weapons except in response to direct attack.

3. We appeal to our government to initiate immediately at the Paris Conference negotiations on the timetable for the pledged withdrawal of all United States military forces.

4. We appeal to all of our fellow church men and women to join us in calling on the President and the Congress to take these steps immediately.

Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, the caucus of Democratic Members of the House is scheduled to meet and vote on a resolution giving our support to a "sense of Congress" resolution to withdraw all American troops from Vietnam by the end of this year.

While I and many others would prefer an early deadline, this is one that has gathering support. Such a pledge would move the Paris negotiations off dead center.

The fact that this resolution is being seriously considered for action on the floor is strong evidence that the American people generally believe we have more important problems to solve at home than we have in Southeast Asia.

Once again, I would like to say that I and many of our colleagues here are ready and willing to go out and meet with the people at the grassroots level and I would strongly urge other Members to do so. Such action would be a step in restoring the faith and trust of the people in our legislative branch.

SHORTAGE OF MEDICAL FACILITIES

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, we are rapidly approaching a crisis in medical education in the United States. School facilities to educate and train future doctors are totally inadequate. Hundreds of dedicated young men and women, anxious to become physicians and alleviate the sufferings of a large part of our population that requires more and more care, are denied the opportunity to attend medical schools of their choice, or indeed any medical schools in this country.

In my own State of Kansas, sharp restrictions on enrollment in the State university medical school have deprived a substantial number of Kansas young people of an advanced professional education. Indeed, it is a sad commentary on this great and rich Nation that scores of young people have found it necessary to go to foreign countries to gain a medical education. For example, in a medical college in Mexico, more than 80 percent of the medical students are from the United States. I regard this as deplorable.

I am, therefore, today introducing a joint resolution which would require the Veterans' Administration to establish a pilot program to assist in the establishment of new State medical schools. In so doing I am joining the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, who proposed an identical bill a few days ago. It is an honor to follow the gentleman from Texas. I sincerely hope that his committee will promptly move our resolution forward to enactment.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6531

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with clause 6 of rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, I am inserting at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an amendment to H.R. 6531, the Military Selective Service Act Amendments of 1971. It is my understanding that under this rule, I will be entitled to 5 minutes in which to explain my amendment even if the Committee of the Whole agrees to a limitation on debate time.

The text of the amendment follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6531, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. GIBBONS

Page 11, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

"(25) By adding immediately before section 17 the following new section:

"'SEC. 16a. No person who is inducted after June 30, 1971, for training and service under this title may be used in combat or deployed to a combat zone outside the United States unless at least one of the following shall have occurred:

"'(1) The President has declared that an armed attack has been made upon the United States.

"'(2) The President has declared that an armed attack on the United States is so imminent that full mobilization of the armed forces is required.

"'(3) The Congress by concurrent resolution authorizes such use and deployment of persons inducted under this title and directs that a full mobilization of the armed forces be effected.

"'(4) The President has requested that Congress declare war, but the authority to so use and deploy inducted personnel pursuant to this clause shall expire at the close of the 30th day after such request was made if the Congress has not declared war on or before such 30th day.

"'(5) The Congress has declared war.

" (6) Such person consents to such use and deployment in such written form as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned.'"

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, March 31, 1971*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Acquaint now thyself with God, and be at peace: Thereby good shall come unto thee.—Job 22: 21.

Eternal Father, without whom we can do nothing wisely and with whom we can do all things worthily, unite these leaders of our people in the true way to achieve justice in our Nation and peace in our world.

During these Lenten days we renew our prayer for our President, our Speaker, these men and women who represent our Nation, and all who work with them. May Thy providence watch over them, Thy spirit sustain them, and Thy wisdom guide them that with a high integrity of purpose they may meet the difficult demands of these troubled times.

Help each one of us to live this day without sin, and may Thy mercy be upon us as we trust in Thee. In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the appropriation bill for the Office of Education and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.

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

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. FASCELL. 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. 36]

Alexander	Ford,	Minshall
Andrews,	William D.	Morgan
N. Dak.	Fountain	Murphy, N.Y.
Arends	Fraser	Pelly
Ashley	Gallagher	Peyser
Bergland	Gaydos	Pickle
Biaggi	Gettys	Poage
Blanton	Giaimo	Podell
Carey	Goldwater	Rangel
Carter	Green, Pa.	Rees
Casey, Tex.	Hagan	Reid, N.Y.
Chamberlain	Hall	Riegle
Chisholm	Hicks, Wash.	Rodino
Clark	Hogan	Rooney, Pa.
Clay	Jarman	Rosenthal
Collins, Ill.	Johnson, Pa.	Roush
Conyers	Jones, Ala.	Shriver
Corbett	Koch	Sikes
Corman	Kuykendall	Stafford
Coughlin	Long, La.	Staggers
Dent	Long, Md.	Taylor
Dorn	Lujan	Terry
Drinan	McClure	Van Deerlin
Edwards, La.	McCulloch	Vanik
Evans, Colo.	Macdonald,	Wilson, Bob
Flood	Mass.	Young, Tex.
Foley	Mathias, Calif.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

APRIL 4, 1971, MARKS FINAL DAY OF YEAR-LONG CELEBRATION OF 300TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST SETTLEMENT IN SOUTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, April 4, 1971, will mark the final day of the year-long celebration of the 300th anniversary of the first permanent settlement in South Carolina. This commemoration of our State's 300 years of history has reached into every area of South Carolina's past and to every phase of its present life. The year has provided the people of our State with a rare moment, one in which we have paused in our busy modern lives to look back and appreciate the heritage we have—to take stock of our present status and to prepare us to enter into our fourth century with courage and conviction.

South Carolina's Festival of History has told of a struggle—the struggle to conquer a wilderness, the struggle of men to be free and in charge of their own destiny, the struggle to recover from the devastations of war and the successful effort to reenter the mainstream of American political and economic life.

The tricentennial year has also afforded a forward look as well as a study of the past. It has been presented in a three-dimensional view of South Carolina—past, present, and future. It has been educational, inspirational, and enjoyable. It has also served to spearhead the beginning of our State's move into an expanded program of tourism in which millions of visitors who now pass through the State will find it worthwhile to stop and spend some time getting to know us.

The important accomplishment, however, has been that the people of South Carolina themselves have acquired a new awareness of our State and our heritage and have had the special pleasure and privilege of acquainting our friends from the other States and nations with South Carolina, its history and its people.

RESOLUTION IMPOSING MORATORIUM ON REPLACEMENT TROOPS TO VIETNAM

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 of this year I introduced House Joint Resolution 258 calling upon the President to impose a moratorium on sending any replacement troops to Vietnam. As our troops are rotated back home at the conclusion of their 1-year tour of duty, they would not be replaced and in 1 year there would be no U.S. troops left in Vietnam. Remaining units would be consolidated as they are under our present reduction program.

I am pleased to note that we are now moving in that direction. On May 1 of this year, we will have remaining in Vietnam 284,000 American troops, assuming that we continue to reduce our Armed Forces in Vietnam at the present schedule. If, indeed, the President does announce his new reduction schedule, as he is expected to do next Wednesday, and announces a reduction at the rate of 16,500 a month, then our troops would be out of Vietnam by October 1972.

If the President should go to a 20,000-a-month reduction, as we hope he will, we will have all of our troops out of Vietnam by July 1972. But we actually would stop sending American troops to Vietnam by August of this year, because our normal monthly rotation rate will exceed the 20,000 reduction per month, hopefully to be ordered by the President.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting a 2-year extension of the Selective Service Act at this time and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I understand the feeling held in Congress that we have a mandate to move to all-volunteer armed services as expeditiously as is possible in the national interest. It has been my conclusion that to accomplish this in 1 year's time, circumstances being what they presently are, would be costly for the country not only in the short term, but also in terms of the irreversible pattern it would create for meeting our future military manpower needs. I have some personal misgivings about an all-volunteer service under the best of circumstances; but in terms of what will be necessary to achieve an all-volunteer service coincident with the scaling down of the war in Vietnam and present morale conditions in the armed services, the need for caution is all the more apparent.

I hope, as do many of my colleagues voting to extend the draft for 2 years, that we will achieve a point of no draft calls long before the 2 years are up. This hoped-for result is dependent upon many things beyond the scope of this law. I have reluctantly concluded the realistic course is to extend the draft for 2 years. I urge my colleagues to be realistic, since the alternatives are the engendering of false hopes and possible damage to the balanced relationship we must have between our military and civilian components.

RETIREMENT OF BARNET NOVER AND NAOMI NOVER

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

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of an era in Washington journalism. Barnet Nover is retiring as Washington bureau chief for the Denver Post, and simultaneously his wife, Naomi, is retiring as a Denver Post reporter.

Barney Nover's daily newspaper career spans more than 50 years. Following his graduation from Cornell University in 1919, he joined the staff of the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News, rising to the post of associate editor before joining the staff of the Washington Post in 1936. In 11 years with the Washington Post, Barney covered the political and foreign affairs beats, and held the title of associate editor. He became chief of the Denver Post's Washington bureau in 1947 and has served in that capacity until today.

The Novers were married in 1934, and Naomi subsequently became half of a rarity in American journalism—a husband-wife reporting team. In recent years they have covered some of the biggest stories in Washington and other points on the world political scene.

In past years Barney Nover was one of those few journalists who become Presidential confidants. I can also report that he goes out of his way to assist new Congressmen. When I arrived on the Capital scene in 1963, Barney and Naomi gave generously of their time in helping me find my way during those first difficult months of my career in Congress. I will always be grateful.

Knowing the Novers as I do, I expect that this good counsel will not end with their official retirement. I also expect to see their bylines in the future, because no doubt their expertise will be valuable to the journalistic fraternity for years to come.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to

address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during debate and under the 5-minute rule on consideration of H.R. 6531, I intended to offer the following amendment.

On Page 6, after line 4, insert the following:

"(16) Section 6(o) is amended to read: 'Except during the period of a war or a national emergency declared by Congress, no person may be inducted for training and service under this title unless he volunteers for such induction—

"'(1) if the father or a brother or a sister of such person was killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States or subsequently died or is totally disabled as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service, or

"'(2) during any period of time in which the father or a brother or a sister of such person is in a captured or missing status as a result of such service.'"

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is self-explanatory. It would prohibit the involuntary inductment into the armed services, any person whose father, brother, or sister has been killed in action, died, or is totally disabled as a result of injuries received during service, or is a prisoner or war or is missing in action. I urge its adoption.

AMENDING THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6531), 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.

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

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 further consideration of the bill, H.R. 6531, with Mr. BOLAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the Committee rose on yesterday, it was agreed that the first section ending on line 22, page 11, of the bill would be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. ABZUG

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ABZUG:

Page 1, strike out line 3 and all that follows thereafter down through line 22 on page 11 and insert the following: "That effective January 1, 1972, the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 is repealed and the President shall take such action as may be necessary before such date to insure an orderly winding up of the affairs of the Selective Service System."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her amendment.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to the Military Selective Service Act because I am unalterably opposed to military conscription. I believe it should be dismantled. I believe that the draft in this country not only violates the concepts of the American tradition of freedom and creates a system of involuntary servitude, but also I believe the draft has made possible the escalation and the continuation of the war in Indochina without the consent of the American people or, in fact, the Congress of the United States.

I believe that we can take no more important step toward ending this wretched war and withdrawing our troops from Indochina before the end of this year than by ending and repealing the entire Military Selective Service Act now presently on the books.

I share with millions of my fellow Americans a very deep distress at the strife and discord the draft has produced in this country during the time it has been in effect in peacetime. Until recently the draft was conscripting thousands of young men, men too young even to vote. The draft is still exploiting the labor of all young men, especially those who are politically and economically least powerful.

Many of my constituents are in this group. Many constituents of other Members are in this group.

Many are poor, many are Puerto Rican, many are black. We have all witnessed the increased alienation of the young people as conscription has forced them to choose between going to fight in Vietnam in an illegal war or fleeing the country or seeking jail as an expression of conscientious objection, or turning on to drugs, as the Army reports more than 50 percent of our young people have done.

What about the prisoners of war that we are all so concerned about? We continue to draft young men and make killers of them, and then we wonder about what we are going to do about those who are captured in this senseless and insane war in Indochina.

I object to any and all draft laws. I believe peacetime conscription has taken away the power of this body over U.S. foreign policy. I believe it has weakened the control of this House over the foreign policy of our country. It has provided the manpower for large-scale military interventions overseas without either the consent of this body or the consent of the people.

The existence of an unlimited supply of conscripts has encouraged the Government to resort to military solutions. It has prevented consideration of any constructive foreign policies in this country. The Vietnamese war in its entirety might have been avoided had Congress been required to approve reinstatement of the draft for the specific purpose of furnishing fighting men for Vietnam instead of being called upon to approve an ambiguous and now repealed Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

I believe the power to draft and to conscript has been a key element in enabling administrations, Democratic or Republican, unilaterally to commit this Nation to war, even when that involvement has proved to be against the desires of 70 percent of the American people and dangerous to the national interest and to the economy of this country.

I believe the key role which the draft plays in making possible the continuation of this immoral and unpopular war in Indochina is on the line by the very introduction of this bill here today, which continues to give the President unlimited power to continue to induct young men into a war which the American people have rejected, which rejection the President has not heeded, and which war this body must act now to reject. This body must act to reject the war not only by voting to repeal the draft, but it must also act to go further and to reject the war by insisting that all troops be withdrawn from Indochina by the end of this year and by withholding all appropriations for such troops and for the purposes of that war.

The repeal of the draft today is merely a first step in ending the ignominious war in Indochina. I believe those of us who wish to restore to Congress its rightful role of having something to say about the matter of war and peace must take this first initial step. We must defeat this bill and support the amendment to repeal the Selective Service Act.

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

Mrs. ABZUG. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support fully the statement being made by the Congresswoman from New York. Yesterday on the floor of this House, I spoke out against the continuation of the draft. I used language that some of my colleagues termed intemperate and unkind. My only regret is that I did not use stronger language against those who would continue this pernicious and venal draft system which, as the Congresswoman so aptly describes, is the mechanism by means of which we feed young men into Southeast Asia to be brutalized and slaughtered.

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

(On request of Mr. MITCHELL, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. ABZUG was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield further, as I was saying, I agree with the gentlewoman's apt description that the Selective Service System is the mechanism by means of which we send more young men into Southeast Asia to be brutalized and maimed and mutilated and slaughtered.

I heard a great deal of talk on the floor yesterday morning about the Calley case, I submit to the Members that when they vote to further extend the draft—and it will be extended, I fear—Members should just remember they are creating the possibility for 10,000 more Calleys and 10,000 more Americans to be killed.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I should like to take just a few seconds to commend the gentlewoman from New York for what I know is a very sincere motivation. I am sure she intends this as

one device which will render war as something that will not happen again. I certainly share her desire for that objective and that goal; but I respectfully suggest that the matter has been oversimplified, that when one thoroughly explores what this amendment would do the exact opposite of what she seeks may be the end result.

Repeal of the draft act would not only repeal the induction authority provided by the law for the President to maintain manpower strength in the armed services but also would destroy the existing system of registration and classification established over the past 40 years.

Here is what that would do: It would shrink the base of military power available to this Nation. I believe that is what the gentlewoman intends. But when we shrink the base of military power available to this Nation do we necessarily make war less likely?

One historian or one famous person whose name I do not recall once said that with complete and total disarmament the decisive weapon of world war III could be a thing as simple as a dagger. That statement brings into focus a human reality; that is, men, so long as they are human, will some way find a means to disagree and a means to express that disagreement in war.

I wish it were not true, but it is true and history bears me out. So when we shrink the base of military power we do not shrink man's desire to make war or the fact that he will be evil enough to do it.

Here is what we do when we shrink the base of manpower, through the gentlewoman's amendment: We increase reliance for prevention of war upon the most horrible weapons mankind has ever conceived, nuclear weaponry. The obvious result is if we do not have the manpower and we do not have standby registration facilities with which to fight a conventional war, and we are in danger, then we increase the likelihood of nuclear warfare. That is a direction we should not follow in this country. We should be going in the opposite direction.

I respectfully suggest that the gentlewoman's amendment takes us in that direction. It should be defeated.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I shall not take 5 minutes, Mr. Chairman, because the gentleman from California has adequately explained what the situation is.

I, too, share the gentleman's views in commending the gentlewoman from New York. She is a very serious person in this presentation, and I know her to be very sincere and very serious. I also commend her for making the situation crystal clear. Instead of nibbling away at the power of induction, without realizing what is actually going on, she faces the issue foursquare. She does not say, "Let us do away with the induction power of the Selective Service Act," or the Draft Act, as it is called; but she says, "Let us do away with the Draft Act, the entire act."

What does this mean? This means, if the amendment were to be adopted, we would have absolutely no machinery, no mechanism in the Government to induct or to acquire or to maintain any necessary manpower pool in the defense of this country for the security of this country.

The whole basic issue is the defense of America, the security of America. The only way to secure the defense of the country is by manpower, by strength, by the ability to repel the enemy. The only way to repel the enemy is to have sufficient manpower. Now, in these times the only way to get sufficient manpower is by the mechanism of the draft, as obnoxious as it may be to most of us.

I wish we did not need it.

I wish we had an all-volunteer army and that patriotism in this country would be such that the people would rally to the flag and defend their country when it needs defense more than at any other time in its history. I would like to see this. But I am also a realist. We do not have it, and those of us who feel the responsibility of furnishing the necessary means to defend and secure our country have to resort to whatever means we have available.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ABZUG. I would like to comment on what the Chairman said and what the gentleman from California said with regard to the fact that if we are proposing to repeal the draft our country is left defenseless. First of all, with respect to the comment made by the gentleman from California, I believe all of us would welcome the day when we could find a way of settling international disputes through peaceful means and when we could have complete disarmament under the jurisdiction of a universal public authority. In this nuclear age the idea that a nation or civilization itself will be able to survive the ever spiraling arms race is becoming something most tenuous. Settling disputes through the use of armies and through nuclear threats has failed us so completely that we must look forward to other alternatives in the future.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to your statement about what would happen in the event that we did away with the Selective Service System, there have been alternatives proposed here which are transitions to the stage that we should be approaching the final stage which I believe would be most healthy for this Nation and for the world, namely, complete disarmament under a public international authority such as the United Nations.

We have to recognize that any changes that may be proposed, even the changes involved in the bill before us, require a certain amount of adjustment. That adjustment can take place through the powers that the President has. If we were to repeal the authority for the Selective Service System, appropriate steps could be taken with existing Presidential power to dismantle the system.

I do not think that is a valid argument, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank you for your observation, and may I say that I, too, share your desire for Utopia and for everybody being in love with everybody else and I hope for the elimination of evil from the world. But unfortunately we do not live in that atmosphere now and we never will. There has been no new argument advanced on this floor today that has not been advanced before and which has not been rejected before.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. In listening to your statement, you indicated that a realistic appraisal of the situation would suggest there would not be a whole host of people rallying to the defense of this Nation if we did not have a selective service system. I question in my mind whether that system, with all of its inequities and venalities, has not, indeed, contributed to that very climate which you abhor.

Mr. HÉBERT. I deny the statement as a fact, stating that inequities exist as a uniform proposition. There are some inequities that exist, but I think the Draft Act has been used by some individuals as a vicious and venal piece of propaganda in an attempt to divide this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. ABZUG) there were—ayes 11, noes 73.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS REFUSED

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

The CHAIRMAN. A demand for tellers with clerks is not in order since tellers were not ordered.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred and ten Members are present, a quorum.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRINKLEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRINKLEY: On page 7, after the period in line 8, insert the following:

"The local board and/or its staff shall perform their official duties only within the county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in which the local board is established."

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I propose to offer a second amendment after this one which deals with intercounty Selective Service Board consolidation involving up to five counties per board. I offered this same amendment in the committee and it was not carried in the committee.

Mr. Chairman, the current amendment under consideration was not offered in the committee because I felt that it came under the consolidation provision. How-

ever, it does not and this instant amendment is designed to prevent the administrative procedures which are currently being conducted relating to draft boards.

First, let me commend the Director of the Selective Service, the Honorable Curtis Tarr. I think he is a very able man and I certainly commend him for trying to make the Selective Service System work better and to do the very best he can in a responsible and responsive manner.

He proposes, and is in the process of implementing with the States, and in conjunction with the States, a device whereby several counties together may pool their talent in one of those counties administratively; that is, clerically, to better handle draft board cases.

It is my feeling that this does not necessarily mean better handling. I feel that even though a clerk of a draft board is a part-time worker as opposed to being a full-time worker, that she may better serve her people locally in the county where she lives, where the young man lives, by handling everything in the same county where the draft board itself is located.

The thrust of the amendment is that it would require the office of the clerk of the draft board to be within the county served; it would require the records of the draft board to stay within the county so that intercounty records would not be pooled together.

This simply would not allow consolidation, called collocation, of administrative records or administrative personnel. It would allow local boards to be truly local instead of intercounty. I think that a county is synonymous with local, and where a draft board goes across county lines, this no longer would be the case.

Mr. Chairman, I would be delighted to respond to any questions.

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

Mr. BRINKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Georgia if there are any cases today where there are some of the smaller counties that combine with adjoining counties, and that combine clerks and one draft board? Are there any cases of that kind?

Mr. BRINKLEY. Yes, at least it is proposed for the State of Georgia, since we have 159 counties.

Mr. MYERS. I am aware of that. I mean existing today, have there been any smaller counties that, because of the size of the county and because of cost factors, that single draft boards are not feasible? Have any of them already been consolidated through their own desires?

Mr. BRINKLEY. Not that I know of, except that in the committee I believe the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER), indicated that there may be some boards in Texas which were consolidated under the authority already given to the President.

Mr. MYERS. That are already consolidated today?

Mr. BRINKLEY. Yes, that is right.

Mr. MYERS. Previous to Selective Service Director Tarr's latest development?

Mr. BRINKLEY. Yes.

Mr. MYERS. How would this amendment change this condition today?

Mr. BRINKLEY. It would acquire an affirmative adjustment.

Mr. MYERS. It would have to go back to the original counties?

Mr. BRINKLEY. Yes; if the board consolidation authority is also deleted.

Mr. MYERS. What your amendment then says is that when a man signs up in his county at the draft board, the clerk of that office must stay in the county of his residence?

Mr. BRINKLEY. That is true.

Mr. MYERS. And not in a county not of his residence, the clerk and the draft board both must also stay in the county?

Mr. BRINKLEY. There would be no intercounty pooling of personnel or records in one central point. I think the maximum presently allowable is five counties. This amendment would require it to be limited to one political subdivison; namely, one county.

Mr. MYERS. This amendment would require them to remain within the same county?

Mr. BRINKLEY. Right.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, then the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia would not maintain the local draft board as such; it would merely mean administrative procedures by which a clerk would be maintained, and the records maintained in the county, but it would not maintain in each county a local draft board; is that correct?

Mr. BRINKLEY. That is correct as far as this amendment goes, but the second amendment which I shall offer after this one goes to that very point. That is the very thing which the second amendment would eliminate; namely, the present authority given the President to consolidate local boards. That authority should also be deleted because I do feel that this is a hand-and-glove type of situation, but this amendment does not go to the present authority which the President has to consolidate draft boards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I specifically asked to strike the last word so as to indicate that I am not speaking against the amendment. I merely bring to the attention of the House the situation as it prevails.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY) is a very valuable member of our committee, and this particular matter of concern of the gentleman was discussed in the committee, and it was also indicated that the intention of the Selective Service was to collocate the boards.

We did not go along with the gentleman in his concern. He did not offer his amendment in committee, nor did it get a vote, and I just wanted to put that before us, since the gentleman from Georgia has now offered his amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia, the author of the amendment, a particular question.

The question I raise is this: Does your amendment make an effort toward fair and equitable representation of black and other racial minorities on the local boards, where they have not been provided with any representation at all?

Mr. BRINKLEY. No; it does not address itself to that.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PIKE. I would like to say to the gentleman from California that he has raised a question which has been of great interest to me for a long time. Four years ago when we renewed the draft bill, I offered an amendment which said roughly this, that to the extent practicable, draft boards shall accurately represent the ethnic and sociological background of the district which they serve.

I think the word "economic" was in there also.

The amendment at that time was defeated. But I am happy to be able to say to the gentleman that in this bill brought before you this year, there is a provision to that effect in the bill and you will find it written up in our report. This is one of the changes which is in the bill this year, which in my opinion should do something to make draft boards more equitable.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment on the question raised by the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) and the statement by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

I have introduced for some time legislation—H.R. 1567 in this 92d Congress—which would require local draft boards to reflect the ethnic and economic nature of the areas served by the draft boards. When I testified before the Committee on Armed Services on March 4 regarding the draft, much of the discussion centered on the composition of local selective service boards. I was pleased that committee members were sympathetic to my views. My distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. PIKE) was especially concerned, and I know that his efforts were most helpful in persuading the committee to adopt language dealing with this issue.

I am happy to note the bill itself does provide on page 7 at lines 16 to 19—

> To the extent practicable, the members of a local draft board shall accurately represent the economic and sociological background of the population which they serve.

That is clause 19 of section 1 which amends section 10(b)(3) of the Military Selective Services Act of 1967, as amended

I would assume that that language certainly includes ethnic background. Would the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) like to clarify that one point?

Mr. PIKE. Frankly, I do not think they could represent the sociological back-

ground without representing the ethnic background.

Mr. RYAN. I agree and I hope the legislative history is clear.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the committee for having included this provision. In spite of the fact that there is much in the bill with which I disagree, I do think that, when the committee has made an attempt to correct an inequity, it should be commended. In this case the committee has made an attempt to correct this inequity. As long as the draft exists, and I hope that our actions this week will end it, at the very least those individuals who pass upon a young man's draft status should be representative of his community. So I am pleased that the substance of my bill, H.R. 1567, has been incorporated in the bill before us.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not consume the 5 minutes, but I merely want to emphasize one point for the benefit of the membership as they assess this amendment.

