox, had not sworn "to support, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." But the discovery of his oath of amnesty proves that he had indeed done so. Furthermore, he had also sworn to "faithfully support all laws and proclamations made during the rebellion with reference to the emancipation of slaves." Lee's oath was duly executed, signed, and notarized, and for a century it has remained buried in a file in the nation's archives.

Some historians feel that full citizenship was barred to General Lee by section 3 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution which states that:

No person shall be a Senator, or Representative in Congress or elector of President or of Vice President, or hold any office, civil

or military under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

While this section might have effectively barred General Lee from full citizenship during his lifetime, I believe that a simple Presidential pardon would be all that is necessary today, inasmuch as a posthumous pardon would make the question of whether or not he should have been entitled to hold office a moot one. Nevertheless, I am today offering a joint resolution, introduced earlier in the other body by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, JR., which would, if enacted posthumously, restore this right to him as well.

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. FASCELL, for 1 hour, on Thursday, May 20.

Mrs. ABZUG, for 60 minutes, tomorrow, and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. PRICE of Texas, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. BLACKBURN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHALLEY, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, today, for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, today, for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BOGGS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RANGEL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CULVER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. WIGGINS, and to include extraneous matter with his remarks during the debate today on House Joint Resolution 223.

Mr. DENNIS, to extend his remarks in the debate today on House Joint Resolution 223, and to include his individual views in the committee report.

Mr. MILLER of California, in five instances.

¹ Rules and Regulations established by the Secretary of State.

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

Mr. McCLORY.
Mr. BROOMFIELD in three instances.
Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.
Mr. CARTER.
Mr. HORTON.
Mr. LENT.
Mr. SCOTT.
Mr. RAILSBACK in two instances.
Mr. SHOUP.
Mr. ROUSSELOT.
Mr. PELLY in two instances.
Mr. NELSEN.
Mr. MORSE.
Mr. McCULLOCH in two instances.
Mr. BELL.
Mr. GROVER.
Mr. FREY.
Mr. VEYSEY.
Mr. GUDE.
Mr. BRAY in two instances.
Mr. DEVINE.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. MYERS.
Mr. FORSYTHE.
Mr. CONABLE in two instances.
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in three instances.

Mr. KEMP in two instances.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. SKUBITZ in four instances.
Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.
Mr. HILLIS in two instances.
Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.
Mr. MCCOLLISTER.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. MATHIAS of California.
Mr. REID of New York.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. RIEGLE in two instances.
Mr. TEAGUE of California.
Mr. VANDER JAGT.
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. HALL.
Mr. KEATING in two instances.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio in six instances.
Mr. ESHLEMAN.
Mr. BOB WILSON.
Mr. SCHMITZ.
Mr. HASTINGS.
Mr. McKEVITT in three instances.
Mr. WHALEN.

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

Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. GAYDOS in five instances.
Mr. BEGICH in two instances.
Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.
Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.
Mr. FOLEY.
Mr. EILBERG.
Mr. RANGEL.
Mr. REES.
Mr. DRINAN.
Mr. BADILLO in two instances.
Mr. CLARK in two instances.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in eight instances.
Mr. HATHAWAY in two instances.
Mr. JACOBS in two instances.
Mr. SCHEUER.
Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama in two instances.
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mr. ADDABBO in two instances.
Mr. NATCHER in two instances.
Mr. MOLLOHAN in five instances.
Mr. ASPIN.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
Mr. GETTYS in two instances.
Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.
Mr. HEBERT in three instances.
Mr. CULVER.
Mr. CARNEY.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
Mr. ROBINO in two instances.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. FRASER in three instances.
Mr. O'NEILL in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in two instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.
Mr. MINISH.
Mr. PEPPER.
Mr. O'HARA in two instances.
Mr. BENNETT in three instances.
Mr. FUQUA.
Mr. HAGAN in two instances.
Mr. SEIBERLING.
Mr. ROGERS in five instances.
Mr. HUNGATE.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 7. 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 24, 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:

460. A communication from the President of the United States, proposing supplemental appropriations for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for all three branches of the Federal Government, together with a letter from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (H. Doc. No. 92-73); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

461. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report on the final conclusion of judicial proceedings in docket No. 156, *The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana, Plaintiff, v. The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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. SISK: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 304. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Government Operations to conduct studies and investigations with respect to matters within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-59). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 317. Resolution creating a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on the House Restaurant, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-60). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 339. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7. 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 (Rept. No. 92-61). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 6509. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to restore the system of recommitment of retired pay for certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BELL (for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. TEAGUE of California):

H.R. 6511. A bill to establish in the State of California the Toyon National Urban Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 6510. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the hourly minimum wage rate to \$2.25 and to extend the coverage of such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6512. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 5-percent increase in benefits thereunder with a \$100 minimum primary benefit and subsequent cost-of-living increases, and to liberalize the earnings test; and to amend title XVIII of such act to provide medicare coverage for prescription drugs and chiropractic services and to extend medicare benefits to disability beneficiaries without regard to age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6513. A bill to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 6514. 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.

H.R. 6515. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6516. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 10 percent increase in annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6517. A bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds for cooperative forest fire protection; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6518. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and furnish financial and other assistance to States and other public bodies and organizations in pro-

viding an urban environmental forestry program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6519. A bill to provide for the arrest and punishment of violators of certain laws and regulations relating to the public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 6520. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include payment under part A thereof for the costs of services needed for the treatment of any dental condition or affliction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 6521. A bill to encourage States to increase the proportion of the expenditures in the State for public education which are derived from State rather than local revenue sources; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ERLBORN:

H.R. 6522. A bill to extend the period within which the President may transmit to the Congress plans for reorganization of agencies of the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 6523. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to review as to its suitability for preservation as wilderness the area commonly known as the Indian Peaks Area in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 6524. A bill to require the protection, management, and control of wild free-roaming horses and burros on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 6525. 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.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself and Mr. Reuss):

H.R. 6526. A bill 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.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6527. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and operate a National Museum and Repository of Negro History and Culture at or near Wilberforce, Ohio; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6528. A bill to regulate interstate commerce and to provide for the general welfare by requiring certain insurance as a condition precedent to using the public streets, roads, and highways in order to have an efficient system of motor vehicle insurance which will be uniform among the States, which will guarantee the continued availability of such insurance, and the presentation of meaningful price information, and which will provide sufficient, fair, and prompt payment for rehabilitation and losses due to injury and death arising out of the operation and use of motor vehicles within the channels of interstate commerce, and otherwise affecting such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6529. A bill to carry out the recommendations of the Presidential Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6530. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profit-sharing-retirement plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing-retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension

plan reinsurance program, to provide for portability of pension credits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEBERT (for himself and Mr. ARENDT):

H.R. 6531. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to increase military pay; to authorize military active duty strengths for fiscal year 1972; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself and Mrs. DWYER):

H.R. 6532. A bill to provide temporary authority to expedite procedures for consideration and approval of projects drawing upon more than one Federal assistance program, to simplify requirements for the operation of those projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 6533. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and furnish financial and other assistance to States and other public bodies and organizations in establishing a system for the prevention, control, and suppression of fires in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6534. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-1972; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6535. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6536. A bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war, national disaster, emergency, or economic depression, and to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 6537. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6538. A bill to prohibit the use of channels of interstate or foreign commerce, including the mails, for the distribution of certain material which is harmful to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6539. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6540. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6541. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6542. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of second-class and third-class mailing permits of mail users who have used these permits systematically in the mailing of obscene, sadistic, lewd, or pandering mail matter, to prescribe criminal penalties for such systematic use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6543. A bill to protect the privacy of the American home from the invasion by mail of sexually provocative material, to prohibit the use of the U.S. mails to disseminate material harmful to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 6544. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 6545. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make advance payments to producers under the feed grain program with respect to crops of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6546. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to establish certain requirements with respect to air traffic controllers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6547. A bill to amend section 582(c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6548. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to transfers taking effect at death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6549. A bill to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to provide that the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction of renegotiation cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6550. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to repeal the special tariff treatment accorded to articles assembled abroad with components produced in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 6551. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that cosmetics containing mercury or any of its compounds bear labeling stating that fact; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 6552. 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. NATCHER:

H.R. 6553. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 6554. A bill to protect ocean mammals from being pursued, harassed, or killed; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 6555. 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. PATMAN:

H.R. 6556. A bill to establish the Big Thicket National Park in Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6557. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to conduct research and development programs to increase knowledge of tornadoes, squall lines, and other severe local storms, to develop methods for detecting storms for prediction and advance warning, and to provide for the establishment of a National Severe Storms Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 6558. A bill to protect ocean mammals from being pursued, harassed, or killed; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 6559. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GAIMO, Mr. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 6560. A bill relating to the construction of an oil pipeline system in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. OBEY, Mr. REES, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 6561. A bill relating to the construction of an oil pipeline system in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 6562. A bill relating to the construction of an oil pipeline system in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 6563. A bill to make Flag Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 6564. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the deportation of aliens who publicly advocate the commission of acts of violence against persons, property, or any public authority in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6565. 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. SPENCE:

H.R. 6566. A bill to amend title 18 and title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the trial and review of criminal actions involving obscenity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 6567. A bill to amend the Telecasting of Sports Contests Act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 732), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (for himself, Mr. BARING, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DORN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. WINN, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 6568. A bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Office of Management and Budget with respect to the construction, acquisition, alteration, or closing of veterans' hospitals, and to prohibit the transfer of Veterans' Administration real property unless such transfer is first approved by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 6569. 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. YATRON:

H.R. 6570. A bill to terminate the airlines mutual aid agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 6571. A bill to amend the act of June 4, 1920, to exempt certain students from payment of passport fees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 6572. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to prohibit distribution of food stamps to a person engaged in a labor dispute, strike, voluntary work stoppage or because of enrollment as a student at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 6573. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove the present \$255 limitation on the amount of the lump-sum death payment thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6574. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce the waiting period for disability insurance benefits from 6 to 3 months, and to eliminate the special definition of the term "disability" which is presently applicable to widows and widowers so that such term will have the same meaning in their case as it has in the case of disabled workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. EDMONDSON, and Mr. STEED):

H.R. 6575. A bill to amend the act entitled "an act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma", approved October 31, 1967 (81 Stat. 337); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 6576. 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.

H.R. 6577. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6578. A bill to control the generation and transmission of noise detrimental to the human environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6579. A bill to establish a national land use policy; to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to encourage and assist the States to prepare and implement land use programs for the protection of areas of critical environmental concern and the control and direction of growth and development of more than local significance; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6580. A bill 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.

H.R. 6581. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6582. 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.

H.R. 6583. A bill to amend section 8 of the

Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6584. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6585. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6586. A bill 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.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6587. A bill to clarify the right of States and local subdivisions to provide for domestic preference in acquiring materials for public use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 6588. A bill to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas (for himself,

Mr. ABBITT, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GROSS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. PELLY, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. SCHMITZ, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. WARE, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 6589. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to prevent the imposition thereunder of any prohibition on the importation into the United States of any strategic and critical material from any free world country for so long as the importation of like material from any Communist country is not prohibited by law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 6590. A bill to require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a study and investigation of the effects of the use of pesticides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6591. 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.

H.R. 6592. A bill to extend to every person classified or processed under the Selective Service Act the right to legal counsel to the end that the rights and privileges afforded under law may be known and secured; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6593. A bill to provide that certain expenses incurred in the construction of a rapid transit station in Oakland, 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.