In the first place, we should remember that the bill before us grants absolutely no new authority with respect to consolidation to the Director of Selective Service.

The language of the bill does not include anything to that effect.

I think what is taking place here is confusion between consolidation and collocation. What is being undertaken by the Director of Selective Service administratively is collocation, and this merely means using together two or more boards. In all instances, boards being collocated remain autonomous bodies and separate in identity, authority, jurisdiction, and responsibility. The only thing that the collocated boards will share are the clerical personnel and the physical facilities. The authority of the board remains separate and the membership of the board will not change. They will still handle the cases of young men from their own communities and they will still bring to bear their personal knowledge of the special needs of the local community in the classification of the area registrants. The special bond between the registrant and his local board in his community will not be broken.

So as we vote on this, remember that there is no new granted authority in this bill to the Director of Selective Service and we are only placing an interpretation upon what he is doing administratively, and I emphasize that he is not consolidating draft boards but he is merely collocating them for the purpose of saving some of the taxpayer's money.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. The gentleman spoke about Director Tarr's administrative action in collocation of Selective Service offices. What is the purpose of this collocation?

Mr. GUBSER. To save money. If the gentleman will permit, I will use my own County of Santa Clara as an example. The principal city of that county is San Jose. It is centrally located. Public transportation is available. We have three draft boards housed in the same area. We were evicted last week, but nevertheless they had been housed in the same building, and they are able to employ some of the same clerical personnel. The action results in fantastic savings of money, but it does not deprive the registrant of being represented by someone from his own community.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Have you made a study to determine whether the boards would be in the same cities? I believe one of the questions being raised here points to this situation. Let us say there are five different cities. Would they have the draft boards in one building in one of those cities? Could that situation exist, in your opinion?

Mr. GUBSER. I think that the Director of Selective Service intends that the physical facilities where the clerical forces are and the files are kept could be collocated, but this would not prevent a draft board from holding its meetings in an individual community.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. The gentleman has spoken about his home county. Let me speak about my home county. It is a small county of about 18,000 population. The draft board and Selective Service office is located in the county courthouse. It pays no rent, has no costs other than wages and telephone. That office now would be transferred 50 miles away, making it necessary for some young men to drive 80 miles to be registered. What savings would there be in a case like that? True, they will have to hire the same clerk or another clerk. She will have to move to another city. There will be absolutely no savings whatsoever. Quite to the contrary, the young men going to sign up would have to drive as far as 80 or 90 miles. Is there any saving in that situation?

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman may be totally correct with respect to his own local situation, but it does not follow that the Director of Selective Service will act in the same manner in every situation.

Mr. MYERS. If the gentleman will yield further, it seems to me the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, which I am going to support, does not really say that in your home county you cannot consolidate the five boards into one; does it? I think you could accomplish that in your county and probably should.

Mr. GUBSER. No. There are too many people. There are individual communities. I am quite confident that will not take place.

Mr. MYERS. The gentleman's amendment would not prohibit anything within the same county to accomplish savings?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California speaks of fantastic savings. Would the gentleman put an estimate on the fantastic savings that would be accomplished by diminishing, through consolidations, the autonomy of the local draft boards?

Mr. GUBSER. I would answer the gentleman thusly—and the gentleman has been here longer than I have, and he has seen the trend that this Congress has followed so far as squandering the taxpayers' money—and I would say that 25 cents would be fantastic.

Mr. GROSS. Twenty-five cents would be fantastic?

Mr. GUBSER. Any savings.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought: That you were not quite sure of your ground in the matter of fantastic savings. I am told by another Member of Congress that Mr. Tarr, Director of Selective Service, was on Capitol Hill Monday morning, and he is reported to have said that contemplated consolidations throughout the country would result in a savings of a million dollars. That is nationwide. I do not discount a million dollars, but I do not see anything fantastic about that in the administration of a nationwide draft program.

I want to say to the gentleman that I support continuation of the Selective Service Act, and you can consolidate in the cities all you want to consolidate. But do not go out into the rural areas of America and attempt to consolidate all of the draft boards. I want to see local, county administration in Iowa. Under the draft law we are not dealing in tractors and combines. We are dealing in human beings, and, perhaps, in human life itself.

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

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

Mr. GUBSER. I think a million dollars is worth saving. I think the gentleman would agree with that.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly I agree.

Mr. GUBSER. But I think the gentleman has erred in stating that the local autonomy will be surrendered. They will have the same local autonomy as always. The only thing is that where one local draft board is open only a few hours a day, several will be combined, and that will be open all day, and it will save some clerical cost and combine the clerical duties into fulltime jobs.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Indiana states that in some instances young men would be compelled to drive 100 miles to register for the draft.

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

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

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, when we have accomplished this combining, and when we have a fulltime secretary or clerk in that office and we make her move to another city and she is open fulltime in another city, when there is no rent paid in the first location—and this happens in about 12 of my 15 counties—I do not know what savings there

will be. If there is, let us agree right now to cut $1 million off the appropriations. If it will save $1 million, let us do that right now.

Mr. GROSS. If we are merely going to transfer and load the expense on the families of the young men being drafted, I cannot agree there is any saving.

Mr. MYERS. That is what I think. I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GROSS. So am I.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRINKLEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRINKLEY:

Beginning at page 7, line 24, and continuing through page 8, line 11, strike the following:

": *Provided*, That an intercounty local board consisting of at least one member from each component county or corresponding subdivision may be established for an area not exceeding five counties or political subdivisions corresponding thereto within a State or comparable jurisdiction when the President determines, after considering the public interest involved and the recommendation of the Governor or comparable executive official or officials, that the establishment of such local board area will result in a more efficient and economical operation. Any such intercounty local board shall have within its area the same power and jurisdiction as a local board has in its area."

and substitute therefor on page 7, line 24, a period after the numbers 1972.

On page 8, line 20, strike the following:

", and each intercounty local board shall have at least one member from each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto included within the intercounty local board area."

and insert a period after the portion of the word "tion" on page 8, line 20.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a companion amendment to the one just voted upon. The one we just voted upon was defined as a collocation amendment, which we feel is one administrative step toward this consolidation authority which we think is present under existing law, which enables the President under said existing law to establish intercounty boards using up to five counties together. We believe that that would be an anomaly, that the local board would not be truly local if there would be five counties in a centralized location, which would not be consistent with the best interests of the young men involved.

We think anything so intimate and anything so important as the draft should be passed upon by people who are truly local. We submit that the intercounty arrangement is not that local and the authority to utilize more than one county in formulating intercounty draft boards should be deleted. My amendment would accomplish this.

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

Mr. BRINKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this is merely a conforming amendment to the one just passed.

Mr. BRINKLEY. The chairman is correct. The goal of both amendments is the same.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for favorable consideration of this amendment.

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

Mr. BRINKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I commend my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for offering these amendments, because I think the gentleman has been getting at the heart of the problem developing throughout the country in the last few weeks, which is the preservation of the autonomy of local draft boards.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRINKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I also commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY).

The efforts of the gentleman from Georgia will be appreciated by people throughout every State who will be saved from having to drive for miles and miles to distant cities to register for the draft. I support him in his efforts and hope that a majority of the Congress will, also.

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

Mr. BRINKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. We agree to accept the amendment.

Mr. BRINKLEY. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I, too, wish to commend the gentleman for the amendments he has offered to this bill.

Mr. BRINKLEY. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania: On page 4, strike lines 5 through 8.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the subject of my amendment is a draft exemption for seminarians and divinity students.

The present law is that section 6(g) of the Selective Service Act exempts from the draft "regular or duly ordained ministers of religion and students preparing for the ministry under the direction of recognized churches or religious organizations."

H.R. 6531. Section (11) of the committee reported bill would amend section 6 (g) of the above act by striking that part of the section relating to divinity students.

My plea to the Members of the House is to reject the administration recommendation and retain section 6(g) of the act without amendment.

The rationale is that the Selective Service System has not justified the need for termination of the exemption for divinity students or seminarians. No Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish church organizations were consulted by Selective Service relative to the effect the recommendation would have on the securing and training of young men for service in the ministry in their respective denominations. This matter is of extreme importance for meeting the military and nonmilitary religious needs of the Nation.

My suggested amendment is to strike lines 5 through 8 on page 4.

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

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BYRNE) to restore the existing statutory exemption for divinity students.

In my judgment, any action by the Government to draft divinity students would constitute an interference of Government into spiritual ground and would, in a sense, violate our traditional separation of church and state. I would oppose such a step because I feel it would be most unwise.

Both historically and constitutionally, ministers and divinity students have been exempted from the military draft. This exemption has applied since the inception of the Selective Service System, including the period during World War II; the Supreme Court approved the draft exemption of ministers as recently as March 8, 1971, in its opinion in Gillette against United States.

Repeal of the draft exemption for divinity students would create administrative difficulties for local draft boards. Some divinity students become ministers at the beginning of their training or when they take religious vows, and would thus continue to be exempt, while others who belong to different denominations could be drafted while students. The Government might, through enactment of this provision, be setting standards in religious education. This would constitute a violation of the separation of church and state. In addition, training of many students—who may begin their religious study at the age of 14 or 15—might be interrupted, with detrimental effects on the student's determination to fulfill his theological program.

It would also be an inefficient use of manpower to induct those who intend to serve in the ministry, especially at a time when major denominations are experiencing a lack of clergymen to serve their religious and educational needs. Meanwhile, the chaplaincy needs of the Armed Forces have always been filled voluntar-

ily by the ordained graduates of the Nation's theological seminaries. If the divinity student exemption were repealed, it is hardly likely that a young man who had been drafted to serve in the Armed Forces would, after ordination, volunteer to serve an additional 2- or 3-year term as a chaplain. Thus there might well be a shortage of spiritual leaders in both civilian and military life.

In view of the fact that it seems both unnecessary and unwise to alter our traditional policy of exempting divinity students from the draft, I urge adoption of the Byrne amendment.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his amendment. I rise in support of it.

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

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman offered this amendment in the committee. I was one of those who supported him, and I should like for him to know I remain of the same opinion.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am well aware that there is a great deal of interest in and sympathy for this amendment. Quite frankly, considering the background of the entire matter, I would normally approve it myself. No one has a higher regard for gentlemen of the "cloth" than I, but that is not the issue in this amendment.

What are the facts?

The Commission on Chaplains in the Armed Forces has recommended elimination of the divinity school exemptions. The Commission on Chaplains is a policy group that makes recommendations to the Department of Defense on the recruitment and retention of chaplains. The Commission represents 41 religious denominations. Opinion in the religious community is somewhat divided on this issue. It would appear that the Commission that speaks for the majority of denominations supports the committee position on elimination of divinity student exemptions.

The Congress could not continue exemptions for divinity students as an aid to religion as that would be a violation of the first amendment to the Constitution. Thus, if divinity students are given an exemption, it would have to be justified on the same basis that college deferments were justified. The present manpower pool is so large and the draft calls so relatively small that student deferments can no longer be justified as necessary in the national interest. The same is true of divinity students. It should be understood that ministers of religion continue to be exempt. The provision in the committee bill, which was requested by the President, applies only to students of theology.

It was testified in the committee's hearings that many students stay in college as a means of gaining a draft deferment. While the percentage is undoubtedly small, there are some who enter theology schools as a draft haven. If student deferments are eliminated but divinity exemptions are not eliminated, the theology schools would be the only remaining draft haven and a great number of draft evaders would be seeking entry in such schools.

If the divinity student wants to claim he is a conscientious objector, unquestionably it would be granted. Then he would serve, if this legislation goes through as it is written, 2 years doing worthwhile service for his fellowman, such as in a hospital or mental institution.

I do not believe that performing such work would keep a person from later making a good minister. It might make him a better minister. For that reason I do oppose this amendment.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana.

This amendment came up twice in the committee. Frankly, it is a very easy amendment to vote for. We called it the "pearly gates amendment" in the committee. Those who favor it are obviously going up, and those who do not favor it obviously, when their time comes, are going down.

I think that chairman asked me to speak in opposition to it because I am so far committed already that I have almost nothing to lose.

Mr. Chairman, I have never claimed to be any great expert in morality, but what I think we are doing here is not good and it does not make much sense.

First of all, as the gentleman from Indiana said, the Association of Chaplains did pass a resolution on this. This is a general commission of chaplains consisting of Armed Forces personnel. Their language was that they "urged that seminarians and seminary enrollees be subject equally with others for the risk of selection for military service," and they "request their member denominations to give attention to the issues posed by the present 4–D exemption for certain seminarians and enrollees."

Well, what are some of these issues? The whole thrust of this bill and everything we try to do with this bill is to make it apply to people equally. We are after justice and we are after equality. Of course, divinity school students are worthy, but so are biologists and so are chemists and so are physicists, and environmentalists and teachers, and almost anything you want to name. Once we start going into the loophole business and opening the door for a loophole for anybody, no matter how worthy they may be, then the physicists are going to say, "Well, exempt me, too," and the teachers will say, "Well, exempt me, too." What we are going to have, instead of a bill which strives for justice for everybody—and that is what this bill does—would be a bill which asks for justice for everybody plus a little bit of privilege for a few people. I am afraid that that privilege will grow and grow and grow.

I recognize the motivation of those who support this amendment and recognize their sincerity, but I simply say, let us take the position that we are going to be equal to everybody regardless of what their occupation is.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from a clergyman in my own district who is not of my own faith. I would like to read the closing words of it.

> In particular I should like to see the 4–D exemption ended. Why we ministers and ministerial students should be exempt from being called to military service has always been a question that has bothered me, unless it came from some attachment to a primitive past and an unusual reverence for "Holy men." Indeed the whole message of Christianity is that God became man in order to share our trials and endure our life. Why then we should ever have exempted the clergy from a very real segment of life is as immoral as it is theologically unsound.

I do not know whether it is immoral or not. I do know that we have a bill here which is just and fair to everybody, and I would simply like to keep it that way.

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

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

Mr. MIKVA. Do I understand the gentleman from New York to suggest that the chaplains' society was in favor of the termination of this exemption; is that correct?

Mr. PIKE. Yes; and I have the language of their resolution right here.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not also correct that before one can become a chaplain one must be a graduate of a seminary?

Mr. PIKE. Yes.

Mr. MIKVA. Well, it seems to me that the chaplains are very anxious to preserve their monopolistic position and I do not see where that is an entirely Christian or Jewish approach.

Mr. PIKE. By and large the draft will apply at the undergraduate level. Most of the people who are going to become chaplains or become a clergyman are going to divinity schools at a higher level. They could already have passed their exposure to the draft by the time this takes place.

I would further say that I do not think that our churches are going to get the kind of moral leadership that they really want if their people lack enough commitment to serve for 2 years and then go on into the religious field.

Mr. MIKVA. As I understand the gentleman, one of the ministers in the gentleman's district wrote to the gentleman and suggested that the entire exemption, not only for seminarians, but for regularly ordained ministers be covered by the draft.

Mr. PIKE. That is what he suggested. However, the committee did not go that far. The committee did take a compromise position and in my opinion the compromise should be sustained.

Mr. MIKVA. Then, would it be fair to say that it is comparative morality that is being advocated.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chair-

man, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr Chairman, with this one exception, I strongly support the legislation that has been recommended by the Committee on Armed Services. I think the 2-year term is sound. I think the other provisions in the legislation—the added pay, and so forth, are necessary for a wide variety of reasons. But I do feel that this amendment has more reason for support than opposition.

Therefore, I feel constrained to speak on its behalf despite the recommendations of the majority of the Committee on Armed Services.

I fully support the idea that we need more religious leaders in all faiths throughout the United States. It is my information that most religions, if not all, are having a very difficult time recruiting an adequate number of students for their various training schools. In addition I am told by sources that I think are accurate that despite what has been said by some, several of the major religions in our country have not been able to fill their quotas in the Chaplain Corps of the Armed Forces. I am told that particularly in recent years, during the Vietnam conflict, that the Roman Catholic Church has not been able to supply its quota or share of chaplains to the military services.

I am told that those who believe in the Jewish faith have been unable to fully implement and meet the quotas that they had for the armed services.

Therefore, in my judgment, both because we want a greater supply of religious leaders in our own overall civilian society and because we need more religious leaders in all denominations in the armed services, it seems to me that we ought to support the Byrne amendment.

There are some other somewhat technical reasons why I think this amendment should be approved and why the committee's recommendation should be defeated. I am informed that in the Jewish faith the young person at the age of 12 or 13 starts his training. If the committee's position is sustained, in effect what you are doing is taking a young Jewish student out of his training to become a religious leader and putting him into the military service after he has made that basic decision. I am told that in some cases in Roman Catholic orders there is somewhat the same circumstances.

If that is true then I do not think the Congress should then break up the training where they have already made a specific religious commitment. Therefore in my judgment and for the reasons stated, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BYRNE) prevails.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I think the statement the gentleman made is wholly accurate insofar as it addresses the problem which the various faiths are having in attracting ministers or clergymen. However, this is a problem which really does not have much to do with the draft, because we have had this exemption, and we have had this problem during the period of this exemption, and it would seem to me that it is a poor solution to the moral leadership problem in America in achieving a solution by making our moral leaders exempt from what all other Americans are subject to.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. My response to that would be very simple. I think it is unfortunate they have not been able to recruit in the various theological schools the necessary number of religious leaders or those who seek training for religious leadership, but if we eliminate this provision in existing law as the committee has recommended, I think you complicate the recruiting problem.

I do not think we should roadblock their recruiting efforts. Therefore I believe we should support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I had not intended to speak out on this matter in the Committee of the Whole because I did speak at length during the general debate at page 8639 of the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I believe that the granting of an absolute exemption for divinity students is one of the greatest mistakes this Congress has ever made. I disagree very strongly with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD). Exemptions for divinity students are not only inconsistent and unjustifiable—and I do not see how you can possibly justify phasing out undergraduate deferments and then proceed to give a certain class of students an absolute exemption. I also believe that the exemptions actually hurt the cause of organized religion because there are people, admittedly very few, but there are people who are in divinity schools because of this absolute exemption, not for the purpose of advancing the cause of the Supreme Being, but for the purpose of avoiding military service.

Personally, I would say to the members of the Committee that in view of the fact that you are phasing out and eliminating undergraduate deferments I believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BYRNE) is not only undesirable, but I seriously question the constitutionality of the absolute exemption.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ICHORD. I will yield in just a few minutes after I make my point.

If this amendment is constitutional since you are phasing out all other undergraduate deferments, and not violative of either the first or the 14th amendments to the Constitution, it could only be justified on the ground that it is in the interest of the national security, and this, I would say to the gentleman from Michigan, cannot be true. It cannot be serving the national security interests because divinity schools are now graduating more ministers than the minority requires.

Members of the Committee, this amendment was offered in the Committee on Armed Services. It was fully debated. It was voted down by a vote of 24 to 7, almost 4 to 1, in the Committee on Armed Services.

This matter was considered by the Commission on Chaplains representing all denominations. They voted for the elimination of divinity student exemptions because they are basically unfair and basically inequitable, by a vote of 3 to 1.

I hope the Members of this House do not succumb to the pressure exerted by a few in the ministry, admittedly sincere, to grant what I consider this unconstitutional exemption.

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

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS. My question is this. I am a little confused. I understand now that our draft is operating on the 18- and 19½-year-olds or it will prospectively. Therefore, who would this amendment affect? Would not the persons in divinity school already have been through the lottery and thus it should have been determined whether or not they are to be drafted before they ever arrived at the divinity school. I just do not quite understand who would be effected by this change?

Mr. ICHORD. I will say this to the gentleman—this would continue the law as it presently is and give an absolute exemption in the case of divinity students.

Now we are phasing out college deferments. We are eliminating college deferments unless they were enrolled in school prior to April 1970.

Mr. ADAMS. This then would just apply to those who are already in divinity school or a rabbinical school, or in the priesthood?

Mr. ICHORD. If I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania correctly, it would apply prospectively to everyone entering a divinity school from now on, as being an absolute exemption.

Mr. ADAMS. If the students enter at age 18 or 19—I thought they would be undergraduates and already subject to the draft—in other words my question is—I do not see where it applies. It seems to me everybody has already been drafted or exempted from the draft before they get to the divinity school under the system that you are now applying.

Mr. ICHORD. No, not necessarily. That would depend on the calls, I would say to the gentleman from Washington, and if we reach the zero draft, you possibly will not have any calls of college students at all.

Mr. ADAMS. In other words, draft calls are still going out to people who are in graduate schools; is that correct?

Mr. ICHORD. That is right.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) if I could have the gentleman's attention.

The gentleman from Washington raised the point as to whether these people had not already been handled by the draft before they ever got to divinity

school. The minority leader answered this point a moment ago, but perhaps the gentleman did not get it.

The basic reason for the Byrne amendment—and incidentally, there is nothing unusual in this amendment. It simply retains the language in the law as it is now—the basic reason for the Byrne amendment is that in the Catholic religion today those who are going to a seminary in general begin their training at the beginning of their college year rather than going to a civilian college first and then going on to the seminary.

Second, in many of the versions of the Jewish religion, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) said a while ago, young men are committed to a religious career in some cases as early as 14 or 15 years of age.

So the very point of this amendment is that it merely extends an exemption which is already included in this bill, the exemption extended to ordain ministers of religion.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) said this was a bill that was going to provide complete equality. But the fact of the matter is that in this bill we are retaining exemptions for ministers of religion. And I would say to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) that the constitutionality of that ministerial exemption was upheld in the Gillette case by the U.S. Supreme Court on March 8 of this year.

So what we are doing in the Byrne amendment is saying that we are also going to provide a special exemption to those who are ordained ministers of religion, then we ought also to extend that same kind of exemption to those who have also begun the ministerial process in their own particular religion at the beginning of the college year, or in some cases even before.

Now this process does raise a question, and I am sure this is what the gentleman from Washington had in mind. That is that in the Protestant denominations students ordinarily do not go to divinity school until after they have graduated from college.

Traditionally in the draft law—and this is in the law now and it is the section that the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania would simply retain—in order that we not be placed in the impossible position of aiding one religion as against another, there has been established over the years a procedure where those who intend to become ministers in the Protestant religion can signify their interest in attending a divinity school in advance, at the time that they are in college, and then if they are accepted by an established Protestant denomination as a candidate for the ministry, the divinity student exemption would extend to them.

It is only with regard to students in this category that there would be any question raised at all of somebody trying to cheat under the divinity student arrangement. Maybe there are some cheaters. I do not believe that we can eliminate them completely in any system. But in order to protect those religions which do begin the process of their ministerial education at the age of 18, 15, or even 14, I think the Byrne amendment is a sound one.

I understood the point—I wanted to know when you were declared to be a divinity student.

Mr. ADAMS. I did not realize that there was a large group of people in the Roman Catholic seminaries or in the rabbinical schools that entered those schools at the age of 16, 17 or 18. My understanding was that the basic decision on the question of entering divinity school is made by nearly all religions at the end of the college level. I intend to support this Byrne amendment but I would like to have the gentleman tell me how many people are involved. I have been disturbed about the provision the gentlemen mentions which would allow an undergraduate to obtain a deferment by simply declaring "I am going into divinity school." I want to protect the legitimate students and so I will vote for the amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman will yield so that I might answer his question, I do not have the actual figures. Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania does. But I met yesterday with leading members of all three denominations, and I can tell you it is a very sizable number. In fact, I think it represents virtually all seminarians in the Catholic faith, and apparently it represents a very substantial percentage in the Jewish religion. Let me just say, with respect to Protestant divinity students, that they do not get this exemption simply by saying they intend to go on to divinity school. To qualify they have to be accepted by a recognized school and endorsed by their own religions faith.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York, if he has the information.

Mr. PODELL. I can speak for those who enter into the rabbinate. A child who studies for the rabbinate usually begins his education at an age below the 13- or 12-year-old level. Most begin their education in the elementary schools, graduate into the high school level, and then go to college; then, of course, the college is the divinity school level. I would say that 95 percent of the students who apply for the rabbinate begin most likely at the age of 7 or 8, certainly no later than the age of 11 or 12.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman. That certainly supports my information.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wish to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks in support of the amendment. I have in my congressional district the largest seminary in the State of Ohio, Borremo, a combined high school and seminary, which furnishes Catholic priests. We also have the largest rabbinical school. I certainly compliment the gentleman for pointing out the ages of these students who go from high school into college, which is a continuous process for both schools. They are located side by side. I strongly support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. LEGGETT. I support the Byrne so-called pearly gates amendment, regardless of why the Chaplain Corps would support its repeal. We have long recognized in our country and in the whole world that we have two kinds of people, men of the cloth and men of the sword. I think it is fundamentally unrealistic to expect to take young seminarians and impress them into service and expect that they are going to do the kind of job that we would expect of people who are not hampered with an excessive amount of religion.

I know if I were serving in Vietnam or any such place and I was firing a gun, I would feel very uneasy if my colleague to my right or to my left were mumbling prayers instead of aiming through the crosshairs.

I know the gentleman from Missouri, of course, has objected to this exemption on the basis that perhaps some folks have fraudulently taken advantage of deferment. Well, the main fraudulent loophole, of course, is still there, and that is the ordained minister—believe it or not, I am an ordained minister of some group who sent me rather facetiously a certificate—

I am sure that anybody who wants to get out of the draft can get one of those certificates, so the loophole is still there.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, since he mentioned my name?

Mr. LEGGETT. I did not mention the gentleman's name, and I will not yield at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have to keep in mind that this exemption was not provided to build up the divinity schools. The schools, of course, do have enough people, because we have provided the deferment. There is no assurance that the size of the schools will be adequate in the future if the deferment is repealed. But I think the reason for the deferment is because these young students are fundamentally different, and it is fundamentally unfair to take a young seminarian, after he has served in the seminary since, perhaps, his 14th or 15th birthday, and interrupt that after 3 or 4 years, and place him into service and force him into the realities of life, and hope that maybe he will go back into the seminary. I think we have to keep this in mind, that people of the cloth who are deferred eventually find their way back into the military service—that is, in the Chaplain Corps, and I think that is the proper place where these people should serve, not at the side of a rifle butt.

In the rationale provided for this repeal in this legislation, providing for repeal of the deferment provided by the Selective Service Director, they say any divinity school students, of course, will qualify as conscientious objectors. I intend to offer an amendment shortly relating to conscientious objectors, but I

would point out there are many young men of the cloth who believe in God who are not fundamentally opposed to all wars. To presume that everybody who believes in God is opposed to all wars, I think, presumes there is an immorality to the things we tolerate here in the Congress that probably is not in line with the facts.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT), for his position. I hope our point of view prevails in this matter and that we continue the deferment of divinity students as we have in the past.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman declining to yield to me?

Mr. LEGGETT. No; I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the case referred to by the gentleman from New York upheld ministerial exemptions on the ground that they did not violate the first amendment dealing with the establishment of religion. I raised the question under the 14th amendment, the equal protection clause, exempting one class of college students and not exempting the others. I would further point out to the members of the Committee that this amendment was voted down 24 to 7 in the full committee.

I realize it is hard to fight, as the gentleman well refers to this, a pearly gates amendment, but I do intend to ask for a division vote.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when the whole thrust of the legislation before us is allegedly to prepare the way for the possible move toward a voluntary army, we are asked to set a historic precedent in beginning the forced conscription of divinity students with the passage of this legislation.

My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Missouri has indicated or questioned the constitutionality of this continuing exemption, and yet the Supreme Court ruled specifically on it in 1917 in *Arver* v. *U.S.* 245 U.S. 159, and there was a second case this year—*Gillette* v. *U.S.*, docket No. 85—which was earlier mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from New York, in which approval of this exemption was also indicated by that body.

I would challenge this great committee to cite a single instance in American history when there has been a problem of insufficient chaplains for the military services. From the time of Washington's Continental Army, when two Baptist ministers were the first to volunteer to become chaplains for the Continental Army, we have never had a shortage of ministers to do the work of the ministers for the military, but we are here asked to take the young people of the Jewish faith and of the Catholic faith and, yes, in some instances, of the Protestant fellowships whose lives have been set aside for God's service, and who have begun their training, and conscript them into the military service or force them to state conscientious objection—which many may not be able to do in good conscience—in order to have some other kind of forced service which still diverts them from their calling for preparation for the ministry.

Gentlemen, I understand the standing of the church in our time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is one of the problems which concerns me: the increasingly secular nature of the church in the present day. Since I know the gentleman is an ordained minister and that he has a distinguished military record in the armed services and is also an active Member of this body, I wonder if the gentleman would give me, for my clarification, his thinking about whether the increasing secularization of the church has any bearing on the problem?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would say I believe had the church been the church, had the church fulfilled its unique spiritual role in the society, and had the ministers been about their business, as ought to have been the case, this legislation with these provisions never would have been before this body.

I do think the increasing secularization of the church is one of the reasons why Members of this body would consider the amendments here considered today.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I gladly yield to the distinguished dean of the House.

Mr. CELLER. Of course, this amendment only concerns seminarians and not ministers. Does the gentleman know that in every draft act passed by this Congress ever since the Revolutionary War seminarians were not subject to the draft except in the Civil War? It is rather strange that in the South they also exempted seminarians. So on only one occasion, as it were, have we drafted the seminarians, and that was in the Civil War. Is the gentleman aware of that?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I was not aware of this single exception. Perhaps in the South we were standing in need of prayer more greatly than were the forces of the Union. Or it may mean that the Yankees simply were not religious enough.

Mr. CELLER. Very well spoken. But does the gentleman believe if we are going to draft seminarians we will dry up the source of supply for the ministry?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The distinguished dean of the House is exactly correct. I do agree, sir.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. I commend my colleague for the statement he has made and indicate my support for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BYRNE) which would retain the provisions in present law for the exemption of divinity students.

I recognize that the President, together with Congress, has made great strides in eliminating the most glaring inequities of the draft which existed 2 years ago. The institution of the lottery, whereby no registrant has more than 1 full year of eligibility or uncertainty has measurably reduced the onus of the draft. The purpose of committee provisions in H.R. 6531 dealing with student and divinity student deferments are, I am certain, sincere attempts to continue the trend of making the selection more even handed and equitable.

However, I think some very serious questions can be raised about the benefits of taking the step that is contemplated to remove the statutory exemption for divinity students. First of all, it has been documented that the chaplaincies of our armed services are presently successfully filled by volunteers. It is certainly questionable whether ordained ministers of all faiths would be as willing to volunteer for chaplaincy service after serving 2 years of conscripted service prior to their divinity training.

Second, I am informed that in both the Catholic and Jewish religions, and possibly in others, the continuity of training is an extremely important element in the preparation for the priesthood and the rabbinate.

Some divinity students become ministers at the beginning of their training or when they take religious vows and thus, would be exempt, while others who belong to different denominations and religions would be drafted while they are students. By enacting this provision, the Government would be setting standards in religious education which is a strict violation of the "separation" clause of our Constitution.

Some students of divinity begin their training at age 14 or 15, to study for 10 years in a most intensive program. It presupposes an intense commitment, devout spirituality, and unconditional willingness to serve the Lord. A 2-year interruption and exposure to a most secular atmosphere may be detrimental to a student's determination to fulfill his theological program.

Mr. Chairman, the questions this provision raises with respect to Government interference with long-established modes of religious training for divinity service, with respect to the excellent record of voluntary service in the chaplaincy, and with respect to probable discrimination in favor of students who would be exempt by virtue of the fact that they are ordained as ministers at the start of their training, are good reasons for retaining the present language of section 6(g) of the act in full, and thus, for supporting the Byrne amendment.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. I think the statement the gentleman made with respect to moral and the religious issues was very eloquent. I should like for him to com-

ment on this subject. I have heard that one of the arguments to sustain the committee's recommendation is that the religious students are protected by the conscientious objector section in this bill. It seems to me on the basis of Supreme Court rulings recently on religious, ethical, and moral questions, raised as the basis for conscientious objection, we can assume that most of the students of religion, or many students of religion, will in fact be conscientious objectors.

If we are concerned about saving the taxpayers money, why should we send all these people through the process of being administratively adjudicated as conscientious objectors by passing this section of the bill? This expensive approach can be circumvented by passing the amendment. Would you please comment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I believe there is merit in what the gentleman has suggested. Divinity students would be conscientious objectors in many instances. I would also say, and underline, the forced term of service required of conscientious objectors would divert these young men from their religious training for a period of 2 or 3 years.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BIAGGI. I rise in support of the amendment and I commend my colleague's comments in connection with it.

I have consistently expressed my support for the concept of an all-volunteer army and have cosponsored legislation to that effect. The Gates Commission clearly sets forth the reasons and the necessity for moving to an all-volunteer Armed Force.

The present bill perpetuates the draft with all its inequities. There can be no justification for continuing this excessive burden on a small segment of our population any longer.

The pay increase provisions are very good in that they will go a long way toward attracting volunteers who have otherwise balked at joining the services because of the less-than-poverty wages paid.

However, the provisions extending the draft for 2 years and eliminating college and divinity student deferments are not acceptable.

I firmly believe we can end the draft this year—June 30, 1971. The present plans call for drafting only about 160,000 men this year. So far the Army has called for 60,000 inductees in the first 3 months.

If the draft were ended in June, the Army would have roughly 9 months from now to attract the few thousand extra volunteers it needs. It is already engaged in a $10 million advertising campaign to encourage volunteers and certainly the pay increase will help attract even more men.

In the event that the effort to end the draft now should fail, under no circumstances should divinity students be drafted. Frankly, these men have a far tougher job ahead of them.

We are experiencing in this country today a rapid decay of our moral fiber. People are turning away from religion in increasing numbers. Young people are turning to drugs and the occult for their metaphysical experiences.

The people on the front lines in preventing this decay are the priests, ministers, and rabbis of our various religious faiths. They are dedicated to the work of saving the spiritual lives of others and protecting the moral fiber of the Nation.

Certainly their work is as important to the national interest as the physical defense of the Nation. Our enemy, especially the Communists, depend on destruction of the moral fiber from within for success. Destroy belief in God and you destroy belief in the present form of government.

The only time in this country's history that divinity students were drafted was during the Civil War and that was only by the Union Army. To draft them now would be to dry up the source of spiritual leaders. For those who are concerned that this deferment may be a refuge from military service, I suggest they examine the record which clearly shows there is a substantial reduction in the number of divinity students during wartime rather than an increase as some baseless charges have suggested.

I strongly urge my colleagues to restore draft exemptions to divinity students.

Beyond that the question of eliminating all student deferments is questionable. Its effect will only be on a limited number of students. If the draft is extended for only 2 more years at most—as seems likely—then only three or possibly two classes will be affected. Again, such a narrow application of a change is discriminatory on its face. I urge my colleagues to reject this provision of the bill also.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate my support of the all-volunteer armed force concept. This body authorized good money for a blue ribbon commission to study the possibilities of such a concept. General Gates and his colleagues on the Commission have emphatically stated that an all-volunteer army is not only obtainable but desirable.

Elimination of the draft authority extension provisions of the measure before us today will bring about these results. Any fears of lessened national security are completely unfounded. Extension of draft registration authority along with the right to reinstate the draft by congressional action provides this country with the emergency protection it needs.

Let us remove here and now this glaring inequity in our laws. The volunteer army has been a part of this Nation's peacetime history from the founding days of the Republic. Let us not abandon yet another worthwhile tradition of our forefathers.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope we would not be cataloged as saints or sinners, no matter how we may vote on this amendment. I do note, in connection with the comments of my colleague from New York (Mr. PIKE), the Gates Commission was the basis for the recent study of the draft. If it be the "Pearly Gates amendment" we are voting on here, then I think we have reached a new high today. However, I am not here to speak either as a saint or a sinner. You can choose the category that I fall in just as well as I can. I am talking from my own military experience, which is as long and as productive as my congressional experience.

Most of my early military career was in the recruitment and training of men in the infantry in order to prepare them for combat. I cannot advocate by any stretch of the imagination that we should take some of the 17,000 young men who have vowed that they are going to devote their entire lives to almighty God, to our Creator, and suggest that they are proper subjects for recruitment. I do not think they will make the kind of soldiers that you will look for in the interests of the national security of our country. Why? Because they will be distracted by eternity and not think in time. If you do not think in time in the infantry, you get to eternity very fast. This is a very real problem in this and in all of the aims that we have in order to try to get to that kind of national security that we can live with and which will still not divide our country.

In order to do this, by and large, we must seek to have career soldiers who come in not only for the enlistment period or the conscription period, which is a dead loss to the Army, because you do not make a good soldier in 1 or 2 years. It must be for a longer period of time. These men will at best serve for the minimal limited period of time in order to satisfy the draft regulations and then they will go back to divinity school. So what do you hope to achieve by this? Not one thing. It is a wasteful program with regard to recruitment for our military service.

Second, I find that the amendment comes a little late. We have had the "God is dead" period—that we went through a couple of years back. It is past us now. The young people are opting for all kinds of religious exercises today. We need them to do it. As the minority leader said, we need to respond to the call for moral leadership which we properly should place within the realm of the church. The bad part of this amendment is that the Defense Department did not seek to recommend it. The hearings are explicit on that. The Draft Director did, but he is not the most experienced man in this field. He is only around for 1 year. The Department of Defense did not seek it, either. Third, there has not been one word of consultation with any representative of a major faith with regard to how it would affect the church in this country. If you do not think that they deserve such consultation, then for goodness sake abolish the first amendment entirely. We were talking about the Gillette case that the gentleman from Missouri mentioned about the establishment decision. We never went into the question of the other part of the first amendment which denies to us as a Congress any right to prohibit the free exercise of religion. I think the most evident and completely apparent exercise of religion is when a man says, "I am going to devote my entire life to the service of my Creator." This would be a prohibition on that exercise.

I think we ought to look at this in terms of what is needed in this country

and what our people expect. The separation of church and state is the basic concept with regard to religion and state which has kept this country from anticlericalism or antistatism. We have operated for nearly 200 years on that basis, where the church is secure on its ground and the state is immune from the church on its ground. Let us not breach that law by moving into the church and screening those divinity students who say they want to devote their lives to God.

If, as the gentleman from Missouri said, there are those in the seminaries using that as a means of escaping proper obligations to state, then that decision and that screening should take place by the constituted authorities in those seminaries and those entrusted to do it. If there is a need for discourse and dialog with them to uncover such an isolated case, then it can be done administratively, but to pass a law which takes out of the hands of the church or the state its recruitment from its ranks of soldiers in the service of our Creator and then say, no, the state comes first, would be against the whole theory of separation here in this country, and I believe it would be very bad indeed to do that.

In World War II a chaplain said, in the thick of battle, "Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition."

Today, in the thick of this conflict I urge "Praise the Lord and Pass the Byrnes Amendment."

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take all of my time. However, I would like to speak on one or two phases of the amendment now pending before use.

I think it is significant that in the history of our country, since revolutionary days, the law of the land has been as it presently is and that is it provides for the exemption of divinity students with the one exception as pointed out by the dean of the New York delegation during the Civil War when the North had a slight lapse.

I think it is worthy to comment upon the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) about those people who abuse it. Certainly, we can all agree that people do abuse the privilege. However, shall we close all of our colleges in this country because there are those who will not study or shall we close the halls of this Congress because there are a few, perhaps, who do not attend its sessions. I think not.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should look into the overall importance of these young men who seek to perform a religious purpose in life for themselves. I submit, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that in today's times when we can look across the avenue here and watch and see nothing but pornographic movie houses. When we get in our mail pornographic literature. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether now is the time to destroy religious expansion, but in the alternative whether in some way this Congress should not encourage religious endeavors. We should show to the country as a whole that we are not curtailing the rights of young people who desire to pursue such a high calling. I think it would be a mistake on our part to do otherwise.

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

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

Mr. ICHORD. The gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) indicated that the bill as drawn would make all seminarians subject to the draft.

I would like to ask the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL)——

Mr. PODELL. I would like to respond to the gentleman from Missouri if I could hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. ICHORD. The gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) indicated that the bill as drawn would make seminarians immediately subject to the draft.

Does not the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) agree that if the divinity students were enrolled prior to April 30, 1970, they would continue to have their draft deferment just as other college students that are already enrolled have?

Mr. PODELL. I would like to point out to the gentleman that the enrollment of divinity students differs in various religions. As I indicated before in response to a question, one who aspires to become a rabbi usually does so between the age of 7 and 12 years old. Otherwise, very few can then follow such a career therafter. I see no reason at this time to now bring about a new restriction on religion at a time when a little religion would help us an awful lot.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would point out to the gentleman from New York, and I read from the committee report:

> The Administration has informed the committee that it intends to allow continued deferments of those divinity students who were enrolled prior to January 27, 1971.

So this bill would only affect those enrolled after January 27, 1971.

But I would further say to the gentleman from New York that I do not intend to ask for a recorded vote on this matter. I do intend to ask for a division, because I want to see what the difference in the vote is in the Armed Services Committee and the vote in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union when the pressure gets on.

Mr. PODELL. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to further point out, in the remaining time I have allotted to me, the fact that there is no clearcut distinction as to when a youngster embarks upon a religious career such as there would be in the legal profession when a person finally graduates from college and then embarks upon such a law career.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I think it is timely, necessary, and for the good of the country.

The legislation and amendments under consideration by the House today are of deep concern to every American family. Our responsibility, as Members of Congress, is to insure that this legislation will be as equitable and as truly representative of the needs of the people as possible.

Therefore, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this amendment to continue the historic exemption from selective service of divinity students. I had intended to introduce this amendment myself, so strongly do I feel about its merits, and I am pleased indeed to support my colleague on the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BYRNE), in his efforts to secure passage of this language.

It has been a tradition in our Nation that young men intent on a career in theology and the ministry should be exempt from the draft. This exemption should and must continue. As of June 30, 1970, these young men represented only 109,000 of the draft-age men in our country. This is a small percentage of the total draft pool and yet these young men serve such a large portion of our population.

We are a nation of 206 million people with multiple talents and multiple problems. Too often our younger generation has been characterized by a lack of faith and personal commitment to man's need for spirituality in his life. Too many of our young people today are lost, unwilling or unable to accept the enormous complexities of our technical society.

They—and we—need ministers and priests and rabbis. Each of us needs their special gifts of healing and faith.

I join with my colleagues today in vigorously supporting the continued exemption of divinity students from selective service.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed at the attempts by my colleagues to eliminate the draft-exempt status of divinity students. Surely, Mr. Chairman, it is ludicrous to draft these young men who have chosen the clergy as their vocation. At a time when our Nation exhibits signs of moral bankruptcy, a dearth of moral leadership and a vacuum of moral virtues, we in this body are further robbing our Nation of what is needed most; men who will train to become the spiritual leaders of the country.

Is there any greater dedication to the well-being and the strength of a nation than the devotion of a higher calling? These men should be allowed to continue their religious learnings and attain ordination in the clergy. Then, and only then, could they serve their country in the best capacity, and even, Mr. Chairman, the Armed Forces if they so wished. Perhaps if the Armed Forces had more religiously oriented leaders, it would be more highly regarded.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I am calling for the retention of deferments for our college students. This would not mean that students would then be exempt from the draft, for I know all too well that this is one of the most glaring inequities of the current system.

Unfortunately, age and academic qualifications have been misused by people seeking to avoid the draft, and this is patently unfair. Higher education should not be used in this manner.

Yet, if we continue to talk about the

best use of our natural resources, we must include our human resources under that subject. One of our most important resources is a well-educated population. And I believe that the Armed Forces would certainly benefit by the presence of well-educated individuals.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to ask for a limitation of debate. I would just like to get the feeling of the committee on the length of the debate, and possibly we can do this if we could see how many more Members are desirous of speaking on this amendment—because I do believe we have debated the matter quite fully.

Thank you. Apparently there are just about four or five more Members who desire to be heard.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that a very important decision is to be made by this House in voting upon this amendment. I regard the issue here today as not manpower, it is not personnel, it is not Army and military needs, it is whether or not a principle which has been upheld by this Congress since the inception of the draft shall be abandoned, to give a statutory exemption to people who have dedicated their lives to the ministry of God.

In its report on the pending bill the able Committee on Armed Services, page 13, says that—

> To achieve true equal treatment of students, divinity school exemptions should be eliminated along with all other undergraduate deferments.

Does this House mean to go on record as saying that we do not make a distinction between a young man who is devoting himself to a religious ministry with hardly any financial remuneration in prospect, to a life of dedicated and sacrificial service, is not in a different category from a young man who goes into college or graduate school with the idea of making a fortune, or of acquiring fame or achieving some other desirable objective in life?

Further, the committee says in its report, page 14:

> The draft calls are so small in relation to the large draft pool that elimination of these exemptions should not have a serious impact upon theological schools' enrollments.

So there are not many men involved, and we are not going to get many whom we would not otherwise get. By this removal of the exemptions for seminarians we are not satisfying any military need for manpower. Furthermore, the committee says that all those who are in divinity schools on January 27 of 1971 continue to enjoy the statutory exemption.

Well, if nothing would be gained by it, why do we want to show to America that we are indifferent toward the preservation of the clergy, which is the very epitome and the image of the religious, moral, and ethical life of this country? What, then, is the necessity for removing the exemption by law of these divinity students that is proposed by this bill? What is the need? Why should this House abandon a principle that we have so long observed, and so faithfully adhered to?

This is a time, Mr. Chairman, as you and my colleagues well know, when immorality, the breaking up of the home, the lack of parental discipline leading to growing crime on the part of the youth in America, which commits over half of the crime in this country is prevalent to a shocking degree over the land. And now for the House of Representatives to say that we do not attach any particular significance to a young man who has dedicated his life to the ministry of a particular faith, to which he adheres is to weaken the religious and spiritual fabric of our country and at a time when the need is so desperate that it be strengthened.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the able gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as joining with each and every one of the arguments the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) has outlined in opposition to this bill as it presently exists.

As the gentleman from Florida knows, I oppose any draft law, period.

But if we have to have one, I wish someone would kindly explain to you why this amendment should not be added to this bill.

I completely concur with the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I have just one further thought.

This bill says that the President can exempt these divinity students, but that this House does not care enough about it—we do not feel deeply enough about it—to take a stand on the matter ourselves in the House of Representatives as to whether divinity students should enjoy statutory exemption or not.

Mr. Chairman, can it strengthen the religious, moral, and ethical forces of this country in the troubled times for this House to indicate that attitude of relative indifference to a matter so important to the preservation of all that is most valuable in American life? Of course not.

I hope the Byrne amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the very eloquent statement just made by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BYRNE).

On the question of manpower, the figures that have been given to me indicate that if we were to take all available seminarians, it would represent only three-tenths of 1 percent of the total manpower pool now available to the Selective Service System.

So we are not going to be making, as the gentleman said, any significant contribution to the manpower resources of our country.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point I would make in reply to the gentleman from Missouri. I have a communication from the general director of the National Association of Evangelicals. He says that even though their seminaries are running almost full student capacity, they are always short of trained pastors, and that there are some denominations that have more than 5 percent of their pulpits empty at the present time. He also points out that the Lutheran Church and the Missouri Synod has 400 churches without pastors today.

So I think the statement made earlier that our seminaries are graduating more men than are needed by the ministries simply will not stand the test of these facts.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman's amendment is adopted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of this amendment.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think we could bring this to a head rather quickly if one simple question were to be asked. I have already stated as one of the senior Members on the Republican side that I supported this amendment. I think it would be very useful if we were to ascertain how the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana, voted and I respectfully yield to the gentleman to answer that question.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee is delighted to answer the gentleman's question.

I would also make the observation that the chairman has remained loyal with respect to the wishes of his committee and follows what the committee has voted out.

As I said, the chairman, with the gentleman from California in committee, were in a minority. But the gentleman then accepted the committee's vote and if called upon, I shall continue my conscientious vote and vote for the amendment.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. The chairman is one of the new fearless seven.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I think I have never seen a more delightful parliamentary ploy than the gentleman just made here.

At this opportunity I want to commend our chairman for his vigor, eloquence, and enthusiasm in fighting for the bill which came out of his committee.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Lousiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California.

I might say to my friend from New York now whom I charged with the re-

sponsibility of leading the committee fight on their amendment that I did not interrupt him with the knowledge as to whether he was going upstairs or downstairs. He indicated it was downstairs—and my comment is I know my Members.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Chairman, the statement "In God We Trust" has been a reflection of this Nation's religious heritage, a heritage that speaks well of our country.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, to now deny divinity students draft deferments would be a step away from our religious heritage. It could well mean that many young men now studying for the ministry, the priesthood, or now engaged in rabbinical studies would never return to their seminaries after military service. In fact, it has been estimated that, if draft deferments for divinity students are ended, it will mean that as high as 80 percent of such students will be purged from their studies. The result would be obvious: It would be a major blow to the Judeo-Christian heritage and leadership that has served this Nation so well in the past.

All of us are aware of the declining numbers of young men entering divinity studies. This means there are now fewer young men who are presenting themselves for a life of service to the religious and moral needs of the American people. This commitment is a serious one and one which the Nation needs.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, an end to such deferments would also have far-reaching consequences on our military. It would mean that our Armed Forces would eventually be deprived of an adequate Chaplain Corps. It would mean that our servicemen would eventually find it much more difficult to seek spiritual aid and moral comfort.

I am well aware of those who question the value of maintaining chaplains for the Armed Forces. I do not agree; I do not raise these questions. I doubt that the great majority of those American families with sons and loved ones in the service raise such questions. Only a small number of men are affected by such deferments. Of these men, the conscientious objector probably is the exception rather than the rule. The great majority of the men studying for the ministry, the priesthood, and to be rabbis are desirous of serving their Nation and many of them, no doubt, will give it valued service as chaplains.

Mr. Chairman, another effect of ending such deferments would be an end to the service divinity students now perform; service which helps the entire Nation. Social work is an important part of divinity studies. We need look no further than any area of need in our communities to find that divinity students are making valuable contributions, not only in religious training but in the prisons, in homes for the retarded, and in other areas where the less fortunate are found.

To end such deferments would be a disservice to our Nation—a blow at the very moral fiber of our country—and a partial turning away from our heritage which dictates that "In God We Trust."

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this moment to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Florida who preceded him to the microphone in their comments about the need to retain exemptions now presently granted to divinity and seminary students.

I think it would be very pointless and shortsighted of us not to follow the very dramatic and eloquent words of the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from California. This exemption should be retained.

Mr. Chairman, I also should like to mention one brief fact. We are looking today to a shorter extension of the draft and perhaps the nonextension of the draft. Certainly all of us look forward to the time in the not-too-distant future when the draft will not be a factor in our life, and therefore this divinity exemption would be in keeping with the idea of an eventual end to the draft.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment before us to restore draft deferments for students preparing for the ministry.

To delete this provision, in my judgment, would represent a departure from congressional precedent that would, in effect, infringe on the rights and responsibilities of religious bodies as guaranteed by the Constitution.

Congress, even during the most critical years of World War II, recognized the special role of the minister and the student preparing for the ministry and exempted them from the draft. I believe it would be extremely unwise, untimely and unwarranted for Congress now, at a time of lesser national emergency, to depart from its wartime recognition of these traditional values.

To eliminate this provision at this time would certainly have an adverse effect on the free flow of needed and qualified ordained and regular ministers into established pastoral fields, into the military Chaplain's Corps, and into positions of leadership in the church and the synagogue.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Byrne amendment. I want to say to the members of the committee that I have voted for the draft in whatever shape it came up ever since I have been here, but I do not think I am going to vote for it this time. The main reason I am not is, because there is nothing equitable about the way it is being run.

In my home county the draft consists of a miserable, middle-aged, frustrated woman, who is the clerk of the board who says who is going to go, and she rubberstamps the names of the members on it. If anybody for any reason asks for a deferment, she arrogantly says, "I'm going to get you, Buster, come hell or high water." And she does.