H.R. 6594. A bill to establish an urban mass transit trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6595. A bill declaring a public interest in the open beaches of the Nation, providing for the protection of such interest, for the acquisition of easements pertaining to such seaward beaches and for the orderly management and control thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6596. A bill to enlarge the Sequoia National Park in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6597. A bill to provide for the creation of an authority to be known as the Reclamation Lands Authority to carry out the congressional intent respecting the excess land provisions of the Federal Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6598. A bill relating to the construc-

tion of an oil pipeline system in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6599. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to ban the use of certain internal combustion engines in motor vehicles after January 1, 1975; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6600. A bill to amend the National Emission Standards Act to require standards be set at the most stringent possible levels, and to require the use of a National Bureau of Standards for certain technical service in connection with establishing such standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6601. A bill to authorize a program of research, development, and demonstration projects for non-air-polluting motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6602. A bill to prohibit commercial flights by supersonic aircraft within the United States until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds and reports that such flights will not have detrimental physiological or psychological effects on persons on the ground; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6603. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to preserve competition among corporations engaged in the production of oil, coal, and uranium; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6604. A bill to amend the Clayton Antitrust Act to provide accessibility to documentary evidence gathered in connection with certain antitrust actions brought on the behalf of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6605. A bill to create a National Coastline Conservation Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6606. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Clean Air Act in order to provide assistance in enforcing such acts through Federal procurement contract procedures; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6607. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited sample drug products and other potentially harmful items, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6608. A bill to extend unemployment insurance coverage to employers employing four or more agricultural workers for each of 20 or more weeks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself and Mr. COLLIER):

H.R. 6609. A bill to require the Department of Defense to determine disposal dates and methods of disposing of certain military material; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6610. 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. GAYDOS:

H.R. 6611. A bill to authorize assistance to local educational agencies for the financial support of elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6612. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to make its benefits available to certain areas of extra-high unemployment, to authorize additional funds for such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6613. 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 purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6614. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the basic workweeks of firefighting personnel of executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6615. A bill to include firefighters within the provisions of section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the retirement of Government employees engaged in certain hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6616. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6617. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to facilitate the collection of statistics with respect to the incidence of crime and to provide for the establishment of a National Crime Statistics Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN (for himself, Mr. COLMER, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. ABERNETHY, and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.R. 6618. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the restoration, reconstruction, and exhibition of the gunboat *Cairo*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS (for himself, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. KING, and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 6619. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 6620. A bill to provide that expenses incurred in certain construction in the city of Richland, Mo., 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. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. LENNON):

H.R. 6621. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 6622. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6623. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for employers who employ members of the hard-core unemployed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 6624. A bill to appropriate funds for the continued preconstruction planning and survey of the Howards Mill Lake, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 6625. A bill to appropriate funds to initiate a flood control study of the Waccamaw River Basin, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 6626. A bill to appropriate funds for a flood control study of the Lumber River, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 6627. A bill to appropriate funds for the beach-erosion protection at Carolina Beach Inlet, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 6628. A bill to appropriate funds for a model study and preconstruction planning of a jetty at Masonboro Inlet, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 6629. A bill to appropriate funds for a feasibility study of deepening the channel

from 8 to 12 feet from Acme to Fayetteville, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 6630. A bill to appropriate funds for continuing construction of the New Hope dam and reservoir project, North Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LENNON (for himself and Mr. PREYER of North Carolina):

H.R. 6631. A bill to appropriate funds for continued preconstruction planning and survey of Randleman Lake, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 6632. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H.R. 6633. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make advance payments to producers under the feed grain program with respect to crops of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 6634. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 6635. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6636. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to advance the date after which the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may take crime insurance available at affordable rates within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6637. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Code to increase the jurisdictional amount for the administration of small estates, to increase the family allowance, to provide simplified procedures for the settlement of estates, and to eliminate provisions which discriminate against women in administering estates; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6638. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, relating to school fare subsidy for transportation of school children within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 6639. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of certain former alien employees of the United States who have been admitted to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6640. A bill to provide rules for the application of sections 269 and 1551 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 6641. 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. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. BURTON):