I have taken this matter up with the draft people, under General Hershey and others, and they have had an in-house investigation, a whitewash. In fact, the last fellow who investigated it was a colonel, and when she got done with him, he cleared her and some time later went into his garage and committed sucide

I have no hesitation in naming names. It is the Belmont County, Ohio, Draft Board. And I am not going to let this old gal make me commit suicide. But she sure has got me to the point of voting against the draft.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Byrne amendment. The policy of granting draft exemptions to divinity students—an uninterrupted tradition throughout the history of the Selective Service Act—would be thoughtlessly abandoned if the legislation now before us is not amended. Plainly, Mr. Speaker, such exemptions are more than justified. The Supreme Court itself, in ruling March 8, 1971, on Gilette against the United States, made remarks widely interpreted as sanction for these exemptions.

Even outside a legal context, the exemptions appear warranted. Let us consider, just briefly, what would happen should the Congress flatly prohibit the exemptions. Some divinity students are ordained as ministers at the very beginning of training. Others, conversely, must wait until their training is completed. Quite obviously, Mr. Chairman, this means that some divinity students would be exempt from the draft and others highly vulnerable to it. Is this fair? Indeed, is it anything even remotely or tenuously approaching fairness?

Many divinity students, to cite just one further example, begin their training very early in life—sometimes at the age of 14 or 15. Such rigorous training, often spanning a decade or more, demands a student's uniform and uninterrupted attention. An abrupt hiatus into the Armed Forces could only damage a student's chances of successfully completing his studies.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the Byrne amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BYRNE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ICHORD) there were—ayes 114, noes 29.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEGGETT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEGGETT:

On Page 4 of the bill, lines 16 and 17, strike out the words "religious training and belief" and insert the following [convictions

or beliefs gained through training, study, contemplation, or other activity].

On lines 17 and 18, strike out the words "participation in war in any form" and insert the following [any participation in any form of war].

On lines 18, 19 and 20, strike out the words "the term religious training and beliefs does not include essentially political, sociological or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code" and insert the following [convictions and beliefs include views which are found in traditional religious principles and views which are based on a deep, sincere, and meaningful belief of an ethical and moral origin and content which occupy, in the life of its possessor, a place parallel to that of the beliefs of a traditional religious person and imposes a compelling duty of conscience about what is right or wrong and what should not be done. 'Convictions and beliefs' do not include views based solely on considerations of policy, pragmatism, or expediency regardless of how deeply held.]

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment may be the only amendment we have on the conscientious objector section. What I have offered is merely a restatement, prepared by the counsel for the office of the Director of Selective Service, of what the existing draft law practice is in the United States today. As we know, the Congress has legislated in this field, and the courts have interpreted our language, and we have legislated again, and the courts have interpreted our language again, and the last time the court interpreted the language was in the rather important case of Elliott Ashton Welsh II, versus the United States. They were interpreting language we have in the law today, that is in the committee bill, that says:

The term "religious training and beliefs" does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code . . .

That language, as it has been interpreted, was really strained by the Court in the Welsh case to come up with the conclusions they did, but they came up with the conclusions by a 5-to-4 decision, and it is good law. What they really mean is that one does not have to be tied to an established religious order in order to claim the conscientious objector status. One cannot have just a prevailing feeling that one does not like the Vietnam war or the Korean war, but one has to have a basic philosophic conviction, however acquired, that is so deeply held that it totally motivates one's whole philosophy of life and obliterates one's participating in war in any form.

Just to restate a little bit, of course, what we are doing in the Welsh case as distinguished from the language that is used in interpreting existing law, the Court says:

What is necessary under Seeger for a registrant's conscientious objection to all war to be "religious" within the meaning of section 6(j) is that this opposition to war stem from the registrant's moral, ethical, or religious beliefs about what is right and wrong and that these beliefs be held with the strength of traditional religious convictions.

They go on to say:

If an individual deeply and sincerely holds beliefs which are purely ethical or moral in source and content but which nevertheless impose upon him a duty of conscience to refrain from participating in any war at any time, those beliefs certainly occupy in the life of that individual "a place parallel to that filled by . . . God" in traditionally religious persons. Because his beliefs function as a religion in his life, such an individual is as much entitled to a "religious" conscientious objector exemption under section 6(j) as is someone who derives his conscientious opposition to war from traditional religious convictions.

They go on to say:

Those whose beliefs are not deeply held and those whose objection to war does not rest at all upon moral, ethical, or religious principle, but instead rests solely upon considerations of policy, pragmatism, or expediency—

The words we use in my amendment—then the deferment does not apply.

Then the Court concludes:

On the basis of these beliefs and the conclusion of the Court of Appeals—

That Welsh held the beliefs—

With the strength of more traditional religious convictions . . . we think Welsh was clearly entitled to a conscientious objector exemption. That section exempts from military service all those whose consciences, spurred by deeply held moral, ethical, or religious beliefs, would give them no rest or peace if they allowed themselves to become a part of an instrument of war.

I know it has been said that the court may change, that this is only a 5-to-4 decision, that we should not confound an existing interpretation of the Supreme Court.

I say that this is the Congress of the United States, this is the place where we make the laws. We certainly ought to conform the laws to the existing draft law practice in the United States, and we should not have any trepidation about doing that.

I believe that we will be enacting in this bill today, if we take the chairman's amendment, which is in the bill, a new acid test on the manner of classification; that is, if one wants to serve alternative service for 3 years then what we say in this bill is "we want the draft boards to more liberally grant this exemption status."

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LEGGETT was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. LEGGETT. I believe if the draft boards are going to go into more liberally granting this status they ought to have the same kind of honest test that good, bright draft lawyers are using in defending their claimants in U.S. courts today. Let us give the draft boards the same benefit of a claim and statement as to the status of law as the bright lawyers have in fighting this matter on a continuous basis in court.

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

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Am I correct in saying that the gentleman is simply restating into the present law the specific holding and the language in the Welsh case? And am I further correct in saying that in doing this he is perhaps clarifying the role and the job of the local draft board in applying the law of the land?

Mr. LEGGETT. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. That is exactly what we are doing.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. I should like to say to the gentleman that I have an amendment I intend to present here on the subject of the conscientious objector, which I regard as an amendment to protect his legitimate rights, with respect to this additional year of civilian service which the committee has put in the bill.

I do not quite see why the amendment of the gentleman from California is required in view of the fact that the present law, although cast in the language of religious belief in the statute—which, frankly, I think is what Congress had in mind and what I would be for—has been interpreted by the court to mean what the gentleman is saying. So why should we say it again?

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LEGGETT was allowed to proceed for an additional 30 seconds.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Really the Court has expanded on the interpretation of the Congress.

We are not making any effort in this bill to put in concrete what perhaps may have been originally intended in 1967 when we amended this bill.

I say we have to either fish or cut bait. Either we have to reaffirm that religious training is what we mean, tied to an established religion, or we have to go ahead and put in concrete what the existing draft law practice is in the United States today.

If we want to avoid litigation and to avoid ad infinitum contests, giving benefits to expensive lawyers and forcing kids to court rather than allowing draft boards to do their job, then I say support this amendment.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The committee went into this matter very thoroughly. Defining a conscientious objector is not easy. The Supreme Court has been working at it for some time, and finally has clarified the matter. At least, the committee almost unanimously agreed with it.

It is not a matter that is easy to debate on the floor, as to the technical wording of defining a conscientious objector.

Let me read what is in the committee report.

The Committee, in retaining the existing language defining a conscientious objector, recognized that this language has been subjected to the most intense legal scrutiny by the United States Supreme Court.

A majority of the Supreme Court has ruled on the adequacy of the present language of the law. The interpretation by the Supreme Court has resulted in guidelines outlined by the Selective Service System and the various components of the Department of Justice and the Federal Court system to establish workable concepts in implementing this complex provision of the law.

I am well aware that at this time it would be impossible for either propo-

nents or opponents of the amendment to go into the wording of a complex matter such as this. I for one, being a member of the Quaker faith, on religious grounds myself, have always been in favor of the rights of a conscientious objector. I have defended the rights of the conscientious objector in the committee and on the floor. While I might not agree with exactly every word in the present definition, I certainly say that you are opening up a Pandora's box by trying to work out another rule as to what is a conscientious objector.

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

Mr. BRAY. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEGGETT. How will we be opening up a Pandora's box if we give back to the Supreme Court their interpretation of our prior language virtually verbatim as prepared by the chief counsel of the Office of Selective Service?

Mr. BRAY. I do not think that is quite the situation. I was in the committee at all times when this matter was discussed, and I have studied court rulings on the matter. I do not recall how many votes there were against the wording in the bill. There were only one or two, I think. But we did determine this wording. I think we are all trying to reach roughly the same results here. The committee went into the matter in depth. The various counsel on the Committee on Armed Services—and I will say they are very capable men—knowing what the committee wanted, did draft this definition according to the majority ruling of the Supreme Court. I realize at times it is very proper to try to determine what is correct on the floor with relation to a bill, but I realize also that at this time it would be very difficult to try to arrive at another definition of conscientious objectors. I am against opening up a Pandora's box here.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, suplementing what the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY) said and commenting on what the gentleman from California who offered the amendment said in explaining this amendment, let me say that this amendment was probably discussed more thoroughly than any other amendment before the committee. It was voted down by a resounding voice vote. I believe it was 36 to 3 on the amendment that was adopted.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEGGETT. The divinity amendment was likewise resoundingly defeated, was it not?

Mr. HÉBERT. Where? In the committee?

Mr. LEGGETT. The "Pearly Gates amendment" was likewise resoundingly defeated in the committee, was it not?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes, but not by such a wide margin. I said this was the widest margin of all, which shows the unanimity of opinion against it in the committee, which was perhaps the most unanimous of any, with just perhaps a few exceptions. This was practically a unanimous vote.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my chairman in opposing this amendment.

I do not know how proper it is to refer to an amendment which refers to deferring divinity students as a "Pearly Gates amendment."

I have had numerous calls today indicating that I was in favor of removing the divinity student deferment. I do not know who spread the rumor, but someone did. Nothing could be further from the truth. I support the divinity student deferment most emphatically. I received a call from as far away as Savannah, Ga.; they now know of my feelings.

I say that if any amendment is superfluous it is the last one offered by the gentleman from California. We need it like we need a hole in our head.

Mr. HÉBERT. I pointed out the fact that the Counsel for the Selective Service System urged that there be no change made in the language defining a conscientious objector. The committee observed this advice. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRINGTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRINGTON. On page 11, strike out lines 21 and 22.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to H.R. 6531 providing that the President's authority to induct expire on June 30, 1971.

For 23 years Congress has imposed a system of military conscription on the people of this country. The draft has been traditionally justified solely on the basis of necessity. The system has become so established in our society that some persons—including some Members of Congress—now even question the advisability of ending it.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest it is time to cut through the accumulated inertia and speculative myths and return to the people of this country their birthright of personal freedom.

More than 30 years ago, as Congress debated the first peacetime conscription bill in the Nation's history, Congressman Jerry Voorhis warned:

Believe me, gentlemen, it is going to be difficult to ever repeal such a measure once you get it established, for you will have made of your military establishment one of the greatest economic factors in your whole country. You will have vested the greatest power in the Executive and the Army that the Congress has ever granted in all American history.

Conscription does not constrain militarism or prevent the emergency of a professional army. A broad and sweeping power, it enables a President to turn peaceful free men into unwilling instruments of war. It enables him to raise and commit unlimited numbers of men to foreign wars without the approval of Congress—a direct affront to this branch's constitutional power to declare war.

Under the present law, the draft provides an unlimited source of cheap manpower to prolong a disastrous war even in the face of overwhelming public opposition.

Rather than impede the professional army, the draft provides the manpower to sustain its lowest ranks. Only 12 percent of servicemen today are draftees, yet 88 percent of infantry riflemen in Vietnam are conscripts. Two-thirds of American casualties last year were draftees.

The draft is a form of involuntary servitude. It deprives a small group of men of basic civil liberties in order to reduce the cost of the Military Establishment for the general taxpayer. It is alien to fundamental American principles and is the cause of widespread bitterness and alienation. The Selective Service System forces young men to make a decision which for many has no satisfactory alternative: they must choose induction to fight a war they feel is wrong, imprisonment, emigration, or evasion by deceit. A lottery does not answer many questions. Is it really fair that the accident of a birthday sends one man to involuntary servitude or war and another to college or a well-paying job?

An end to the induction authority this June will not lead to a significant reduction in force levels. Today only 360,000 of the 2.85 million men in uniform are draftees, and the administration budget makes clear that force levels are scheduled to drop by approximately that number of men over the next 15 months, to a level of 2.5 million. Such a reduction in force levels will insure an easy transition.

Stopping the draft induction authority as of July 1 is also consistent with the administration's timetable for deescalating the war in Southeast Asia. Because of the timelag for training, this action would not affect the flow of recruits to Vietnam until December, several months after the time Secretary of Defense Laird has said the U.S. ground combat role will end.

If Congress does not end the draft, the Defense Department will not have sufficient incentive to attract volunteers. The Pentagon's claim that the draft is "necessary" has gone unchallenged too long. William Pitt said:

Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human freedom. It is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves.

Mr. Chairman, without the clear and present danger of a national emergency, such a system has no place in the life of this country.

Such a system should be ended as quickly as possible.

I, therefore, move the adoption of my amendment to provide that the President's authority to induct expire on June 30, 1971.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LATTA was allowed to speak out of order.)

UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE NEEDS REVISION

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that a court-martial has just sentenced Lieutenant Calley to life imprisonment, I think it is high time that we take a look at the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Mr. Chairman, in 1950 the Congress established a Uniform Code of Military Justice. Enactment of this code was prompted by the desire to meet serious objections and criticisms lodged against court-martial procedures during and following World War II.

The Uniform Code of Military Justice established a complete judicial system for U.S. servicemen. Under its provisions, military courts are required to function under the same basic concepts as those which apply to our Federal and State courts. The Calley court-martial has, however, revealed a shocking difference between these two systems of justice. These differences appear in article 52, which provides that a man in uniform may be convicted of a criminal offense by less than a unanimous verdict of the members of the court-martial, except where the death penalty is mandatory. Under the provisions of this article, a man can be convicted and imprisoned for life by less than a unanimous decision of a six-member court-martial. In fact, he can be so convicted by the concurrence of three-fourths of the members present at the time the vote is taken. For lesser offenses he may be convicted by the concurrence of two-thirds of the members present at the time the vote is taken. By the use of the words, "present at the time the vote is taken" throughout this article means that a conviction can take place without the presence of all six members of the court-martial, which further reduces the number necessary to convict. Such a section is repugnant to me as I believe a man's rights should be enhanced rather than reduced when he dons the uniform of his country. As a civilian, he is entitled to a trial by 12 jurors and a unanimous verdict of all the jurors is required for his conviction.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this Congress should waste no time in amending article 52 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to require a unanimous concurrence of all members of a court-martial in order to convict for any offense. I have, therefore, introduced legislation to so amend article 52 and I would hope that the Committee on Armed Services would give it an early hearing.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON).

Mr. Chairman, in connection with this amendment there is little need and no useful purpose to be served by going into detail at this time because I think the House is very knowledgeable about what the amendment does. The House expressed its opinion this morning about voting down the amendment of the gentlewoman from New York which was even a little more extensive while this is more limited by just cutting off the right to induct on July 1, 1971.

Other observations were made by the gentleman from Massachusetts which I will be very happy to discuss at the time if it is brought to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I think the House knows exactly what the situation is.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose for taking this time is to ask for some information. The first question I have is concerned with the occupational deferment section of the bill. It is my understanding that the committee bill does not repeal the President's authority to provide by rules and regulations for the deferment of persons in the practice of medicine, whose service is found to be necessary for the maintenance of "the national health, safety, or interest." Am I right in this assumption?

Mr. HÉBERT. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota, because of his strong interest in this matter and calling it to the attention of the committee previously before today that the matter is now getting attention and by the proper sources at the White House and in the Department of Defense. We have every assurance, I believe, that the matter will be worked out in a manner which will be equitable.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday in general debate, I referred to the most recent physician draft and the manner in which it is being conducted. A number of towns in my congressional district are about to be adversely affected by this physicians draft, and I understand that the Selective Service is preparing a directive authorizing State directors to give some recognition to the needs of local communities for physicians' services. I have been given the indication that this directive would provide only for postponement of induction of a physician in those cases where it would result in a certified community hardship. I have not yet seen a draft of the Selective Service directive, but I would like some indication from the committee as to whether the mere postponement in a case such as this would be in accordance with congressional intent or whether it might be possible that the Selective Service should rather provide for deferment as authorized in the act itself.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota that if it is not taken care of—my telephone is always there and the gentleman can call me.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON).

Mr. Chairman, last Saturday in my district I sponsored an all-day session of hearings on the question of the draft. We had about 500 people altogether attending those hearings and there was coverage by all of the local media.

A total of 206 people testified or submitted statements. Of those, 156 were opposed to the draft and 49 were in favor of it. One favored a national service system.

Mr. Chairman, I held these hearings because I was deeply troubled about what to do about this very serious question and I wanted to get a feeling of how the people in my district felt.

I might say that the statements were extremely well prepared and well thought out by people on both sides of the question. The people in my district expressed great gratitude for the opportunity to express themselves through a Member of Congress. Mr. Chairman, I commend to all of my colleagues more of this sort of thing.

I have, after some further soul searching, come to a conclusion on this, and that is why I speak in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. The case of Lieutenant Calley should serve as a warning to us all. We were all shocked by the excesses committed by the German Government during and immediately before the Second World War, in which I served as a member of the U.S. Armed Forces. But that was not just the product of the Nazis. It was the product of an historical process that went on for several hundred years. It was the natural result of the militarization of a great nation.

We should ask ourselves, in the context of the My Lai situation and the Calley trial whether we, too, as a nation are in the process of becoming Prussianized.

We are the beneficiaries of the report of the Gates Commission, one of the most distinguished panels assembled in our time. The members of that Commission unanimously recommended the ending of the draft in peacetime and the establishment of an all-volunteer army. The President has supported an all-volunteer army. So the question, as far as these distinguished Americans are concerned is not whether, but when, to institute an all-volunteer army.

I can think of no more appropriate time than to do it at the end of the expiration of the present authority for induction. I do not support the Vietnam war. I cannot support anything that is going to help the indefinite continuation of the war. And, since it appears that no definite date is about to be set by this Congress in this particular session as to the termination of the war, I can only cast my vote for making it more difficult to carry on that war. Accordingly, I am going to support the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts and urge my fellow Members of the House to do likewise.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana, a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is time that we should say something good about our country, instead of trying to say that America is a warlike, a militaristic, and a no-good country. I love this

country of mine and I have served it. It is the greatest country on the face of the earth, and I am proud to be an American. I have not agreed with everything my country has done.

I also want a volunteer army. That is what we are working toward. The committee considered and raised the pay higher than it was even requested to do. Every method is being pursued to see if we cannot have an all-volunteer army. But to attempt to destroy and to make our great country, America, impotent, as if we were the only evil country in the world, and the Vietcong, Russia, Red China, and North Korea were all lovely people, simply goes against my grain as an American.

I want to work out a bill here that will give every chance for our country to have an all-volunteer army. I do not want to surrender America merely because I do not like the Cailey case, and I do not like the Calley case. There are many procedures that will now be taken in order to protect Calley.

We have made great progress and we are making great progress toward honorably getting out of the war. We have many problems in our country but we can solve those problems and to become an even greater America. But we cannot accomplish this by making America weak. To surrender now would be unthinkable. It would be a terrible thing for America to end the draft on the first of July without an opportunity to make this proposal of a volunteer army work.

Sure, a lot of people will agree that it is a grand idea to stop the draft to make our country helpless. Anyone who believes that America can survive without defense is naive. No one hates war worse than I, and I have seen it at its worst, but I am proud of my America and I certainly will do nothing to destroy it. I do not have much use for those who are not proud of our country.

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

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, is it not so, if I may ask the distinguished gentleman from Indiana a question, the gentleman referred to the Gates Commission, and was it not true that the Gates Commission report was made a year before?

Mr. BRAY. It certainly was. As far as getting people to stop the draft, I could get a group of people from my district to come and sell everything America is for, and it would be easy, but I would certainly lose my self-respect.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON).

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

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to state that we are all lovers of our country, or we would not be here in this House, and I reject the implication that the very sincere, high-minded, and distinguished people who came and testified at the hearings from my district were a group of ragtags who just came to testify against the draft. As I stated, one-fourth of them testified in favor of the draft, and they included several commanders of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I certainly yield to no one in love of my country. I simply ask us to recall the fate of other great nations who went down to a totalitarian catastrophe because they failed to foresee the results of a militaritaristic policy that was continued for several generations. It is time to ask ourselves whether we, too, have started down that trail.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise on behalf of the Harrington amendment to end the draft as of June 30 of this year.

Mr. Chairman, in all the years of American history prior to 1940, we had compulsory military training for only 5 years in all those decades. Starting in 1941 we had something entirely novel and untraditional, and, if I may say, un-American in American life. We had the draft and compulsory military training in peace and in wartime. With 15 months' exception, we have had something foreign in American life ever since 1941. I think 1971 is the time to end it, and we should end it this June.

I think military conscription has changed the character of American life. We have become involved in things which I hope we admit are contrary to our deepest convictions; that of peacekeeper of the entire earth. I came to the Congress because I saw how compulsory military training was changing the character and eroding the values of our people.

I see in all the record of the hearings—and I have read everything about the draft for the last several years, and not just all the hearings—no reason why we should have 2,600,000 men under arms—and that is the ceiling in this new bill. There is not one bit of evidence given for that. If we cannot support that figure we cannot support the draft. I have read everything about the Gates Commission report. After all, he was Secretary of Defense, and he had distinguished people on that committee. Are we just offhandedly going to reject that committee today? Father Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame, was on that commission.

I have seen the respect we have for the seminarians and the divinity students. We do not want to get them involved in war, but everybody else we want to get involved in war. I know everybody is against war and we hope this war phases out. But we have the essential question that so long as we have the draft, we are preparing for war and not for peace.

I think it should be a matter of record our churches are against this draft, just as our churches were in favor of continuing exemptions for seminarians. The Roman Catholic Church bishops, 200 of them, stated in a very firm and unprecedented affirmation that they are against the draft we have today. The time has come to eliminate the draft. The Council of Churches and many Jewish bodies have said the same thing.

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

Mr. DRINAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield for a correction of a statement the gentleman made. He said:

> There is no evidence in the record to support the manpower ceiling.

There are more than 46 pages of justification in the printed hearings.

Mr. DRINAN. I am sorry. The gentleman is correct. There is, however, nothing to prove that is absolutely the essential minimum we need.

Mr. HÉBERT. But there are 46 pages.

Mr. DRINAN. But nothing probative to me.

Mr. HÉBERT. It is available.

Mr. DRINAN. I have read every bit of it, sir, but it is not probative; it does not prove itself to me.

Mr. HÉBERT. But there is this material.

Mr. DRINAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is all I want to know.

Mr. DRINAN. I believe, finally, we should note that the bill Members are asked to vote for today by the committee goes against the wishes of the churches, if that is relevant here, and apparently it was a few moments ago.

Furthermore, this bill does not provide for selective conscientious objection. All of the churches have advocated such provision. The Vatican Council solemnly declared that this is an inalienable right of humanity.

Today, it seems to me, another Tonkin resolution is coming before us.

If there is a vote to perpetuate the draft, it is something which is all against American tradition. It goes against the vast majority of the religious bodies that have spoken on this matter.

I say with fear, but with the hope that I am wrong, that it will be another self-inflicted wound on this House.

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

(On request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DRINAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DRINAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts imply that all churches were against the draft prior to the time of World War II, when the Nation was faced with the crisis of Hitler, Mussolini, et cetera?

Mr. DRINAN. No, sir; I say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. No, I do not mean that at all. I mean that now in the hearings just conducted, in the hearings last year, virtually all or the vast majority of religious bodies were against it.

For the first time in American history the Roman Catholic bishops, all 200, testified that the draft should be eliminated now.

I raise the religious issue because presumably it is relevant in connection with the seminarians.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I just wanted

to be sure, because I was not certain whether the gentleman had made a condemnation of the draft in 1940 and 1941.

Mr. DRINAN. No, sir.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. He was not implying that religious leaders were against the draft at that time of crisis in our American history?

Mr. DRINAN. No, sir.

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

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

Mr. GUBSER. I noted the gentleman quoted the Gates Commission report in support of his position in favor of the Harrington amendment. I do not believe the gentleman means to imply that the Gates Commission in any way endorsed the sense of the Harrington amendment.

Mr. DRINAN. Certainly the spirit if not the actual wording.

Mr. GUBSER. I believe the Gates Commission rather clearly states that the draft should be continued for 1 year, and of course that is inconsistent with the Harrington amendment.

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

(On request of Mr. LONG of Maryland, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DRINAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I am a little puzzled by the force of the gentleman's comments. I can understand that the gentleman is against war, and against the war in Vietnam. But I am a little puzzled as to just how he feels, once we are in a war, and a shooting war, that the draft is somehow un-American.

My son fought in Vietnam. He volunteered to go there. Is the force of the gentleman's argument that somehow it is more American for most of the young men in this country to throw the whole burden of defending the country on a few volunteers like my son?

Mr. DRINAN. No, sir. I say that this is allegedly peacetime and during all of American history we have not had this vast standing army in peacetime. I raise the basic question on which this draft extension is premised; namely, that we need a vast standing army of at least 2.6 million.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Is it not a legalism to call this peacetime?

Mr. DRINAN. I said alleged peacetime. I said, however, sir, history will support the conclusion that if we have the draft, if men are available by conscription, then we will have more wars than if we did not have the draft.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CARTER. For what purpose?

Mr. SCHMITZ. To make a comment.

Mr. CARTER. I have a prepared statement which I wish to make. I will yield for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMITZ. I just wish to say something as a point of clarification while it is fresh in my mind.

I just made a phone call to the U.S. Catholic Conference to check on whether the Catholic bishops have ever come out unanimously against this bill which we are dealing with. Mr. William Ryan, of the Office of Information, tells me that they never made a stand on this bill we are dealing with.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I address you today as a combat veteran of World War II.

Mr. Chairman, today we consider legislation which will instill out Armed Forces with a new vigor. If passed, our military services will be able to regain that image of honor they held for so long. It is our hope that through increases in pay and in benefits and through an improved system of recruiting, our military will be able to attract sufficient volunteers to eliminate the need for the draft, yet maintain our national security both here and throughout the world.

In order to insure that these measures will encourage higher levels of volunteers than now exist, the legislation we consider provides for a 2-year extension of the draft authority.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the move to an all-volunteer army. But I question whether sufficient volunteers can be recruited in 1 year. In spite of the position taken by the Gates Commission, it is my understanding that most military experts believe an all-volunteer army cannot be achieved in 1 year.

I submit that we must have a 2-year extension of the draft to insure that we have a sufficient number of men in our services to provide for the protection of our national security.

With the incentives provided in H.R. 6531, the needed number of volunteers could well be reached before July of 1973. We may find that unprecedented numbers of volunteers are drawn into military service. The legislation we consider today has not excluded this possibility. If, before the 2-year induction authority expires, it becomes obvious that military manpower needs are met through volunteers alone, the President may terminate induction.

It is obvious that President Nixon is committed to ending the draft as soon as possible. I believe that he will do so when it becomes evident that there are sufficient volunteers so that an end to the draft will not jeopardize our national security.

At the present time, it is far too risky to count on our hope for an all-volunteer army. With the national security of our Nation at stake, it would be unwise to build our military strength on dreams of the future. Unlike the foolish man of the Biblical parable, we must build our house on the rocks, not on the sand. Then we as a nation will be able to withstand whatever storm befalls us.

We must be sure that we will always have an army of sufficient strength to preserve, protect, and defend the greatest country in the world.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, many of us have been demanding a change in the manner of selecting American military personnel for a number of years. On April 21, 1967, in a speech in Seattle, I suggested that we should create a military system to meet the requirements of America in the 1970's and not continue through inertia the system which produced the American Armed Forces for World War II.

From a limited beginning of 29 who voted against extension on June 20, 1967, we have arrived today at an historic moment when it is recognized that modern American foreign policy is not based on confrontation with the Axis Powers of World War II between huge standing armies but instead must be direct toward the problems of a nuclear balance of terror and the continual threat of limited military actions. We must also provide for situation where a limited number of troops may be necessary to protect the Nation and American lives when endangered without resort to nuclear exchange.

A STANDBY DRAFT AND A COMBINATION ARMY

In my 1967 speech I suggested the creation of a combination army. I suggested a volunteer combat force of well paid individuals supported by a force of trained Reserves and noncombatant drafted individuals. I suggested this because of my opposition to the continued use of draftees to fight in executive wars when there has been no legislative action to declare war or at least a state of national emergency.

At that time I suggested that we have a ready combat force of no more than 100,000 volunteers with a supporting force of 600,000 men. We could pay privates and other noncommissioned officers as much as $5,000 for the pay grade E–1, $12,000 for Pfc's and $19,000 for E–8, and still not spend any more on military manpower than we do now. This is because we would not experience the amount of turnover, training costs, and immense waste of time that is involved in maintaining a conscripted standing army of over 2½ million which serves for only 2 years. Since that time the Gates Commission has stated that even a 2½ million man Army can be maintained by volunteers. I believe this is the next step we should take. The pay raises here start that process.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE MILITARY FORCES

At the time of the Cambodian intervention a number of lawyers in Seattle prepared for me an excellent brief which analyzed every American foreign military operation from Tripoli in 1801 to the Vietnam war to indicate the Cambodian invasion was not authorized. These operations fall into five categories:

First. Cases where there has been a formal Congressional declaration of war—for example, World War II.

Second. Cases where there has been a specific congressional resolution allowing the employment of force, although not rising to a formal declaration of

war—numerous examples, such as the American-Mexican hostilities in 1914–17, the Tonkin resolution with respect to the Vietnamese conflict, and so forth.

Third. Cases where there has been a broad international sanction for the action pursuant to more general treaty commitments approved by the Senate—for example, Korean action under the United Nations, Dominican Republic action sanctioned by the OAS.

Fourth. Cases where, absent of any of the preceding three justifications, there has been an immediate threat to the lives of American civilians or to American property—chiefly, but not exclusively, minor actions, with numerous examples going back to the early 19th century.

Fifth. Cases where, absent of any of the preceding four justifications there has been a subsequent official recognition by this country that the conditions were not ones which would justify the intervention.

This constitutional analysis of the executive power clearly shows the difference between Executive action using the military as an instrument or American foreign policy and the legislative power moving the Nation into a full-scale activity by either a declaration of war—World War II—or a declaration of a national emergency—Korea. Congress has not exercised its legislative powers and this has produced the recent extension of Executive power in making military actions.

The tragedy in Vietnam has been made worse at home because it has been controlled solely by the executive branch. This has violated all of the constitutional and historical precedents which provide for a division between the Executive powers to conduct a foreign policy and act as Commander in Chief, and the legislative powers to declare a national emergency or to declare war. This misuse of power has badly distorted the whole American governmental and political fabric because we have in effect moved into a war under Executive powers. Any time that we have spent $115 billion, suffered 53,771 casualties, and been engaged in continuous and violent combat for over 5 years, we have a war. In no way can this be considered presidential conduct of foreign policy or simply a Commander in Chief acting to protect troops in the field.

The use of the draft to support this kind of activity rather than the use of volunteer troops or regular Army and Navy units with their reserve components has caused this country immense anguish and brought us to the very difficult state of affairs we face today.

If the Nation had made the basic decision through either the declaration of a national emergency or a declaration of war, then the whole Nation would have in effect gone to war. Then our presidents would have taken proper steps to prevent the inflation which exists today by instituting controls and reforming the draft. The old fashioned type draft which exempted the rich, those in college and everyone else who had the resources to make a sustained effort to avoid it would have been corrected. Then the claim could have legitimately been made that those who opposed the war were opposing the Nation. In the present Vietnam crisis the Nation has never officially gone to a state of war. Political dialog about the Vietnam war is a legitimate debate because the question is whether the Executive is carrying out a proper foreign policy, and the Nation is not at war through a congressional declaration.

PROPER MILITARY PAY

I shall support the concept being developed in this debate today that we should have the pay levels necessary to obtain the limited force of volunteers needed to conduct traditional executive constitutional powers. This combat force to protect American lives or engage in the very limited action I have previously defined should be well paid and composed solely of volunteers. As to the limits on size, I would suggest a maximum of 100,000 men.

DURATION OF THE DRAFT

The present draft should not be extended for more than a very limited period of time necessary to shift to a new system, while we examine the creation of the new force concept of volunteers, reserves, and a public service system which involves both military and nonmilitary service. I shall support the position that in any executive action involving American military force that volunteers should be used first. If it is necessary for a limited period of time to utilize additional manpower, this should come from the reserves, who after all had volunteered for service and are paid to be in reserve status.

Though I am not satisfied with the system, I think we should continue the draft at this time to provide support for combat troops and to provide a group of prospective volunteers until we can develop the Gates Commission system. I also support the concept that there should be an alternative of nonmilitary service so that those who are philosophically opposed to any war may have an option if they are selected in the lottery.

I support the effort of Congressman BINGHAM to amend this bill by including a provision for the National Service Corps Act, of which I am a cosponsor. The bill would partially utilize the concept of a volunteer army while maintaining the flexibility necessary to meet manpower requirements in a defense emergency through the provision of a standby lottery system. In addition, young persons who want to serve their country, but not through the armed services, can volunteer for civilian service and work for a given period of time in a variety of fields, including education, medical care, and Government service.

We must spend some time determining the effects of the new system on the armed services. By limiting the extension of this system we can determine what the effect will be on the number of men who volunteer as compared to those who are willing to be in the noncombatant military forces and can continue correcting the inequities of the system. For this reason I shall support a 1-year-limit amendment. We can then determine how many men will exercise the option of nonmilitary service. This should also provide for the creation of a Reserve force of military personnel for the defense of the Nation which would not consist solely of professional soldiers and would also make a group available to assist with domestic disasters.

I also question seriously whether the National Guard is a proper method of maintaining such an Army Reserve, and I think the Congress and the various State governments should look toward the implementation of the recommendations of the Gates Commission. We need to determine whether the country should have one military Reserve rather than a Federal military Reserve plus a number of State National Guards which vary both in standards and training.

CONCLUSION

The parts of this bill which provide for an increase in military pay and limit the draft, I shall support. I am hopeful that this is the beginning in Congress of our recommendations that America is moving toward a correction of our military manpower system to meet the demands of a modern America.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I appreciate the remarks of my friend and colleague from Washington. Unfortunately, I am not as certain about where we have come from to where we are now. I do not think we have come anywhere as long as 73 percent of the American people are telling us to end the war. We are not even political enough to follow our citizens' directions.

I do not think we have come very far when all we can do is sit around here and talk about the fact that we should not enter into any more undeclared wars, when even high school students can read the Constitution as it refers to our responsibilities.

I am hoping that the gentleman will join me in not only supporting the Harrington amendment, but voting to end this pernicious draft system in America, because the Gates Commission, the Republican leadership, and military experts alike have all told us that the logic for extending the Selective Service System no longer exists.

So, I join the gentleman in his remarks, but with a good deal less optimism than he.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a difficult thing for me to be here at this particular moment, but in searching my conscience I have decided that I should speak.

In the committee I spoke for ending the draft, not for ending the Selective Service System, but for ending the call-up, and I think I should repeat that at this point.

My main reason for taking this position is that I think it is entirely too easy in 1971 to go to war. I think if we have learned anything in the last decade that is what we have learned; so I think we ought to make sense about this.

I am here and now just trying to express what is on my conscience. I believe that when we go to war we ought to have the President clear it with the Congress.

I think we did have a declaration of war in the Bay of Tonkin resolution. That is no longer so, because we have passed, and the President has signed a law repealing that resolution.

I have asked repeatedly in the committee hearings what the time schedule might be for merely removing ourselves from South Vietnam, since we no longer have a declaration of war there, and whether it was necessary for us to stay there in the strength we now are; and I got very inconclusive replies to these questions when I asked both General Westmoreland and Secretary of Defense Laird, I did not get, in fact, any firm answer to my question whether we are not now fighting a war there which is an undeclared war since we have repealed the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

So I am here not because it is very pleasant to be here, because it is not, but because my conscience tells me that our country would be better off if we ended the callups under the draft; because we can always go back to a callup since the President can ask us for a draft callup at any time he feels it necessary. So it is my intention not only to vote for the amendment that is before us right now, which would end the callup, as I understand it—though not the draft system—but if that fails, I plan also to support the amendment for limiting for 1 year the callup provisions.

I realize I have not made a very exciting speech here, but I felt that after almost 20 years of service on the Armed Services Committee, I should today speak my conscience on this question, that I should speak from my own heart, and that I should say that, in spite of the fact that it is painful to say it, I think we ought to end the callup under the draft system at the present time. I do not think our national security will be imperiled by approving this amendment.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KEITH was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman who preceded me in the well of the House, I too am speaking from my heart and from my conscience. I have some questions that are in my mind, questions that existed at the time of the Tonkin Gulf resolution: but then I did not have the self-assurance to take the floor and ask them.

I recall on that day, standing here and saying to the gentleman from Michigan, GERRY FORD, "You know, we may not be able to win this. It is not going to look good in the eyes of the world. We are going to extend our supply lines. It is going to cause inflation, and we may not be able to win it."

And GERRY said, in effect, "HASTINGS, you may be right as to most of the things you say, but we certainly can win it."

And as time went on, the certain victory became more illusive. And now, we must look more carefully at the future implications of this step we are considering today than we did on getting into Vietnam. We must look further, and more carefully, down the road than when we considered committing ourselves to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. We must look much further down this road of decision than we did then—by a long way.

My colleague from Massachusetts who offered this amendment wonders what kind of life style would we have in America? I ask what kind of life style would we have as a nation in the international community? And what kind of life style would the world have if, as a consequence, we had to back away from our commitments in Southeast Asia, or in the Middle East, or in NATO?

That is what we must consider—and contemplate—if we do not have the armed force to back up our foreign policy. Before cutting back on our Armed Forces, and thus perhaps not be able to fulfill our commitments, I would prefer to see us first consider a cut back on these commitments.

To be specific,—what I am trying to find out is just how carefully has this amendment been thought out. So I ask the author of this amendment—what about those who are currently serving under the draft? Would they come home at once?

Mr. HARRINGTON. They would not be affected at all. As I understand the language of the amendment, it would be prospective in application and would not beyond June 30 of this year.

Those who are already affected would be affected as other people are, by laws existing at the time.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman think that this is fair—leaving others to serve in Vietnam?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Much of our existence is not fair.

Mr. KEITH. Of course. I agree absolutely that much about our society is not fair. But, it is a heck of a lot more fair than it would be to those depending on us in the Middle East if we were not able to back up our diplomacy with a creditible military force.

You know, we have been winning these confrontations in years past because we have been stronger than they. Gradually I am told, as we cut back on our military strength, we are going to have to back down on certain commitments, because we may not have the strength. We will not have the strength if we do not have men on the ground in uniform and with the equipment that they need.

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

Mr. KEITH. I would like to finish some of my questions if I may, and that is the reason I have asked permission to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

What kind of life style would we enjoy if we brought these boys home? You made reference to them in your introductory remarks. What would it be like in the rest of the country and in the rest of the world? Is it entirely equitable for us to shift the burden of defense from all segments of our society to those at the lowest economic levels?

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

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, it is my feeling that what we might see is a degree more of confidence on the part of elements in our society which I think have found themselves with a President and a quiescent Congress for a 10-year period involving a substantial portion of our younger population against their will in a situation which we have not formally acted upon.

My hope is that we do not really, necessarily have to look back to this, but that we will look forward from this experience.

The Secretary of Defense in his testimony before us stated that he hoped to end our combat role in Vietnam this summer and that we have a draft call substantially less than it was in the course of the last calendar year.

What I expect from this really is not a dramatic transformation of our way of life gradually coming out, but a recognition of the kind of damage that has been done by the unwillingness of the Congress to assume its responsibility in a basic way to control the situation in the future and to benefit by the past mistakes. It is not an anticipation that we can right all wrongs, but it is a desire to go forward from this point and if there is a need to do something again in these areas of Southeast Asia that we will be able and responsible for acting that situation repeats itself again.

That is what I hope for and I hope the gentleman will help in that direction.

Mr. KEITH. We are living, it seems to me, not soley in an American society but in a world society. Are conflicts with the rest of the countries on this globe what we really want?

When I went over to Southeast Asia with the select committee—I went to Singapore and to Indonesia—I found great confidence in the Nixon doctrine. They felt we meant what we said. We have made commitments. We have in effect a common law marriage with South Vietnam. We have told the rest of the world we would support South Vietnam. Our President said so. If we back away from that commitment, to what court can the injured parties go for a proper resettlement?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. Who was it who first sent combat troops into South Vietnam?

Mr. KEITH. The combat troops were sent, I believe, by the President.

Mr. CARTER. It was at his request?

Mr. KEITH. He added to the advisers 10,000 troops that were used in combat.

Mr. CARTER. It was eventually 17,000, was it not?

Mr. KEITH. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. How many were added under President Johnson? Up to 540,000 or better?

Mr. KEITH. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Has that number not been scaled down by over 200,000 at the present time?

Mr. KEITH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CARTER. Then should we not give the President credit for having done that?

Mr. KEITH. I think we should.

Mr. CARTER. Is it not true, to go a little further, at the present time our military position, outside of Vietnam, is low, and that this situation, not merely in Vietnam, but this present position requires a continuation of the draft and improvement of our military situation in the world? Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. KEITH. Certainly. I would like the House to know that the gentleman just asking me these questions has been a "dove" since the day this whole thing started. But he does believe in our living up to our commitments, and he is unique among us for the foresight that he has shown. I am glad to have his support of the President's position in this matter.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. CARTER. I believe in a strong America. I do not feel it was wise for us ever to have gone into South Vietnam. But now we are getting out. Let us have a little patience, provide a little time so the President or the administration can accomplish this withdrawal in a wise manner. In the meantime let us not be defeated. We have the strongest country in the world, and we should all decide to preserve, protect, and defend it. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. KEITH. I have some other questions which I would like to propound. If we were to withdraw precipitously from Southeast Asia and substantially lessen our presence in NATO which would certainly be the result of this amendment, what would happen to the Southeast Asians who have opposed communism for the last 10 years with our support and our promise of further support?

Mr. HARRINGTON. If the distinguished gentleman will yield so that I might answer the question, my response would be that we are backing out of Southeast Asia now, if we can call the anounced withdrawal rates—done for the sake of domestic and political considerations—a backing out.

I would like further to observe in relation to the measure suggested this afternoon that we should address ourselves to the ending of the draft alone. I do not think I could be accused of advocating disarmament or backing out of our responsibility in world alliances. Ending the draft really has no bearing on these matters. We have a very small percentage of people in our Armed Forces today who are draftees, and we might very well consider whether we could not get by with a less sizable Armed Force than we have at the present time and yet continue to meet our commitments.

I do not think that in trying to equate these things we are turning our backs on our allies in Southeast Asia or avoiding responsibility, for it does not do justice to the tone of the debate, nor does it necessarily go to the very question we have before us.

Mr. KEITH. I wish to make one final observation. We should be in a position to lessen our military commitments before we lessen our capability to meet them, and we should resolve the problems of Southeast Asia and the Middle East and of NATO before we lessen our Armed Forces capability to respond to these situations that confront us.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. FISHER. I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Armed Services, after many weeks of intensive study, drawing upon all sources of reliable information from the Department of Defense and other sources, concluded that the minimum period of time for which the draft must be extended is for 2 years. That was based upon the manpower requirements to meet our reduced force levels, provide the people that will be required in the immediate future. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, offered at this time, under present circumstances, amounts to nothing less than a move toward unilateral disarmament. Airplanes, tanks, guns, submarines, ships, and other weapons—many of which are highly sophisticated—are useless unless we have trained manpower to use them. It is just that simple. And there is no reason to believe that these minimum manpower requirements in the immediate future can be met by voluntary enlistments.

If this Congress should make the mistake of taking this move toward unilateral disarmament at a time when the Soviet Union is accelerating its warmaking capability, it would be interpreted as an indication that we are weak and as an indication that America does not have the resolve, and that the prevailing sentiment in this country is yielding to this relatively small minority voice that keeps calling for reduced expenditure, for reduced manpower, and for reduced capability to defend this country and to provide the very minimum requirements to meet our commitments and to present to the world the sort of defense structure that would be realistic in this age of peril.

I would hope that a 2-year period will promptly be accepted. I feel confident it will. We approve the bill and reported it here, and it is tied in with added incentives to induce more people to volunteer. Hopefully within another 2 years, and that is the minimum time we can get a reading and tell much about it, more volunteers will be attracted. If we adopt this kind of amendment, the present incentives for volunteers will be greatly reduced, and we will be much weaker in America, and we will give a much greater invitation to our potential enemies to proceed with the acceleration of their warmaking capabilities.

It is imperative that we retain this standby draft authority. If and when volunteers increase, the draft calls will be automatically less and less. But that is something to be determined in the future. As the matter now stands, we are dealing with an amendment which in effect calls for a unilateral disarmament movement. Make no mistake about that.

If our freedom is to be preserved, if our potential enemies are to be discouraged, we must maintain our strength. It provides the best, and the only, insurance for peace and security in this troubled world in which we find ourselves.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I must say I find myself a little puzzled at what the supporters of this amendment are trying to achieve by it. I gather they feel that somehow if we could cut out the draft, in a few months we can bring the war to an end by cutting off the supply of manpower. If that is the purpose, it is putting the cart before the horse. There are far more effective, and forthright ways for Congress to end the war than by ending the draft.

As a matter of fact, I, myself, have a resolution in, to withdraw from Vietnam by the end of this year. We can simply order the withdrawal or we can cut off the money.

Cutting out the draft, it seems to me, raises a great many practical and moral complications. In the first place, by getting out of Vietnam, we still do not take ourselves out of all the situations in which men may be involved in shooting. As long as we have Armed Forces, it is possible for our men to be fighting and for our men to get killed.

What happens if we end the draft as a means of stopping the war or getting out of a war? What we are saying really is that the great mass of young people in this country, and particularly the children of the upper middle class, are going to put the burden of defending the country—of getting killed on that small number of gung-ho, patriotic kids who, have volunteered to fight for their country. I submit that is morally wrong. Even if it were possible and practical to raise the number of men or to raise the number of quality men that we need by a volunteer force, I think it would be immoral to defend this country in shooting wars, where men are getting killed, entirely by relying on a small number of patriotic young men who are willing to fight and die.

That goes particularly for the withdrawal stages of the Vietnam war, because until we have gotten the last man out of Vietnam, by declaring draft men for reinforecement, we are diminuting the chances of survival for the ever smallest number of young men who are there.

I do not see, to use the words of the gentleman from Massachusetts, anything American about that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I have taken this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a number of questions that will relate to three amendments to be submitted here, I presume, in rapid order: The amendment before us now, to end the draft; an amendment to bar the sending of any selectees to combat without an official declaration of war; and then the final amendment, to continue the draft for only 1 year instead of 2 years.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we are all now agreed, from the President on down, the time has come to disengage

in Vietnam. We have given our ally, the South Vietnamese, the time that country needed to develop its own defense capability and we now have it on authority of the South Vietnamese and our own military command that indeed their defense capability is very impressive. They have 1.2 million men in uniform, fully armed and fully trained.

I make no apologies for being one of the strongest defenders of Vietnam for 6 years in the well of this House. I make no apologies for that. We had a right to be there. We had a responsibility to be there. We gave that country the time she needed to develop her own defense capability.

Now we are all agreed the time has come and our mission has been completed. We have lost 53,771 American soldiers and suffered 294,000 casualties as of the first of this month, and we have disrupted the lives of 2,855,000 young Americans who saw service in Vietnam in the last 6 or 7 years.

Now I want to ask a question, Mr. Chairman. We are now reducing our forces in Vietnam at the rate of 12,500 a month. According to figures supplied to me by the Pentagon, on May 1 of this year, 1971, we will have remaining in Vietnam 284,000 American troops.

We are told that next Wednesday the President will announce a new withdrawal policy, since his present policy of 12,500 a month reduction expires on May 1. That was his target a number of months ago. That target date is now being reached. Now the President, next Wednesday, is going to announce to the country and the world a new troop reduction schedule.

There are those who say he is going to announce a reduction schedule of 16,500 a month, and there are those who say he is going to announce a reduction schedule of 20,000 a month.

Let us assume that we should take the lower figure. Obviously he is going to increase the present 12,500 per month reduction rate. So if on May 1 we have 284,000 and the President announces a 16,500 per month reduction policy, our troops in Vietnam will be reduced by 16,500 during May. But, since we have a policy of rotating our soldiers back home after 12 months service, a total of 24,000 of our boys in Vietnam will be eligible to come home during the month of May. We will thus have to send to Vietnam 7,500 new soldiers in May. We arrive at this figure by subtracting the 16,500 who will not be replaced from the 24,000 being rotated and come up with 7,500 new troops needed in Vietnam.

The following month, in June, we will have, under the President's proposed 16,500 reduction policy, remaining in Vietnam only 267,500 soldiers, of whom 22,300 will be eligible for rotation back home, so we will have to send during the month of June only 5,800 new fresh troops.

In July we will have 251,000 troops left under the 16,500 reduction policy.

But since 20,922 will be eligible for rotation, we will have to send to Vietnam 4,422 to maintain our strength. In August, we will have 234,000 left in Vietnam of whom 19,554 will be eligible for rotation. So we will have to send 3,044 to Vietnam. By October of this year we will reach parity when our monthly troop reduction almost equals our monthly rotation. We will have 201,000 troops left in Vietnam of whom 16,791 will be eligible for rotation, so we will have to send only 291 fresh troops that month. But in November, the number of boys eligible for rotation back home under our 12-month rotation policy will actually exceed the 16,500 rotation, and we will need no soldiers to send to Vietnam. Thereafter the monthly rotation policy will exceed substantially the 16,500 scheduled monthly reduction until October of 1972, when there will be no troops left in Vietnam, unless the President is forced to alter his reduction policy, which I doubt he will.

If we were to take 20,000 as a monthly reduction policy, the requirement of sending new replacement troops would end by July of this year. At the 20,000 per month reduction rate, we would have all of our troops out of Vietnam by July of 1972.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed as much time as he needs to state his question.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Now, what I want to know is, under these figures for our troop strength as of May 1, 1971, supplied by the Pentagon, and under the proposed reduction policy, we find that by August of this year, we will not be sending any new troops to Vietnam and will continue reducing our troops and troop involvement until, by June of 1972, there will be no American troops left in Vietnam. Why, then, is the draft necessary? We now have 284,000 troops in Vietnam. We have 168,000 troops in Okinawa, the Philippines, Formosa, Japan, and Korea and somewhere around a quarter of a million troops in the European theater.

Mr. Chairman, I do not ask this question facetiously. These are statistics supplied by the Pentagon. I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts raised a perfectly valid question, and I believe those who have spoken in support of his resolution or for continuing the draft for only 1 year or the one limiting the shipment of soldiers to combat without a declaration of war are questions properly raised because the figures would not seem to support the continuation of the draft. I would like the chairman to explain that. My mind is open in this proposal and I am anxious for the chairman to provide the answer.

Mr. HÉBERT. If I am allowed enough time by unanimous consent, I will try.