H.R. 6642. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of low-cost meal programs, nutrition training and education programs, opportunity for social contacts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6643. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLLEN:

H.R. 6644. A bill to amend section 1402(a)

of title 10, United States Code, to revise the rule for recomputation of retired or retainer pay to reflect later active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 6645. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 6646. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 40-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, with a minimum primary benefit of \$120 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; and to authorize appropriations to finance the cost of these changes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEBELIUS:

H.R. 6647. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. BRINKLEY, and Mr. MATHIS of Georgia):

H.R. 6648. A bill for the improvement of navigation conditions in the Apalachicola River, Fla., and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 6649. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the credit against tax for retirement income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 6650. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 6651. A bill to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 6652. A bill to encourage States to establish abandoned automobile removal programs and to provide for tax incentives for automobile scrap processing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 6653. A bill to provide for the establishment of a system of overtime pay for the U.S. Capitol Police; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 6654. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 6655. A bill to amend the Federal law relating to the care and treatment of animals to broaden the categories of persons regulated under such law, to assure that birds in pet stores and zoos are protected, and to increase protection for animals in transit; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 6656. A bill to authorize a program to develop and demonstrate low-cost means of preventing shoreline erosion; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG of Texas:

H.R. 6657. A bill to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 per-

cent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KOCH, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.J. Res. 486. Joint resolution repealing the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BELL:

H.J. Res. 487. 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. BIAGGI:

H.J. Res. 488. 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. DELLUMS:

H.J. Res. 489. 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. EVANS of Colorado:

H.J. Res. 490. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H.J. Res. 491. Joint resolution to direct the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the effects of the display of violence in television programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.J. Res. 492. Joint resolution to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide for the designation of the second Monday in November of each year as Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.J. Res. 493. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the calendar week beginning on May 30, 1971, and ending on June 5, 1971, as "National Peace Corps Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.J. Res. 494. 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.

H.J. Res. 495. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the last Friday in September as "American Indian Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself, Mr. CEDERBERG, and Mr. MAYNE):

H.J. Res. 496. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week in November which includes Thanksgiving Day in each year as "National Family Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 497. 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. SCHWENGEL:

H.J. Res. 498. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the calendar week beginning on May 30, 1971, and ending on June 5, 1971, as "National Peace Corps Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. LUJAN, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. SCHMITZ, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. WINN, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.J. Res. 499. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the continuance in office of judges of the Supreme Court and of inferior courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H.J. Res. 500. 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. SYMINGTON:

H.J. Res. 501. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the calendar week beginning on May 30, 1971, and ending on June 5, 1971, as "National Peace Corps Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.J. Res. 502. 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. BINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 224. Concurrent resolution protesting the treatment of American servicemen held prisoner by the Government of North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORDOVA:

H. Con. Res. 225. Concurrent resolution relative to San Juan's 450th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania):

H. Con. Res. 226. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to U.S. support of proposals made by Premier Golda Meir of Israel for the negotiation of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. COLLIER, and Mr. MCCLURE):

H. Con. Res. 227. 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. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 228. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the congressional intent in the enactment of the black lung benefit provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 229. Concurrent resolution calling for the humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HULL:

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution urging the President to determine and undertake appropriate actions with respect to stopping armed attacks on aircraft and passengers engaged in international travel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. ZION):

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to obtaining recommendations for appropriate steps to obtain an accountability of, humane treatment for, and release of,

Americans held prisoner or missing in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of international standards for the humane treatment of animals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELLUMS (for himself, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 340. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Res. 341. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

78. By the SPEAKER. A memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the use of an engraving of Mount Rushmore on some denomination of U.S. currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

79. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to establishing a minimum wage of \$2; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

80. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the creation of a national park in the counties of Texas, Cimarron, and Beaver, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

81. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a Federal study of airport noise and operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

82. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, requesting Congress to propose a constitutional

amendment authorizing pupils to pray and have Bible readings in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

83. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to establishment of a national cemetery in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

84. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to Federal-State revenue sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. 6658. A bill for the relief of Antonio and Maria Nair Puleo and minor child, Claudia Puleo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6659. A bill for the relief of Theofanis Koutsiaftis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6660. A bill for the relief of Biagio Caruso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6661. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6662. A bill for the relief of Olivia Violet Tennyson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 6663. A bill for the relief of Greta Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6664. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Montemaggiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6665. A bill for the relief of Winston Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6666. A bill for the relief of Maj. Michael M. Mills, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL of Virginia:

H.R. 6667. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the estate of the late R. Gordon Finney, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6668. A bill for the relief of Amante and Rizalina Cabalda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 6669. A bill for the relief of certain Filipino nurses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 6670. A bill for the relief of John Vincent Amrault; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6671. A bill for the relief of Chan Gok Yiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 6672. A bill for the relief of Lucius Edward Arnold and his wife, Ann Marie Arnold, and their children, Steven Watkins Lucius Arnold and Patricia Diana Marie Arnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6673. A bill for the relief of Dionissia Efsthios Kefalinou Tzinieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 6674. A bill for the relief of Adelaida M. Alinsagay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 6675. A bill for the relief of Faustino Murgoa-Melendrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 503. Joint resolution restoring citizenship posthumously to Gen. R. E. Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

48. By the SPEAKER. Petition of Beatrice Miller Montonye, Sarasota, Fla., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

49. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors, Milwaukee County, Wis., relative to use of vendor and voucher payments in AFDC without loss of reimbursement of the Federal share of such aid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SUPPORT FOR CONTINUED FUNDING OF THE SST PROTOTYPE

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, last week, this body rejected by an extremely close vote, continued funding of the SST prototype development. I supported continuation of the development and will continue to do so.

In the First District of Ohio, which I represent, is located the General Electric plant which has been responsible for the GE-4 engines being developed for the U.S. SST prototype aircraft. Thousands of people working and living in my district will be directly affected by the determination made on the SST project. Since I took office in January of this year, I found myself in the middle of the heated controversy concerning the economic problems, the environmental problems, and the social problems which surround the SST controversy. I held re-

peated meetings with representatives from environmental groups in my district and representatives from the aerospace industry presenting all arguments for and against the SST.

After 2½ months of intense review and study of the ramifications of the SST prototype development, I have concluded:

First, the environmental problems represented with the SST development can be eliminated and will be eliminated if the prototype development is allowed to continue.

Second, the progress made in reducing aircraft and aircraft noise has been so successful that the SST will meet all FAA noise regulations and the approach noise will actually be lower than current subsonic aircraft.

Third, the real tough issues concerning the SST are the economic question and the priority question. Federal expenditures to date have no possibility of being recouped if the SST development is terminated. Continuation of the SST project and the appropriation of the necessary \$350 million will give Congress and the country tangible factual basis on

which to judge the feasibility of full development of SST's by American aerospace industry.

Terminating the SST project eliminates existing jobs in the aerospace industry, forfeits the advantageous position which the airlines have in terms of the international airline industry, eliminates the possibility of repayment, adversely affects future balance of trades and writes off the \$800 million plus investment our Government has made to date in the SST.

I am convinced that the age of the SST is upon us and rejection by this Congress will not stop the development of supersonic plans but only eliminate the possibility of American aerospace industry leading the way in this development.

I believe if the SST is considered as an individual issue, it will merit the support and continuation of a majority of this body. Unfortunately, the SST has become a scapegoat for the dissatisfactions of today's society. Terminating the SST will not relieve urban blight, will not provide new mass transportation systems, and will not make welfare reform an accomplished fact.