Mr. PUCINSKI. All right.

Mr. HÉBERT. I will start off by saying to the gentleman that when you were in arithmetic I followed you. As you got into algebra and calculus you left me.

The people on the Committee on Armed Services can engage in simple arithmetic. I said I was with you while you were doing simple arithmetic, but when you got to calculus you left me entirely.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There is no calculus in this.

Mr. HÉBERT. Of course, we are both being facetious.

As a matter of fact, if I answered all of your questions, I would have to go into classified material, so I cannot answer you now.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It is not classified material. We know and I put in the RECORD the statements which appeared in the press where the Pentagon said that we would have 284,000 soldiers left in 1971 and the President is expected to announce a 16,500 reduction policy or a 20,000 reduction policy. We know and we can predict on the basis of these two figures, without any military secrets being divulged, what will be the monthly reduction of forces in Vietnam. Let us not hide behind this military secrecy thing. The documents are not marked "Top secret" and I think we ought to have the facts here and now as to what effect our withdrawal from Vietnam will have on our manpower needs and the draft.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I will yield to the chairman or you, either one.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman would refer to page 8638 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in my remarks of yesterday I went into this point exactly.

The Defense Department in testimony before us indicated that if you removed the incentive of the draft, and that goes for those who volunteer for the Navy, Air Force, or the Army, as a hard core of 270,000 volunteers, what we need are 607,000 men to meet our present commitments, including the reduction of troops in Vietnam during 1971, and we need 458,000 in fiscal year 1972. We have to have the draft in order to make up the difference between 270,000, 607,000, and 458,000.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the President announces a reduction policy of 20,000 troops, no American troops would be going to Vietnam after August of this year. If he announces a policy of 16,500, there will be none going there after October of this year.

So, why cannot the volunteer forces take care of our remaining military needs.

Mr. Chairman, it is high time that we brought those troops back from Europe, it is high time that we brought them back from Vietnam, and it is high time that we brought them back from Korea.

I put into the RECORD yesterday the dollar total of this entire program. It will cost us $14.5 billion in Vietnam in 1971. It costs us another $14 billion to keep troops in other parts of the world.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HÉBERT. I want to make the observation at this time that the gentle-

man from New York (Mr. STRATTON) I think is my calculus expert, and I called upon him to make a rapid calculation of the questions posed by the gentleman from Illinois, and the gentleman from New York gave the gentleman a perfect answer, which I am sure the gentleman understands.

Mr. PUCINSKI. However, the gentleman from Louisiana will have to admit that the figures, as to the number of troops remaining in Vietnam on May 1, are correct because they are supplied by the Pentagon. So far as our needs in Vietnam are concerned, I believe my projections are also correct, so I renew my request for an explanation on continuing the draft. Now I personally believe we will have to continue it for a while, but the gentleman will have to agree we have a right to ask these questions.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am sure the Pentagon cannot impose its will upon the House and I suggest that we proceed with a vote on the amendment now pending before the Committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, when the Committee rises, I shall ask unanimous consent that a table I have prepared on the projected U.S. troop withdrawal from Vietnam be placed in the RECORD at this point. The table shows the reduction in our forces if President Nixon orders a 16,500 per month reduction, or a 20,000 per month reduction. When our monthly reduction exceeds our normal rotation of American troops who have completed their 12-month tour in Vietnam, we will not have to send any replacements. This table shows to complete withdrawal of troops by 1972. I am sure the end of sending troops to Vietnam will spur voluntary enlistments in our armed forces, especially now that we propose to double the salary.

The table will follow at this point:

PROJECTED SCHEDULE OF U.S. TROOP WITHDRAWAL FROM SOUTH VIETNAM

Troops in South Vietnam	Reduction at rate of 20,000 per month	Normally due for rotation	Additional troops needed in Vietnam to replace rotation	Reduction at rate of 16,500 per month	Normally due for rotation.	Additional troops needed to replace
May 1, 1971	284,000	24,000	4,000	284,000	24,000	7,500
June	264,000	22,000	2,000	267,500	22,300	5,800
July	244,000	20,333	333	251,000	20,922	4,422
August	224,000	18,666	0	234,500	19,544	3,044
September	204,000	17,000	0	218,000	18,200	1,700
October	184,000	15,300	0	201,500	16,791	291
November	164,000	13,600	0	185,000	15,422	0
December	144,000	12,000	0	168,500	14,000	0
Jan. 1, 1972	124,000	10,300	0	152,000	12,600	0
February	104,000	9,600	0	135,500	11,300	0
March	84,000	7,000	0	119,000	9,900	0
April	64,000	5,333	0	102,500	8,500	0
May	44,000	3,600	0	86,000	7,100	0
June	24,000	2,000	0	69,500	5,800	0
July	0	0	0	53,000	4,400	0
August	0	0	0	36,500	3,000	0
September	0	0	0	20,000	1,600	0
October	0	0	0	3,500	300	0

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Illinois has been treated, it seems to me from listening to this debate, rather summarily.

There have been references to calculus calculations. However, the gentleman from Illinois has read straightforward a hypothetical situation. The gentleman has raised the ultimate question of why do we need the draft. He comes to the floor not as one who has always opposed the draft or who has always opposed the war. It would seem to me that the Committee could answer the gentleman's question a little bit more carefully than has been done. Please be assured that it will not affect my decision one way or the other because I am voting against the draft as soon as I can. However, I think the gentleman has raised a question that deserves the respectful attention of this Committee.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think it is important to point out to the House not only that the needs are questionable, but we have a right to seriously challenge the estimates of the Department of Defense as to what will be the rate of voluntary enlistments when we are doubling the pay as contained in this bill.

The last experience we had with a volunteer Army was in 1949 when the draft was suspended and we were in a high cycle of employment. There were no real great promotions made at that time. However, today we are spending $22 million of the taxpayers' money to promote enlistments in the armed services. Everyone has seen the stories and the advertisements on the networks.

Mr. Chairman, I say we have a right to challenge the accuracy of the projections made by the Department of Defense as to the manpower needs and as to how those needs can be met by voluntary enlistments.

Mr. CONYERS. I do not believe anything that the gentleman from Illinois has said or any information he asks for bears being labeled "top secret." I do not believe that there is any question of classification that prevents us from examining these facts.

On the other hand, I do believe that just as doctors may bury their mistakes, generals label theirs "top secret."

Mr. PUCINSKI. I shall put this table into the RECORD today. So, there is no question about its being top secret. This is a matter of simple arithmetic based upon figures publicly provided by the Department of Defense.

Mr. HÉBERT. I want to say to the gentleman that the top secret classification expression was being used facetiously.

Mr. CONYERS. Does the gentleman now state to the House that his earlier reference to "top secret classification" was a humorous reference and was not intended to be taken seriously?

Mr. HÉBERT. I say to you that it was being used facetiously, and I would also say that evidently the gentleman's sense of humor and my sense of humor are slightly different.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the chairman said that his reference to calculus was facetious, but I do not believe he treated as facetious the statement when I asked for clarification of the need, the manpower needs in Vietnam, the chairman responded that this was a top secret. I submit it is no more a top secret than the words on a billboard because this is information and statistics, and they are issued by the Pentagon.

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I do not think that this humor or facetiousness with reference to top-secret classifications, or whether we are using calculus when it is simple arithmetic that is involved, is either helpful or humorous to any Member of this House. We are debating a bill which could send thousands of American youngsters to their death.

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

(On request of Mr. HÉBERT and by unanimous consent, Mr. CONYERS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I did not ask for any additional time.

Mr. HÉBERT. But since I have secured additional time for the gentleman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CONYERS. Yes, I will yield to the chairman with pleasure.

Mr. HÉBERT. I would just like to make this statement, that apparently the gentleman's statistics and sense of humor, and mine, are somewhat different, and they apply differently.

Mr. CONYERS. Apparently that is true, and I am glad we have corrected it on the floor and in the RECORD.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am certainly glad to see that the gentleman can laugh sometimes, because I live a very happy life myself, and I laugh all the time.

If the gentleman will yield further, the arguments being advanced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) are all answered in the report and in the printed hearings and they are all thoroughly discussed. If anyone has the time to read it, it is there. That is why I thought the gentleman was kidding when he was asking me questions on things

that are already answered in the report. I thought he was just being facetious and funny, and I was trying to out-funny him.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON). Already there have been some very eloquent remarks for this amendment, and I would like to make a few comments myself. Hopefully, they will not be repetitious.

First of all, I respectfully reject any notion that persons in this House and elsewhere who advocate peace in Southeast Asia and an end to the draft are in some way unpatriotic. I would think that time would tell that those persons who are for upholding the Constitution are the true patriots in this country.

Our involvement in Indochina is illegal. I think time will tell that advocates of peace in Indochina and throughout the world are in fact the true patriots.

Today in debate we heard allusions to the Second World War. For all intents and purposes, that war was the war in which everyone went out to end all wars, but for all practical purposes war is still waging—in Southeast Asia, and in other parts of the world.

If we are to end the insanity and the absurdity of war, it seems to me that this Nation has to be willing to take some bold, creative, and courageous steps in order to achieve the necessary credibility of a nation concerned and preoccupied with peace.

One of those steps is to end the draft.

I think it a fundamental contradiction in this country to say to a young 9-year-old boy on an elementary school playground that we are ordering him to stop fighting, and then 10 years later to give him an M–16 rifle and tell him to go kill—and overkill—in a country he probably does not understand. That is a contradiction.

Maybe if we were voting on a bill this afternoon to draft only persons over 30, then this whole entire discussion would be academic, and I think we would defeat the bill.

But young people in this country today share a growing concern about our real inability to come to grips with war—with minikill, overkill, and megakill. For them, war is absurd, a ridiculous folly.

Today we heard many statements which alluded to our preoccupation with competition with major powers. I only hope those very same gentlemen are as concerned with the problems of the 15 million hungry, the 50 million poor, the millions unemployed, and the up to 25 to 30 percent of the American people who are functionally illiterate.

But when we talk about competition—when it deals with war and military expenditures—if there is in fact need to declare war, then I say let this body, as the body of the people, declare it, and take whatever political consequences that may come.

That is the ultimate test of political leadership.

If there is in fact need for a draft, then draft. But we are in no declared war. The young people of today believe—know—that conscription is a key part of their lives. We started out assuming and stating that we would only use conscription in a state of emergency. Yet this body has never taken on its constitutional responsibility to declare a war.

Perhaps if we understand young people today and if everyone of us in this Chamber will face the votes of 18- and 19- and 20-year-olds in 1972, we are going to have to answer the question—why give them a weapon and tell them to go and kill when the only hope of the young people today is to end the folly of war.

I urge all of you to support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON). His amendment would remove the most divisive force in our country today.

We should end the draft because of what it is doing to the youth of our country today. An estimated 40,000 young men have fled this country to Canada, to Switzerland and to other countries to avoid the draft. We are in effect making criminals of these young Americans. Yet, if we were to end the draft and create an all-volunteer army instead, I would venture to say that a considerable number of those who have fled from this country to avoid the draft would even volunteer to serve this country.

Some of my colleagues may be laughing, but you might be surprised if you only spoke to those who have fled this country and who have returned.

In talking with them, you will find that it is the compulsory nature of the draft which they dislike most—it goes contrary to the basic idea of individual freedom for which this country stands. Because the basic freedom of the individual is violated by the draft, we need to end the draft.

I was one of those who spearheaded the move for an all-volunteer army. I am sorry the Committee on Armed Services decided against it, but I must commend the committee for having come out with the bill they did come out with. I feel that within a year's time because of the salary schedule the committee has adopted, we might arrive at a zero draft. I do hope the House will adopt the salary schedule recommended by the committee and reject any attempts to reduce it. We will approach closer—yes, much closer to an all-volunteer army.

I will say this too, that if we adopt the committee's salary schedule, we will probably end the draft within a year. It may be somewhat surprising to note that more than 2 million of our 2.7 million in the services today are pure volunteers who volunteered although they were in no danger of the draft. It is even more surprising to note that these more than 2 million had volunteered on the present pay scale under which recruits are paid only $134 per month. The new salary schedule will boost this monthly salary to $268, or a 100 percent increase. We hope that by such a salary increase we will be able so induce more young men to volunteer for service, so that we will have a de facto volunteer army.

Mr. Chairman, the most immediate reason for ending the draft this year is to end the divisiveness that conscription has inflicted on the American people. Lives of thousands of young men have been distorted, disrupted, and tragically ended, because of the draft. Only by ending conscription can we hope to reestablish the sense of national unity that has made America a truly great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to approve the Harrington amendment.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me. He was, of course, a very eloquent advocate of the all-volunteer army before our committee, and he offered a bill which the committee virtually incorporated into our recommendations. In view of that fact, that the committee has gone so far even beyond the recommendations of the Nixon administration as to a volunteer army, in view of the fact that we virtually accepted the gentleman's recommendations, would not the gentleman, as a realist, somebody who has had some experience with the military, at least concede that we ought to have some time in which to see whether this volunteer proposal, and doing it by these increases in pay, will actually work, rather than cutting off all the machinery by the end of June, at a time when we are trying to bring our men safely home from Vietnam, and when we are trying to deter further aggression in the Middle East? Is that not a reasonable proposal?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. As I stated earlier, I commend the chairman and members of the committee for having brought out the bill that they did. It is a good bill in many respects. I feel I can support it if it is improved; and the Harrington amendment will improve it. Let me commit myself here and now that I will support the bill if the Harrington amendment is accepted.

Mr. STRATTON. Would the gentleman not think that a proposal as sweeping as this and as far reaching as this ought to have a little time to be tried? Does the gentleman want to create chaos in the Armed Forces even before we have an opportunity to put this program into effect?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. As the gentleman well knows from reading the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, it merely limits the power of the President to draft. The act itself will continue in effect so that if it happens that the President would need his draft powers to meet a national emergency the Congress could expeditiously grant him that power, and the Congress has proven capable of acting expeditiously in emergencies. What I am saying now is that because of the salary schedule which the committee has reported out, even if the draft is ended, I see no danger of having to be without an army. We will have an adequate number of volunteers under the remaining provisions of the bill.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

May I invite the attention of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) to what I am about to say. I would like, with the permission of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) to clarify the argument he just presented in the well of the House, to make very sure that I understand the thrust of his argument. Is this it, that because at a time in the future withdrawals from Southeast Asia will equal the rotation, it will not be necessary to send any new men to Southeast Asia, and, therefore, the draft need not be continued?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Assuming that we continue our 1-year rotation, a policy which I would hope would never change, because that is what keeps the morale of our troops up, since each soldier can predict to the day when he will come home, and assuming the President does not alter either the present reduction policy of 12,500, but instead increases it, as we have reason to believe he will, to 16,500 or 20,000 a month, the calculations show that at the rate of a 20,000-a-month reduction, we would not send any new American soldiers to Vietnam by August of this year, and assuming that the President chose a 16,500 group, then we would not send any new troops to Vietnam after October of this year, because the reduction would exceed the 16,500-a-month reduction level or the 20,000 a month.

Mr. GUBSER. I understand, and for purposes of argument, let me accept the gentleman's premise, but I would like to pursue the thrust of his argument one step further. What does that prove?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That proves that while we remained in Vietnam for the last 5 years and during that time we had 585,000 troops which we had to replace every 12 months, we had to have a draft, but as our manpower needs in Vietnam diminish by the President's action, we may not need to draft young people to take care of the normal needs of the noncombat requirements.

Mr. GUBSER. Is this a fair paraphrase of the gentleman's argument: That because of the figures the gentleman has cited, and which for purposes of argument I have accepted, we do not need a draft?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I raised that question with the chairman of the committee in light of my figures, and if he has an answer it may alter my position on this argument.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman very much. I think the gentleman's thought, intriguing and interesting as it is, is based upon a fallacious premise, and that premise is that when a man is rotated out of Southeast Asia, he immediately goes back into the military pool that the armed services have—in other words, the force level. Many of these men get discharged at the end of their 2 years, and they must be replaced if we are going to keep ourselves up at that force level. That is what we have to look at, and not just in Southeast Asia.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, that question was asked by Mr. Slatinshek, the committee counsel, involving exactly the kind of considerations raised by the gentleman from Illinois. He asked it of General Westmoreland, and the answer appears on page 1088 of the hearings:

Mr. SLATINSHEK. What would your reaction be to a restriction in the law which would permit the induction authority to continue to satisfy the Army's national security and defense requirements with the proviso that draftees could not be sent overseas in the absence of a declaration of a new national emergency?

General WESTMORELAND. We could not live with that in the foreseeable future. Our studies indicate that we could not support our commitments in Southeast Asia on a voluntary basis until we got down to a force of about [Deleted.]

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. He is making my point. We simply must look at the total national manpower levels. They are going down. In June 30, 1968, they were 3.6 million; on June 30, 1969, they were 3,294,000; and the projection for June 30, 1972, is a reduction to 2.5 million men.

The President will have, by June 30, 1972, reduced the armed strength of this Nation by more than one million men. It is going to go down to 2.5 million.

Now the question, is, even assuming we are out of Vietnam entirely—and I hope and pray we are—where do we get those 2.5 million men? All right. In 1948, the President of the United States came to this Congress and said that it was impossible by voluntary means to get more than 1,348,000, although we needed 2,000,000, so we passed the draft law. We could not get the men on a voluntary basis.

Admittedly, this bill has inducements for a career in the military service that were not present at that time, but the fact is that we do not know whether those inducements are going to produce 2.5 million men, and we must keep the draft as a standby. When we talk about 2 years versus 1 year or 2 years versus 6 months, it is pointless; because when we get the 2.5 million men, there will not be any draft. If we do not get them, we have got to have the draft.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Harrington amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems we never learn anything from history. We are prone to want to repeat our mistakes.

He has not been gone so long that many of the Members would have forgotten him, but I had a telephone conversation just a few moments ago with our former Speaker, John McCormack. I called him as I do about once a week simply to visit with him and express my concern for him and my fondness for him and to inquire about Mrs. McCormack.

I talked with him a few moments ago, and he asked me what we were doing on the floor. I said:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems we have an argument between two people from Massachusetts, Mr. HARRINGTON and Mr. KEITH, and it seems that they are not only on different sides of the aisle with regard to party affiliation but also on different sides of the present issue, because Mr. HARRINGTON has offered an amendment for our consideration that would terminate as of June 30 the draft law.

He told me a story. Think about it. He painted a picture for me with words that have significance, an answer to the question we ought to be concerned about. The old gentleman's memory is still good and his mind is still sharp.

He said it was August 12, 1941, and this House of Representatives was in session debating a 1-year extension of the draft law. As he recounted the story to me, it seems that every argument for not extending the draft law then was advanced on that occasion that is being advanced today not to extend the draft law. But, as was the case with another matter in the Democratic caucus this morning, by a vote of 101 to 100 the draft law then by a margin of only one vote was extended, with the all-out effort of the then Speaker, Speaker Rayburn, and the then majority leader John McCormack. There was a vote of 203 to 202. Thank God for one vote on that occasion and for their leadership.

Well, time moves in a hurry and the calendar does not even give one much time from August 12, 1941 until December 7, 1941. Memory and history might not be too good about that extension of the draft law, but most of the Members ought to be able to remember December 7, 1941. Japan did the unexpected. Germany had an ally. We were in trouble and we were not prepared.

You who want to terminate the draft right now tell me where this country would have been December 8, 1941 if we had not extended the draft. Why? It was just to be prepared, just to be ready, just for the possibility that we might need it. And need it we did.

Then the Atlantic Ocean was our first line of defense. Is it there now? Not as a first line of defense. We had time, because we had the machinery to do something about mustering our manpower, mobilizing our forces.

Would we have time today, when we do not have the Atlantic Ocean there as our defense? How could we properly respond to a nuclear attack if manpower was not immediately available?

How many of you people who advocate termination of the draft, as of June 30, have Boy Scouts in your families today? Show me your hands. Do none of you have Boy Scouts in your families? You have sons who are Boy Scouts?

Do not then, if you do, go home and tell your sons tonight to be prepared to honor the Scout motto, when you are not willing to prepare the Nation. That is what I want to tell you. That is my message for you. Do not go home to tell your son he ought to be prepared when you are not willing to prepare the world to be lived in, to set the example.

Why extend the draft? Because this country cannot afford to take the chance. We have proved we were right in 1941. Until we know what is going to happen to the voluntary army, and I say sincerely I hope it does work, let us not immobilize this country. Consider, if you will, the

potential for danger in the Middle East. This potential must be reckoned with.

This is the reason why we ought to vote down the Harrington amendment. This is the reason why we ought to vote down the proposal which will come here a little bit later asking for just a 1-year extension.

How many of you people are willing, in an election year, to stand up here and advance these arguments all over again? Do you really believe the merit of the issue would prevail, or would we simply be making campaign speeches? What would you do to the national security of this country?

I am asking you: Let us not play politics with it. Let us not do anything like that. Let us see if the voluntary proposal can be made to work. Let us vote down the Harrington amendment and let us vote up this 2-year proposal from the committee.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman surely must be aware of the fact that the destruction of this country of ours can come from without as well as from within.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am not so much concerned about without as within.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman should look at what the draft has done to the 3 million men involved in Vietnam. He had better be prepared to ask himself how he will be prepared to defend this country externally as well as internally.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Let me answer that question. I will meet you whenever and wherever it needs defending, if you will meet me.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Harrington amendment.

I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) on the effort and the leadership he has shown here.

Many of us, I suppose, wonder what might have happened in 1941 if things had gone differently, but I do not think we can live in 1941 perpetually.

I came into this well in 1965 and 1966. I was new, as many of you are here now. You are bringing quite a bit of fresh air in, which is always welcome. I was very concerned about expanding the war in Vietnam in a vote on an appropriation bill then. It was made quite clear that unless you voted for this appropriation Hitler would be marching down the street again.

Well, times have changed, but we have not moved the scenery. I actually held my nose on that vote, as I believe some of you here might, because I thought I had better follow the leadership. I was a pretty new Congressman then. I could not believe that we were doing the right thing, and, lo and behold, we were not, in my judgment.

The burden of proof, I think, is on the people who want to extend the draft. Is it not? Is it on Mr. HARRINGTON? We have hit him pretty good here. We have backed him all around the room. If you want involuntary servitude, the burden is on you and not on him. I am not satisfied that burden has been met, either.

As I understand his proposal, we could still come back and draft people. We hear prophecies of Armageddon if we do what he suggests? What has gone on in the past 20 years under the present system? What kind of an endorsement is that? I think it is worthwhile to try another tack. If we can look at the proposal he gives us, then the President might have an opportunity to come down to Congress next week and say, "I would like to go to Laos and I would like to have the troops for that." Maybe it would be Cambodia. Maybe yet another. You name it. I am not acquainted with all of the countries in that part of the world, although I am learning.

I think we must commend the gentleman, and I hope we can find some way to regain some of our independent posture here. We talk a lot about the role that the House should play in making foreign policy. Well, here is your chance. If they want to send troops over, let them come here and ask you about it and do not just give them a blank check to do it.

Next we hear the argument that if we bring troops home, you have to draft troops here to send over there so that you can keep bringing them home. It sounds to me a little like the guy who had quit drinking, but he still had to keep buying whisky. I just do not understand it.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON).

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment, while it might appear to be a little bit radical in form and terminate the draft a little bit more prematurely than perhaps the gentleman from Chicago's statistics will allow, still I think this country has to take a very careful look at the war in Vietnam. We have lost over 50,000 men. We have 350,000 wounded and a lot of them in hospitals who will be there for the next 50 or 60 years. We will be spending for the next 50 or 60 years $250 billion to pay pensions and support for these people. Who can say that this effort that we have made has not been virtually totally in vain.

The President said last week:

> Let us not judge the Laotian incursion prematurely, the jury is not back yet.

I tend to think when the facts came out last week, which were not denied by the White House, that 22,000 South Vietnamese went into Laos and 9,775 came out either dead or wounded, I tend to think that the jury came back and the result was catastrophic. And, I think that the jury report is that Vietnamization is under very, very suspect credibility.

Now, considering that and considering the fact that over the past years wherever I go, in Europe or in the South, in southern schools or northern schools, I find these kids with a little beard, with a long haircut, how many boys has my daughter brought home with long haircuts? The long haircut is not limited only to the colleges and to the high schools but is a common practice in grammar school. My little boy who is 12 years old has his hair a little bit long.

Mr. Chairman, what they are doing is that they are joining in a rebellion, a rebellion against our generation, our group that has voted for this Draft Act. It was extended in 1967 and I participated in that, and now we are doing it again just for 2 years. In other words, let us make a little neat determination for 2 years and let us cut our losses, but we want to get out in due course.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect for General Westmoreland and the Joint Chiefs and the management of our military—and, certainly, let us not discredit anyone, let us not reflect upon the honor of anyone, but I think we have got to withdraw.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Chicago (Mr. PUCINSKI) is right. I think we have got to withdraw from NATO very substantially. We have 3,000 bases around the world. The Soviets do not have any bases anywhere except in the Baltic and in Egypt. The Red Chinese do not have any of their troops any place in the world.

I think we have made a lot of very serious mistakes. I think what we have got to do is to turn this country upside down and shake it and come up with some new priorities, not just mass transit, but a lot of things.

We have $80 billion that we will be asked to appropriate for our military forces this year. I think it is really not too offbeat to suggest that we look to a voluntary force. We have got a good bill. We are providing the money to a voluntary force.

What did the President of the United States say last year when he talked about this voluntary army suggestion? He said:

> This Congress has both the power and the opportunity to take an historic action. As I stated in last year's message, with an end to the draft we will demonstrate to the world the responsiveness of our system of government—and we will also demonstrate our continuing commitment to the principle of ensuring for the individual the greatest possible measure of freedom.
>
> I urge the 92nd Congress to seize this opportunity, and make the bold decisions necessary to achieve this goal.

Mr. Chairman, the President thought he was going to add $950 million to increase military compensation. We are breaking the bank in this bill because we passed in the committee the largest single increase that has ever been passed in any committee since I've been in Congress and that is an increase of $1.7 billion in pay raises for a total increase of $2.6 billion in order to move to an all-voluntary service.

I think it is time to pull the plug on the Joint Chiefs, to terminate what they call and what they like, cozy relationships, with lots of military personnel and lots of hardware around the world.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution places upon us the burden of providing for the common defense. We are now talking about the common defense of this country. We are not talking only about Vietnam, but, of course, what has occurred from Vietnam in the Calley trial, and the

sentence has just been announced as life imprisonment, does affect the concept of an all-volunteer Army.

I have in my hand 49 Western Union telegrams from people in my district expressing dismay at the verdict and at the treatment of Lieutenant Calley. The telephone calls I have had from people in my district in effect say this:

I am not going to let my son without a draft go into the Army.

Mr. Chairman, we do have the responsibility of providing for the common defense. Many say that an all-volunteer Army will work. I would like to submit to you that most of you who are in favor of an all-volunteer Army are in favor of it because you believe that the son of someone else will be the one that will volunteer and that your son will not have to serve.

Certainly I have no desire to force anyone into service. I myself was drafted during World War II, and served 3 years during that time, and I went back in 1950 for approximately 3 more years of service, but I know this, Mr. Chairman, that if this amendment carries, and if the all-volunteer concept does not work out, then we will jeopardize the security of this country if there is no draft.

Others say, "Well, what was our involvement in Vietnam worth?"

Well, to the South Vietnamese, whose lives may have been saved, or who may be able to determine their own form of government, I say it is worth countless dollars.

They may also say, "What was our involvement during World War II worth?"

Well, to the people of England and France and to the Jew whose life was saved because of our actions, it is countless. You cannot count the value.

So, Mr. Chairman, I simply urge the committee today not to adopt this amendment. If an all-volunteer army can work, and if the incentives which we are hoping to pass are indeed incentives, so as to solicit these people into our armed services, then we will know, but if not we can still fall back on the draft should this not prevail.

So again, Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid at this time we are losing sight of the importance of a strong defense, and thinking only of Vietnam, which the Calley verdict is bound to impress on our minds. But the draft we are talking about is simply the symptom of what has happened. We have made commitments all over the world, and frankly it is only recently that we have tried to get rid of a lot of those commitments. The strength of our armed services, and the draft that provides that strength is to provide the strength to carry out these commitments.

It is interesting that those who are the strongest for making commitments all over the world are the ones who scream the loudest when we ask for the strength to try to carry out those commitments.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I am rather an isolationist, and have been for a long time. There have been many situations in the world that we would like to see changed, but I do not and never have supported the philosophy that the United States should by force attempt to right all of the world's problems. There are many right here in this body that have, even today and for some time, expressed the thought that we ought to go in and settle certain problems in Africa. Whenever you go in and take sides in controversies through the world for good against evil, or what we may think is good or evil, then you arouse the other side, the evil side, as you would call it, and they attack you.

We can merely defend the coasts of America, and let all the rest of our commitments go down the drain, or we can keep an effective army and in the future try to use some commonsense on assuming commitments. Regardless of Vietnam, we should keep a strong defense until we do get rid of some of these commitments we have been making all over the world.

I hope the same people today who want to destroy our defenses will also be as interested in the prevention of making commitments in the future.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I am not an expert on whether or not a volunteer army will work. But I want to just reminisce for about 2 minutes. This draft which came out in 1941 has been referred today. I was the administrative assistant to Ross Rizley from Oklahoma who was in the House at that time. He voted against the extension of the draft. I had a lot of arguments with him, but anyway he went ahead and voted against the extension of the draft.

In the next campaign they put out a quarter of a million sheets against Ross Rizley. It showed Hitler and Mussolini sitting right up there—and Ross Rizley speaking against the draft down here. Hitler said to Mussolini, "That's our boy."

That is exactly what we ran against all during that time.

Many times since then I have thanked God the Republicans were not able to stop the draft. I pray today that the Democrats are not going to be able to stop this draft.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON).

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. HARRINGTON, HÉBERT, BRAY, and LEGGETT.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 62, noes 330, not voting 40, as follows:

[Recorded Teller Vote No. 37]

AYES—62

Abourezk	Badillo	Boland
Abzug	Begich	Burton
Anderson, Calif.	Bennett	Carey, N.Y.
	Bingham	Celler
Chisholm	Helstoski	Rangel
Conyers	Hungate	Rees
Crane	Jacobs	Reuss
Dellums	Kastenmeier	Roncalio
Diggs	Leggett	Rosenthal
Dow	McClory	Roybal
Drinan	McDonald, Mich.	Ryan
Edwards, Calif.	Matsunaga	Sarbanes
Fraser	Melcher	Scheuer
Fulton, Pa.	Metcalfe	Schwengel
Fulton, Tenn.	Mikva	Seiberling
Gibbons	Mink	Stokes
Goldwater	Mitchell	Vanik
Halpern	Morse	Waldie
Harrington	Mosher	Wilson, Charles H.
Hawkins	Moss	Yates
Hays	O'Konski	
Hechler, W. Va.		

NOES—330

Abbitt	Downing	Landgrebe
Abernethy	Dulski	Latta
Adams	Duncan	Lennon
Addabbo	duPont	Lent
Albert	Dwyer	Link
Alexander	Eckhardt	Lloyd
Anderson, Ill.	Edmondson	Long, Md.
Andrews, Ala.	Edwards, Ala.	Lujan
Andrews, N. Dak.	Eilberg	McCloskey
Archer	Erlenborn	McCollister
Ashbrook	Esch	McCormack
Ashley	Eshleman	McDade
Aspin	Evans, Colo.	McEwen
Aspinall	Fascell	McFall
Baker	Findley	McKay
Baring	Fish	McKevitt
Belcher	Fisher	McKinney
Bell	Flood	McMillan
Bergland	Flowers	Macdonald, Mass.
Betts	Foley	Madden
Bevill	Ford, Gerald R.	Mahon
Biaggi	Forsythe	Mailliard
Biester	Fountain	Mann
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Martin
Blatnik	Frenzel	Mathias, Calif.
Bolling	Frey	Mathis, Ga.
Bow	Fuqua	Mayne
Brademas	Gallagher	Mazzoli
Brasco	Garmatz	Michel
Bray	Gaydos	Miller, Calif.
Brinkley	Giaimo	Miller, Ohio
Brooks	Gonzalez	Mills
Broomfield	Goodling	Minish
Brotzman	Grasso	Minshall
Brown, Mich.	Gray	Mizell
Brown, Ohio	Green, Oreg.	Mollohan
Broyhill, N.C.	Griffin	Monagan
Broyhill, Va.	Griffiths	Montgomery
Buchanan	Gross	Moorhead
Burke, Fla.	Grover	Morgan
Burke, Mass.	Gubser	Murphy, Ill.
Burleson, Tex.	Gude	Murphy, N.Y.
Burlison, Mo.	Hagan	Myers
Byrnes, Wis.	Haley	Natcher
Byron	Hamilton	Nedzi
Cabell	Hammer-schmidt	Nelsen
Caffery	Hanley	Nichols
Camp	Hanna	Nix
Carney	Hansen, Idaho	Obey
Carter	Hansen, Wash.	O'Hara
Casey, Tex.	Harvey	O'Neill
Cederberg	Hastings	Passman
Chamberlain	Hathaway	Patman
Chappell	Hébert	Patten
Clancy	Heckler, Mass.	Pelly
Clausen, Don H.	Henderson	Pepper
Clawson, Del	Hicks, Mass.	Perkins
Cleveland	Hicks, Wash.	Pettis
Collier	Hillis	Peyser
Collins, Tex.	Hogan	Pickle
Colmer	Holifield	Pike
Conable	Horton	Pirnie
Conte	Hosmer	Podell
Corman	Howard	Poff
Cotter	Hull	Powell
Coughlin	Hunt	Preyer, N.C.
Culver	Hutchinson	Price, Ill.
Daniel, Va.	Ichord	Price, Tex.
Daniels, N.J.	Johnson, Calif.	Pryor, Ark.
Danielson	Johnson, Pa.	Pucinski
Davis, Ga.	Jonas	Purcell
Davis, Wis.	Jones, N.C.	Quie
de la Garza	Jones, Tenn.	Quillen
Delaney	Karth	Railsback
Dellenback	Kazen	Randall
Dennis	Keating	Rarick
Dent	Kee	Reid, Ill.
Derwinski	Keith	Reid, N.Y.
Devine	Kemp	Rhodes
Dickinson	King	Roberts
Dingell	Kluczynski	Robinson, Va.
Donohue	Kuykendall	Robison, N.Y.
Dorn	Kyl	Roe
	Kyros	Rogers

Rooney, N.Y.	Springer	Vander Jagt
Rooney, Pa.	Stafford	Veysey
Rostenkowski	Staggers	Vigorito
Rousselot	Stanton,	Waggonner
Roy	J. William	Wampler
Runnels	Stanton,	Ware
Ruppe	James V.	Watts
Ruth	Steele	Whalen
St Germain	Steiger, Ariz.	White
Sandman	Steiger, Wis.	Whitehurst
Satterfield	Stephens	Whitten
Saylor	Stratton	Widnall
Scherle	Stubblefield	Wiggins
Schmitz	Stuckey	Williams
Schneebeli	Sullivan	Wilson, Bob
Scott	Symington	Winn
Sebelius	Talcott	Wolff
Shipley	Taylor	Wright
Shoup	Teague, Calif.	Wydler
Shriver	Teague, Tex.	Wylie
Sikes	Terry	Wyman
Sisk	Thompson, Ga.	Yatron
Skubitz	Thomson, Wis.	Young, Fla.
Slack	Thone	Zablocki
Smith, Calif.	Tiernan	Zion
Smith, N.Y.	Udall	Zwach
Snyder	Ullman	
Spence	Van Deerlin	

NOT VOTING—40

Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, La.	Long, La.
Annunzio	Evins, Tenn.	McClure
Arends	Flynt	McCulloch
Barrett	Ford,	Meeds
Blanton	William D.	Poage
Boggs	Galifianakis	Riegle
Byrne, Pa.	Gettys	Rodino
Clark	Green, Pa.	Roush
Clay	Hall	Smith, Iowa
Collins, Ill.	Harsha	Steed
Corbett	Jarman	Thompson, N.J.
Denholm	Jones, Ala.	Whalley
Dowdy	Koch	Wyatt
	Landrum	Young, Tex.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHALEN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHALEN:

On page 11, line 22, after the word "thereof" strike "July 1, 1973" and insert "July 1, 1972".

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, if it is in order I should like to address a question to the distinguished chairman of the committee (Mr. HÉBERT).

Mr. Chairman, I think you have been extremely fair during committee consideration of the amendments that were presented, and you have certainly bent over backwards in allowing unlimited time on the amendments we have considered today.

The amendment I am about to discuss is somewhat similar to the one we have just debated. While there are obviously some basic differences. I believe that some of the arguments might be redundant. Therefore, it is my suggestion, Mr. Chairman—and I make it as a suggestion, not a motion—that perhaps we can terminate debate on this amendment by 6 o'clock.

Mr. HÉBERT. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that the chairman is perfectly willing to do that and thinks it is a very fine suggestion. I appreciate it.

As the chairman stated at the beginning, I will not initiate any such move. However, I will make this observation: If any one of the membership is so disposed to move, I will support the motion. I think that would greatly expedite the matter.

However, I would prefer, as I say, to let someone like the gentleman in the well make that motion.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto terminate at 6 o'clock.

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto terminate at 6 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. WHALEN, in support of his amendment.

Mr. WHALEN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in discussing my amendment I am going to touch on three points. First, I shall explain very briefly what the amendment does. Second, I shall endeavor to explain the rationale underlying this amendment. Third, I will advance three arguments in support of this amendment.

First, what does this amendment do, specifically?

H.R. 6531 which presently is before us calls for the extension of induction authority from its present termination date, July 1, 1971, to July 1, 1973.

My amendment simply would reduce that extension of the induction authority by 1 year, from July 1, 1973, to July 1, 1972.

Second, what is the amendment's rationale? Why has this amendment been introduced?

When I first arrived in this body in 1967 several of my colleagues and I became interested in the all-volunteer military concept, so much so in fact that with the help of our staff we sat down and we wrote a book entitled, "How to End the Draft: The Case for an All-Volunteer Army."

I might point out that this book did not reach the best seller list. I understand that the company today may be out of business.

But, Mr. Chairman, we were very delighted, when in 1968 former Vice President Nixon, as the Presidential candidate of the Republican Party, came out and endorsed the concept of an all-volunteer military service.

We were even more delighted when he continued to pursue this approach after he was elected President in 1968.

As you know, of course, President Nixon appointed a commission known as the Gates Commission which took the position that an all-voluntary military service was possible and would be attainable within a year, if pay were increased sufficiently.

The original bill that we had before the House Armed Services Committee, while it was a step in the direction of an all-volunteer military service, certainly would not have accomplished that goal.

Thus, many of us supported as a substitute, H.R. 4450 which was introduced by 92 of our colleagues and which provided for the pay scale contained in the Gates report.

Nevertheless, we were concerned about this particular substitute since it was silent on section 17(c). That section deals with induction authority, and had the substitute been adopted, that induction authority would have terminated on June 30, 1971. We did feel this was too soon and would not have enabled the President and the Department of Defense to attain their goal of an all-volunteer service.

Later on in committee consideration, an amendment was adopted which compressed the pay scales which were advocated for fiscal years 1972 and 1973. This simply means, then, that the bill now before us calls for pay increases in the military service of $2,687 million.

I think the committee action provides the Department of Defense the tools with which to achieve its goal of an all-volunteer service. But in my opinion there were still certain elements lacking in the bill before us. Therefore, I submitted during committee consideration an amendment which called for the extension of the induction authority for 1 year instead of two. The amendment was defeated. I now submit the amendment at this time.

Third, What are the arguments in favor of 1 year additional induction authority instead of 2?

First of all, we have to recognize that the House is really not on record in favor of an all-volunteer military service because the bill presently before us extends induction authority to July 1, 1973, which goes into the 93d Congress. By adopting my amendment, the House will go on record as favoring an all-volunteer military service.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. WHALEN, because I believe it gives an added dimension to this legislation which we are considering today and moves more responsibly and decisively to an all-volunteer armed force. My reasons for supporting this amendment are as follows:

First. Senator Robert Taft declared, three decades ago, when discussing compulsory draft legislation:

> The draft is absolutely opposed to the principles of individual liberty which have always been considered a part of American democracy.

On October 17, 1968, President Nixon stated,

> I feel this way: a system of compulsory service that arbitrarily selects some and not others simply cannot be squared with our whole concept of liberty, justice and equality under the law. Its only justification is compelling necessity. The longer it goes on, the more troublesome are the questions it raises.

Both of these leaders, from the past and from the present, have spoken in a responsible and correct way, and I believe that this amendment insures that move toward a system of all-voluntary military in a responsible and most expeditious manner.

Second. The Gates Commission, headed by former Secretary Thomas Gates, in its report, stated that in their opin-

ion it would take approximately 1 year to convert to and properly implement an all-volunteer military. On the basis of those who served on the Gates Commission—such men as former Commander Alfred Gruenther, Lauris Norstad, and former Congressman Thomas Curtis, ranking Republican on the Joint Economic Committee for many years—the overwhelming evidence favors the concept of the ability of the Army to accomplish this job within this time frame.

Third. The Constitution of the United States clearly delegates to the Congress of the United States, in article 1, section 8, that the Congress shall have power to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Under that clearly delegated responsibility, I believe that it is imperative that the Congress review annually the responsibility of draft authority, and that it not be left just to the President of the United States alone to make this determination.

Fourth. Our country has been engaged for too long in a war that is undeclared and, in my opinion, unconstitutional; therefore, I do not feel that we have the right to impose a compulsory draft system upon the young people of the country when we have not fully assumed our responsibility to either vote "yea" or "nay" on a declaration of war.

To claim that the U.S. Army is incapable, or so rigid, that it cannot adequately recruit for an all-voluntary force within a year's time, I feel improperly discredits the ability and capability of the management of the U.S. Army, both civilian and military.

This legislation gives the Army the adequate tools that it needs for a proper recruitment effort and I strongly urge the support of this amendment now being offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER).

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering a bill with tremendous import. H.R. 6531 contains provisions which will dramatically reduce the many inequities and burdens borne by those men who are serving their country.

Most important of all are the provisions which increase the rates of pay for enlisted men. The Gates Commission had recommended these increases as essential for attracting an increased number of enlistments, and thereby achieving an all-volunteer army.

Now that the pay increases are before us—and are universally approved—I should like to call upon my respected colleagues to consider that portion of H.R. 6531 which deals with an extension of the induction authority.

Why, with all the major priorities for an all-volunteer army written into this bill, should we at the same time extend the draft?

Why not end the draft at the same time as we are setting up the mechanism for an all-volunteer army?

The war in Indochina is being brought to a very low level of U.S. involvement. President Nixon has vowed a new strategy of realistic deterrence and a political foreign affairs doctrine that places the burden of self-defense on our allies, rather than on us. There is no real anticipation of dramatically increased military manpower needs.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to vote for the Harrington amendment to eliminate the further extension of the draft from this measure.

Should this attempt to end the draft this year fail, I would, therefore, urge support of the Whalen amendment to provide for a minimal extension of a year. This would provide a transition period to insure that the all-volunteer army would work, and to complete wind-up operations in Vietnam. It is certainly a lesser evil, for those of us who oppose the draft, than the 2-year extension written into H.R. 6531.

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes in order to complete the explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise the gentleman that the time has been fixed.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY).

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the 1-year limitation included in the Whalen amendment. It provides a transition period to a volunteer army and is thereby responsible. It will give incentive to those in the Pentagon to utilize all the forces at their command to get volunteers. Probably most important it is a good faith response to our young people and demonstrates that we do not want to vote more time than necessary to build a volunteer force. Finally, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a good idea to take another look in a year's time to see how well the volunteer army has progressed. I urge support for the Whalen amendment and a 1-year only extension of the draft.

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

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, continuing my comments, then: The second reason I would urge an adoption of this particular amendment is that it does provide an incentive lacking in the present bill. By setting a time certain, namely, July 1, 1972, by which the Department of Defense would achieve an all-voluntary military service, the amendment establishes an objective, or a target date.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, the amendment puts pressure on the proper authorities to attain this goal, to reach the date established by Congress, July 1, 1972.

So what we would do then, if we pass this amendment, would simply be to attain a goal which many of us cherish, namely, an all-volunteer military service, and at the same time fulfill commitments many of us, including the President of the United States, have made to our constituents, that we will have an all-volunteer military service.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON).

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I take the well of the House for the first time in my congressional career today because I think the subject matter that is before this House is extremely important not only to this House, but to the country at large.

I disagree with those who believe that we should not go on record as extending the draft for only 1 year. I think this Congress ought to face the test a year from now, when we will be facing the electorate, as to the question of whether the draft should be continued for 1 year from that date forward.

That will be the test of the moral courage of the House of Representatives, the courage of this House to determine a year from now whether they can make the decision when they face the electorate of this country, and indicate whether they want to continue the draft in the United States of America. That is the test.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that the action that has been taken by the House Committee on Armed Services, coupled with the action taken by the Nixon administration, makes it possible for us even to be here talking about a volunteer army. I believe the Whalen amendment ought to be adopted, with all due respect to the House Committee on Armed Services, and the recommendations made by Secretary Laird and Secretary Kelly.

The reason is a simple one in my judgment: The reason relates to whether or not this Congress is willing to go on record fully, clearly, and without equivocation, in support of the volunteer army concept. The 1-year extension, in my judgment, is the only effective way of doing it, to make it possible to insure that the pressure is put on the Department of Defense, and on all branches of the armed services, so that they will make the changes that are absolutely necessary, coupled with the pay increase authorizations that are in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, as one of the authors of H.R. 4450, the legislation implementing the recommendations of the Gates Commission, I support the compensation portions of the committee bill. As my colleagues will note on page 27 of the committee report, the first-term serviceman under the committee bill, makes out as well, if not better, as he does in the Gates legislation.

It is this very similarity between the committee bill and the recommendations of the Gates Commission which prompts me to support limiting the extension of

the induction authority to 1 year. The 1-year extension, in fact, is the only action which is consistent with the Gates Commission concept of sustaining our national defense capability while moving as rapidly as possible toward an end to the draft.

As you will recall, the Gates Commission recommended enactment of the pay raises on July 1, 1970, 12 months before they said the draft would be terminated. In the appendix to their report, this policy was made even more explicit:

Military pay is assumed to be raised in FY 1971, a full year before ending the draft.

In other words, the Commission provided for a "transitional year" in which the pay and benefits package would become fully effective. Accordingly, if we act now on the pay raises, we shall be able to reach a "zero draft" within a year. Actually, implementation of the increases before May 1 will give us a 2-months headstart on the Commission's timetable, and will come during the peak recruiting months of May and June.

In asking that the draft extension be limited to 1 year, I well recall the remarks of the distinguished chairman when he opened the draft hearings. He said:

In our present situation, I think the only way to get an all-volunteer Army is to draft it.

The chairman's remarks are in complete accord with the intention of the Gates Commission to use the induction authority during the transitional year to prevent any shortfalls.

Most importantly, I firmly believe the 1-year extension will aid the administration in its attempt to achieve an all-volunteer force.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that regardless of the volunteer force, this body should consider the draft law on a yearly basis. None of us would accept a hardware procurement system that was not subject to annual review—yet somehow we have grown accustomed to long-term authorizations of a manpower procurement system that is inefficient, inequitable, and divisive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the Whalen amendment, but if it fails I propose to offer another amendment tomorrow.

I would like to call the attention of the House to that amendment. It is on page 8785 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday.

This amendment of mine is a serious amendment which attempts to fix the manner in which draftees are used, because I think that is a very serious question. It would prohibit the President from using draftees or deploying them to a combat area unless the President had declared that an armed attack had been committed against the United States, or unless the President had declared an armed attack was imminent against the United States and he was going to mobilize the Armed Forces of this country; or that the Congress by a concurrent resolution had authorized the deployment of those troops to a combat area; or that the President had requested the Congress to declare war, but that the Congress had not done so, and he could use them then during the 30-day period; or that Congress had declared war; or that the draftee grants his consent to such deployment.

I think perhaps we are going to have to continue the draft, but for it to receive my vote it is going to have to be modified as I propose in my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I voted to terminate induction authority forthwith in the Harrington amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will also vote for the Whelan amendment to extend the draft only for a year. If that fails, I am going to support the committee bill.

I do think the President has indicated if he got all the pay he wanted, we could terminate the draft in about 2 years. We are giving him all the pay right now. We are not waiting for 2 years.

I tend to think that if the President thinks we can move to a volunteer force that we ought to have a little faith in that statement.

I think we can build a lot of unity in the country and show the kids that we really want to give them a little optimism and give them a little say and get them out of this rat race and show them that we do have some respect for some of their opinions.

I think we ought to support the Whelan amendment and take the risks, whatever they might be.

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, in the past session of Congress and again this year, I have joined in introducing legislation calling for the creation of an all-volunteer army. In both instances this legislation was based upon the report of the Gates Commission, named by President Nixon to make a study of the feasibility of switching the basis of our military manpower requirements from the present draft-supported system to an all-volunteer army.

The theme of that report was that the establishment of such an all-volunteer service could be achieved. It was the opinion of the Commission that this could be done without impairing this Nation's ability to meet existing and anticipated troop-level requirements. The Commission stated, as their studied belief, that such an all-volunteer army would not only be adequate to defend our country, but would be strong enough to repel any sudden surprise attack.

As we consider this proposed draft extension legislation, I believe we all must bear in mind that the draft, along with the Army, Navy, and Air Force are not ends in themselves. They exist only to defend this Nation. If we can achieve this defense need without the individual and social upset caused by the present draft system, then there is not only no longer a reason for its existence, but a social duty on our part to end it.

One of the key recommendations of the Gates Commission in achieving the end of the draft was to increase pay incentives for volunteers. I believe the members of the House Armed Services Committee deserve high praise for adopting in broad outline these pay incentive goals which the Commission felt necessary to realize an all-volunteer army.

Chronically underfunded and understaffed, the recruiting service of our Army has for years sat in the chimney corner as a poor stepsister of the draft. But during the past few months, more funds have been spent on recruiting, and for the first time in years I understand the number of Army recruiters is up to authorized strength.

Join then, this heightened recruitment activity of the Army, and the increase pay incentives contained in this bill, and I believe it is clear we are definitely on the road toward an all-volunteer army. The question then no longer is whether we will end the draft, but when and how.

Thirty years ago a national legislative battle was fought on this floor over extending the then relatively new draft. Draft extension at that time carried by a very narrow margin. My father, a leading noninterventionist and at that time the ranking Republican member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee was a leader in the fight against the proposed draft extension.

Those who at that time opposed extension of the draft saw such an extension as another step toward war. They feared an enlargement of the warmaking powers of the Executive. That debate was at a time when no American Armed Forces were engaged in hostilities anywhere in the world. Opposition to the draft was clearly an expression of no confidence in the policies of the administration then in power.

But those arguments of 30 years ago do not hold today. The present administration has reversed the course of years of U.S. deepening involvement in Vietnam. It has served notice that U.S. military strength around the world will be trimmed to more modest proportions. It is irrevocably committed to U.S. troop withdrawal from Southeast Asia and its commitment is underscored by results. One-quarter of a million servicemen have already been withdrawn from Vietnam within the last 2 years, and every indication is that this withdrawal process will be accelerated in the months ahead.

The present administration is on record as favoring the end of the draft. It is committed to working toward an all-volunteer army. The legislation before us today testifies to this commitment. These are policies and directions I favor and have confidence in.

The main question I have with this proposed draft extension legislation is, therefore, not its aim, but the time limit involved. It is clear we cannot simply abandon the draft in the vague hope that the goal of an all-volunteer army can be met. There must be a period of transition—a phasing out of one while we build the other. In this I feel the committee is absolutely correct. I for one have no de-

sire to dismantle our defense system, but a desire only to change its manpower recruitment methods.

Need we, therefore, make this a 2-year extension? Considering the Defense Department's heightened recruitment activity, backed with increased pay incentives, 64 percent of which will go to the critical area of men with less than 2 years' service, would it not be possible to achieve these goals in 12 months rather than 2 years? I feel it is.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Congress, by supporting a 1-year extension of the draft, will demonstrate its strong backing of the all-volunteer service. In effect Congress will be saying to the Defense Department, "Now is the time to get on with the job of building the Army with willing recruits, rather than unwilling draftees."

For, if there is one truth about men in general, it is that they tend to take the course of least resistance. This truism, I believe, will hold for our Defense Department, as it does to all other men. Give them 10 years to make a switch from the relatively easy draft system to the more complex recruitment system, and I am sure it will take the full 10 years. If we give them 2 years, then you may be assured, 2 years it will take.

But give them 1 year, and there seems a strong likelihood that as the war in Southeast Asia winds down, removing both the high induction needs and the present antimilitary attitudes motivating many of our young, we can achieve an all-volunteer army by increased recruitment in 1 rather than 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, for all these reasons I urge the adoption of the amendment calling for a 1-year extension of the draft. Adoption of this amendment will give clear expression of congressional support for a volunteer army recognizing the practical difficulties of an immediate transition from a draft-supported to a volunteer-supported manpower base.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MAZZOLI).

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Whalen amendment.

In yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 30, 1971, at page 8654 I inserted my remarks at that point which indicated my support of the extension for 1 year only of the power to induct young men into the military services.

I would like to base my brief remarks today on the idea that a 1-year extension of the draft means that every year the executive branch has to come to the legislative branch and ask for permission to implement its military manpower plans.

This, in my opinion, is fully in accord with the principle of the co-equality of the legislative branch of Government and the important duty the Congress has in the tripartite system of American government. We, as the Congress, should be willing to consider the question of the draft, and all such complex and emotional issues as they arise. This is our role and our function.

If at the end of one year there is no further need for the draft, we can then terminate it. If there is a need for continuing the draft, it can then be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER).

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio banks a great deal upon the infallibility of the Gates commission. It is a fine commission. It did a great job. But it is not infallible.

At page 994 of the hearings, Mr. Slatinshek, of our committee, questioned Dr. Oi, the expert of the Gates commission. Dr. Oi admitted in the record that there would be shortfalls in the immediate years ahead based upon their concept of an all-volunteer military service. In other words, an all-volunteer service would only be possible in 1 year if required force levels were revised downward.

Mr. Chairman, a selective service bill is not the proper vehicle for setting a force level. A selective service bill is only the mechanism for reaching a force level determined in other legislation. It is possible to amend an appropriation bill limiting forces to a certain level. There are other means which can be utilized. We should not take the roundabout route of limiting the mechanism by which we attain a force level.

Much has been said about limiting the draft extension to 1 year so that it will exert pressure against the Defense Department to make the volunteer concept work. What kind of pressure do they mean? Can the Defense Department go beyond the salary schedule established in this bill? Can it bring family housing up to adequate numbers within a single year? What can an administration do beyond what this bill authorizes it to do? The answer is nothing—nothing except to reduce force levels to meet what volunteer enlistments produce.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the exact opposite of bringing pressure to bear in favor of a volunteer army will be the result. You will be shooting the volunteer service down before it is even launched.

We want an all-volunteer military service. This bill launches us in that direction. I urge you, do not launch it as you would a crippled duck.

Almost 50 percent of all-voluntary enlistments today are draft motivated. If you take the draft away in 1 year voluntary enlistments will go down and we will probably not achieve the necessary force level by voluntary enlistments and this time next year we will be reconsidering the draft question. You wil' have shot the volunteer army down even before it had an opportunity to fly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNT yielded his time to Mr. GUBSER.)

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman. To repeat, most voluntary enlistments today are draft motivated. So at the very beginning of an all-volunteer military service, which we all want, you are going to take away that motivation and you are going to lessen the chances for having success within a year. You will be shooting it down. You will have launched a crippled duck.

DOD witnesses have testified before the Committee on Armed Services that limiting the induction authority to 1 year will adversely affect the ability of the Departments to maintain manpower strengths without increased draft calls.

For example, General Westmoreland stated:

> If the draft were extended for only one year, I think this would have a very adverse effect, because I think the young men of the country would get the impression that following this one year extension there would be no draft. There would be no pressure then brought to bear on the young men to join the military services.

Stated another way, existing pressures of the draft have motivated more than half of the so-called volunteers to enter military service. Any indication that this pressure would be eliminated will undoubtedly reduce voluntary manpower accessions and require increased draft calls. This would result in exactly the opposite of what we are trying to accomplish.

If the proposed pay increases are capable of attracting sufficient volunteers into the military departments to maintain manpower strengths, the question of extension of the induction authority becomes moot since the draft is utilized only after the military has been unable to meet manpower requirements through voluntary sources.

The President recommended the 2-year extension after the most searching study. If he can get to zero draft calls before the end of July 1, 1973, under the committee bill he is free to do so. Obviously he will do so if he possibly can since it would be the most politically attractive thing to do.

The committee made an equally searching inquiry and their vote against the 1-year extension was 30 to 9.

In order for the zero draft call of the President to work, three things are required: the large increases in compensation the committee voted; the substantial deployment of U.S. forces in Vietnam; and various improvements in military life, which the Pentagon has commenced. It will take more than a year to complete all of these actions and to be able to make a solid judgment on how they are working.

The failure to provide the President with this induction authority extension for 2 years presumes that the Congress would act expeditiously, only 6 months after the 1-year extension had been in effect. A period of 6 months is hardly sufficient time to establish whether or not the voluntary system and new incentives will provide the manpower required. You cannot revamp an entire system in 6 months.

Let us presume that we do have a 2-year extension and we do attract enough volunteers and we do get zero draft calls in 1 year. You will have achieved your objective. In the meantime, you have protected the security of this Nation with a standby Selective Service.

We can end the draft in a year if the all-volunteer concept works. If it does not work, what kind of position are we going to be in with respect to our worldwide commitments?

Setting a target date is not at all important. The important objective must be to make the volunteer concept work so that in 1 year we will have zero draft calls. You cannot do that, I submit,

by launching a crippled duck here today. That is exactly what the Whalen amendment will make of the volunteer concept.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HICKS).

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I supported the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) in the committee, and I support it now, for a little different reason. I supported it on the basis that we ought to have to consider this problem every year. The Defense Department ought to have to come before the Armed Services Committee and this House each year and justify the number of people they will need. I doubt seriously whether the draft will end in a year. It might end in 5 or 6 years. But we ought to give the volunteer army an opportunity to work. If it does not, they still should have to come before us, and as they justify any other item, they ought to come before us to justify the manpower they want year after year after year, and we ought to consider their needs, find out why they want the number of men they request, and let them have it if it is justified, and not let them have it if it is not justified. That is my reason for supporting the amendment to extend the draft authority for 1 year.

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

Mr. HICKS of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. Does the gentleman hear anybody suggest that we ought to have anything but a volunteer army in peacetime?

Mr. HICKS of Washington. No, I have not.

Mr. HANNA. In the thrust of the many positions that we have heard on the floor, is not the move to come to more of a peacetime position between now and the end of this Congress?

Mr. HICKS of Washington. I believe it is.

Mr. HANNA. Is it not clear and demonstrable that we should not have a draft for a peacetime Army?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI).

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Whalen amendment. But first I want to join in the accolades bestowed upon the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. Having worked closely with him for the past 8 years, I am most pleased that he has retained his warm sense of humor, his forthrightness, and his fairness. We of the loyal opposition know that he has the votes and he knows he has the votes. Nevertheless, proceedings within the Armed Services Committee have been conducted as never before resulting in more productive hearings with an opportunity for all viewpoints to be heard. The gentleman from Louisiana has my appreciation and deserves the respect of all Members of the House for the manner in which he has presided.

As a result, we have before us legislation which is the most far-reaching revision of the Selective Service Act since the inception of selective service. I am especially pleased that we finally have the opportunity to vote on the issue of student deferments. It has long been my contention that 90 percent of what is wrong with the draft lies in the inequities and frustrations created by the deferment of students. We have further provided for a national call of selectees; we have changed the laws with regard to the statute of limitations on the failure to register; we have tampered with the conscientious objector provisions of the law; we have provided for the greatest pay raise in the history of our Armed Forces; we have altered the provisions regarding nonresident aliens; we have established force levels; we have made other changes.

Moreover, the new Director of Selective Service, Dr. Curtis Tarr, who has been most impressive in the exercise of his responsibilities, has instituted numerous changes in the operations of the Selective Service. All of these changes, legislative and administrative, are being made at a time when our Nation is tormented by an involvement in a war beyond anything we have ever experienced, at a time when domestically we are involved in problems of student unrest, racial conflict, economic turmoil, unemployment, and inflation. In essence, these are volatile and rapidly changing times. At this time, it is impossible to predict the impact of these changes on the system. They may be salutary—they may be inappropriate. A year's experience will undoubtedly focus on additional problems which should be addressed. Congresss owes it to the citizenry to monitor as closely as possible the operations and performance of the Selective Service System. During periods of such profuse and profound uncertainty, it seems to me an abdication of responsibility to extend the draft for more than 1 year.

To those who would argue that a 1-year extension will complicate military planning, I can only respond by stating that the situation will be no different than it has been for the past year. I have heard no expression of concern that any problems were created for our planners. Why then the necessity for a 2-year extension?

A year from now we will be far more knowledgeable on the effects of our actions and we can continue what I consider to be the generally constructive efforts toward designing an equitable program for securing essential military manpower.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I favor a volunteer army. I support the committee bill as, on balance, being a substantial step in that direction. I reluctantly oppose the Whalen amendment, as being neither practical nor prudent under existing circumstances.

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

Mr. DENNIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG).

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think there is one thing that has not been pointed out. I serve on the Military Construction Subcommittee. We are trying to do something on family housing, which is critical to a volunteer army which we are all after. We have planned a strong increase in the program, but a year from now we cannot possibly have that family housing in place, so if we extend for only 1 year, we will not have any idea as to whether a young man who may have a family is going to be interested in volunteering and making a career out of the service.

This is why we should make it a 2-year extension, and by the end of that time, we will have a better idea. I am afraid a year from now everybody will throw up their hands and say the idea of the volunteer army has failed, and we will probably increase the draft rather than have it drop back then as we would like to have it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, the remarks made by some of my colleagues here would seem to indicate that the draft is in keeping with American tradition. In fact, the very opposite is true. In our history of 195 years we went without the draft for 160 years. In the 139 armed conflicts in which this Nation has engaged, we resorted to the draft in only five instances.

I was amazed to hear a few minutes ago the remark made by one of my colleagues that the military dictatorships in the world we see today constitute the best argument against a volunteer force. The fact is that Greece and Argentina, both of which have conscriptive forces, fell to military dictatorships in recent years, whereas Canada and Great Britain, both with all volunteer forces, have never had to deal with problems of a military coup.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN), which would have the effect of extending the draft for only 1 year, instead of for 2 years, as the committee bill provides.

I support the gentleman's amendment for the same reasons that I supported the earlier effort to end the draft this year: That is, that the draft is an unwarranted infringement on the personal liberty of our citizens, that it is inherently inequitable, and that it is a major source of division and friction in our country.

Moreover, there is no doubt that a 1-year extension of the draft, coupled with the pay raises in H.R. 6531, would permit the armed services to attract enough volunteers to meet even the high manpower requirements set forth by the Pentagon for 1972 and beyond.

What the committee has done, insofar as the compensation provisions of H.R. 6531 are concerned, is to combine the pay raises which the administration had in mind for this coming fiscal year and the following one. After a two-step pay raise, the administration felt, an entirely voluntary armed force would be feasible, and no further draft would be necessary.

But since 2 years of pay raises as envisioned by the administration have been

combined into one by the committee for an immediate raise in fiscal 1972, the administration's request for a 2-year draft extension is no longer necessary.

One year is sufficient. The manpower experts of the Gates Commission projected—and the Defense Department has not successfully refuted this projection—that 1 year after their projected pay raises were enacted, the draft would no longer be necessary.

Mr. Chairman, that is a compelling argument for the pending amendment. If a 2-year extension of the draft is not imperative, then it is imperative not to extend the draft for 2 years.

Almost 100 Members of the House have sponsored a bill, either my own bill or a similar one, to bring about an all-volunteer armed force as soon as practicable. Mr. Chairman, such a force is practicable with a 1-year extension of the draft and I urge my cosponsors and all of my colleagues to support the pending Whalen amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER).

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Whalen amendment, and I urge its adoption.

A 1-year extension of the draft is an expression of commitment on the part of the House to the existence of an all-volunteer military force. Further, Mr. Chairman, when this Congress or any Congress imposes the human tax which the draft really is, that Congress should be required to justify to itself the real necessity for the imposition of that human tax, and force itself to review the need for such a human tax each and every year the draft may be imposed.

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

Mr. BIESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to respond with four comments to the presentation made by the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER). First, with respect to the Gates Commission, we should recognize this was composed of outstanding citizens who studied many long hours. It came up with a finding that within 1 year it would be possible to have an all-volunteer service if adequate pay were provided.

Second, Dr. Oi's name and his testimony was mentioned by Mr. Gubser. It is very significant to note that Dr. Oi, in his presentation, mentioned that with an all-volunteer force we can get by with fewer military personnel than with the draft.

Third, I believe we have to recognize it is not possible to have an all-volunteer service without a statement of policy, without some kind of pressure, without an objective. My amendment would do that.

Fourth, we should remember that in terms of military personnel we are moving in two directions. We have the tools now, with the increased pay provided by this bill to attract volunteers at the same time while the President is reducing our forces.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I offered in the committee an amendment to extend the Draft Act for 4 years. My amendment was soundly defeated. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) offered his amendment. It was soundly defeated in the committee by a vote of 30 to 9.

After hearing the testimony, it seems to me the 2-year extension is really a good compromise, and I hope this committee will support this compromise of 2 years.

I might say that under the bill before us there are benefits, to attract the volunteers. If the volunteers come in then we will not have to call up the draftees.

Under the present act and also under the bill before us the Director has authority not to call any draftees if they are not needed. In 1970 in 2 months the Director of Selective Service did not call up any draftees.

Therefore, under this bill there is a built-in volunteer concept.

I urge you to defeat the amendment.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have supported the committee which deals with military affairs and the administration in each instance that I recall since coming to the House, and yet I am going to vote in favor of this amendment. I am going to do it because the people I represent—I believe the people throughout the country—are fed up with the conflict in Vietnam. They want it terminated at the earliest possible day.

I should like to take a second look at the draft law 1 year from now. I may well vote in favor of extending it for another year at that time, but circumstances can change. I would hope that they will change for the better between now and next year.

I do urge that this amendment be approved by the House.

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the draft as long as this Nation continues its involvement in Southeast Asia. After that issue is removed from this controversy, we should review the need for our military manpower needs.

In my judgment, the draft and the huge manpower pool which it generated have been substantially responsible for our deep and tragic involvement in Southeast Asia. If we are to get out, the termination of the draft becomes an integral and important step. I cannot support a draft which provides 14 percent of the strength of our Armed Forces and produces 33 percent of our casualties.

I will vote for a 1-year extension of the draft because it improves the 2-year proposal which might otherwise become law.

My basic objection to any extension of the draft will remain until we remove ourselves from Southeast Asia.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Whalen amendment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KEATING yielded the remainder of his time to Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, there are two points I would make very briefly.

One is I believe it ought to be understood by those who are concerned about the rate of volunteers, the latest analysis I have seen from the Department of Defense shows that 57.2 percent of those now going into the armed services are true volunteers who would not be forced to volunteer because their draft numbers are above the cutoff limit.

Second, again to get back to a point I tried to make earlier, let me quote from Secretary Kelley. At the time he testified before the distinguished committee he said in opposing the customary 4-year extension:

> The early attainment of (a) zero draft calls for maximum pressure on those of us who are responsible for implementation . . . and the administration should be obliged to report periodically to Congress on progress towards its attainment.

Given the pressure of competing programs, I submit that a 2-year extension would promote a "wait until next year" attitude, rather than the "maximum pressure" which Mr. Kelley has called for. The 1-year extension, however, provides a real incentive to establish a volunteer force—and it would leave Congress the option to extend the draft another year should unexpected circumstances warrant such action to maintain national security.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CEDERBERG and Mr. FINDLEY yielded their time to Mr. GERALD R. FORD.)

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, those people who supported a volunteer army are supporting this amendment, but others are, too. Those who support putting pressure on the administration to wind down the war more quickly are supporting it. Those who support the idea that Congress should review the draft more frequently are supporting it.

I would like to emphasize one other point.

The draft, of course, can be extended again, and it might be extended next year if we so desire, but we are living in a world of great uncertainty. The war is hopefully being wound down. We have a new look in the Army, and the pay is being increased. This year, in this kind of a transition period, in a world of uncertainty, something as important as the draft should be examined yearly.

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully. I have heard nothing that would indicate anything would be lost by limiting this to a 1-year extension.

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

In fact, I think there is much to be gained by it. I think it will put added incentive upon the military and upon the administration and upon the Congress to try to bring this draft to an end. In fact, it is my hope that we, this Congress, not another Congress, will be able to bring this draft to an end.

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, the principal point that needs to be restressed is that by a 1-year extension we do not foreclose the possibility of a further extension of the draft if it seems to be required for our national security. We are extending it by our votes in the next day or so, I presume, and yet the fact that it had to be extended was not seen as a great calamity even though it came in the year 1971. So to have the question of the draft come up again in 1972 will in no way undermine the security of this country nor threaten our legitimate commitments.

I am not particularly enthusiastic about a volunteer army, but I do not want to see the draft law extended until it is just and humane. Although I think the committee improved it this time, there are still serious problems existing.

I hope we can look at it again in a year and see how the world looks then and see if we are out of Vietnam and then make a judgment as to what the security requirements of our country will be.

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I support the Whalen amendment for a 1-year extension of the draft.

If we could have provided the same kind of authority like pay increases that is contained in this act last Congress so that the 1-year transition had been July 1, 1970, to July 1, 1971, we could have gone to an all voluntary military next fiscal year, but that is not the case. We need some time, but I think the military needs the pressure of only a 1-year extension.

I believe if we do find out by, say, March or April of next year that there needs to be a further extension, we can take action at that time. But it is my belief, from reading the Gates task force study, that a 1-year extension is adequate and that we can have a volunteer service operating without resorting to the draft by July 1, 1972.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the Committee on Armed Services for increasing the pay so that we can have more of an assurance that a voluntary military will be sufficiently operative.

I think we have reached the time to eliminate the draft and I think this is truly the American approach under which we have operated throughout most of our history. I think the country is ready for the Congress to suspend the draft by the middle of next year.

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, as Mr. WHALEN said a moment ago when he introduced his amendment, the important thing is that what we are now considering is really the Harrington amendment all over again in somewhat different form. And I think the same arguments apply against it as applied against the Harrington amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have gone a long step in the committee bill to get a volunteer army underway. But we have got to be allowed some time for these changes to take effect without at the same time risking our national security by abruptly terminating our existing procedures for recruiting the military manpower we need.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a good deal of plausibility to a 1-year extension. It sounds like a meaningful compromise. But let us not kid ourselves. Under the present bill the volunteer army will go into effect on the 1st of July. If we adopt the Whelan amendment, then by next January we are going to have to begin to decide whether that volunteer Army has worked. Mr. Chairman, six months will just not be enough time. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but we will be acting and deciding in an election year, and an election year, let us not forget, in which the 18-year-olds will be voting for the first time.

How much chance does anyone think there will be of getting another extension of the draft under those circumstances, even if the facts demonstrate overwhelmingly that we will need it for another year because the volunteer concept has not yet caught on?

So I am convinced the only wise thing to do is to provide in this bill the same kind of a 2-year extension that we have had so often in the past. This will provide us with a reasonable opportunity to test out the volunteer army theory, and then when the time comes to make our appraisal as to whether it has worked or not without being under the pressures and the heavy demands of an election year.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER) predicated his argument in favor of a 2-year extension of the draft, in part, upon our commitments abroad.

Mr. Chairman, the facts of life are not only committed around the world, but we are badly overcommitted.

The cold, hard facts of life are that it is not within the capacity of the people of the United States of America to police and bankroll the world. The sooner we realize this, the sooner we will get on our way to solving the real problems that confront us here at home.

Mr. Chairman, there is no reason at this time—no sound reason—for extending the draft for 2 years. There is absolutely no reason why we cannot review the situation next year.

I support the Whalen amendment for a 1-year extension and urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY).

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, there has been some mention as to remarks which were made by Secretary Kelley in his testimony before our committee. I am certain that no one intentionally misrepresented it, but allow me to read from page 44 of the hearings—and I am quoting exactly what Secretary Kelley said:

> To extend the draft for 1 year only would mislead our nation, and particularly our young people. It is exceedingly improbable that, given the present national security environment, the conversion from conscription to all-volunteer could be accomplished by July 1, 1972. A brief look at requirements for new enlisted personnel in fiscal year 1972 shows why.

Mr. Chairman, I did want to set the record straight as to exactly what Secretary Kelley said as to the matter of an all-volunteer Army. We certainly desire that.

I envision an all-volunteer army as one where the draft quota reaches zero. That is an all-volunteer army. That is our objective, and what we should be working for. I hope that time can be reached in 6 months, and it might be. I will say this: that a 2-year draft extension will be much nearer to realizing the objective.

I would hope that time could be reached in as little as 6 months. It may be that we can, but I must say in all candor and honesty that it does not seem likely, given our very real security requirements and the time necessary to make the prospect of an all-volunteer army attractive to the point where voluntary enlistments would enable us to meet those requirements.

I will say this: a 2-year draft extension will put us nearer to the goal of an all-volunteer army. We will always know that the draft is there, if we need it; draft calls can always be reduced to allow for increased enlistments, if these do come about.

We must have room to maneuver in this matter. A 2-year extension will give us that room, where a 6-month extension or a 1-year extension will not. Because, we will then know that the draft is still there if we need it, while we are reaching for an all-volunteer army rather than in 6 months, and a year extension, would be.

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

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN), in the committee, and I support it today. Four years ago we extended the draft for 4 years, and an effort was made to extend it for only 2 years, and every single argument that has been made against a 1-year extension today was made against a 2-year extension 4 years ago.

There is no reason on earth we should not be called upon to look at this next year, which does not mean that you might not have to extend it further, whether the all-volunteer army is working or not. I happen to think we will have to extend the draft next year. But, since we require the Department of Defense to rejustify their need for tanks, planes, and ships every single year, I frankly refuse to accept the proposition that a human being deserves less consideration than a tank does, or a plane does, or a ship does. I think, if we cannot stand up

to the 18-year-old vote on this issue next year, then this issue ought to be defeated.

I strongly support the Whalen amendment, and I hope it passes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have long been committed to and strongly favor an all-volunteer military force. I believe that circumstances are developing that would permit us to achieve that result. I think it is desirable. I think that it is practicable. This legislation helps significantly in achieving that result. This legislation, plus the reduction of our military commitment in Southeast Asia, this legislation with the new ceiling of 2½ million in the Armed Forces, this legislation with the extra pay incentive, will bring to us the ultimate objective which, in my opinion, is an all-volunteer military force.

Now, I do not quote this gentleman very often in debate, but I am impressed with what the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) said on page 67 in the committee report, so let me read it to you.

> On the other hand, by a very strong majority of the Committee, we accepted the entire pay package and basic allowance for quarters incentives originally tentatively suggested by the Administration for 1973. . . .
>
> In taking this action, the Committee has gone at least 80 percent of the way toward the stimulation of a volunteer force or zero draft calls. . . .

Let me make this observation, if I might:

For the life of me I do not understand why the people who want an all-volunteer army do not accept the best of two worlds, which is the committee's recommendation. They have the extra pay and fringe benefits, they have the lower troop ceiling, they have a reduction in our commitment in Vietnam. If we stay with the committee, and all of these things fit together, as I hope they will, at the end of 1 year you have what you want, which is an all-volunteer military and zero draft calls. And you have also some insurance if a crisis arises at some later date. I do not think we ought to gamble with the possibility of a crisis by weakening our military. Supposing we have a crisis in the Middle East, and we are at the tail end of this legislation with a 1-year extension?

Obviously, we will not be as strong as we ought to be to meet that kind of challenge.

But if you have a 2-year extension and you have achieved your volunteer army, you have the strength to meet that challenge. In addition, you will have acquired the capability in that 1 year of time to achieve what you want, which is an all-volunteer military organization. So you would have the best of two worlds.

If you have a 1-year extension, in effect, what you actually have is only a 6-month extension, because it does not go into effect until July 1 and Congress about a year from now will have to face up to the reality of what you are going to do about it in the future. So it will be a period of limbo. It just does not make sense to go to a 1-year extension when you can have the best of two worlds. With a 2-year extension, you can get a volunteer army, as I hope we will, and you have that insurance—the protection against a crisis which might arise anywhere in the world whether it is in Western Europe or in the Middle East or in Southeast Asia. We ought to have that insurance. We ought to protect ourselves against that kind of contingency which we all hope will not take place.

I believe the committee's recommendation is sound and that a 1-year extension is a serious gamble against the security of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT).

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, again I must say that there is but little more that can be added to the debate in which we have been engaged. Some of it has been redundant. But we come back to the same proposition.

Referring to what the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has just said—are we going to gamble with the future? We do not know what the two bodies of the Congress will do in a situation projected so far into the future. I can well understand those who say that they would prefer a 1-year extension. But the real key is, and the committee has always maintained, and I personally have maintained, that we do need an extension of the draft. That was spelled out here by an overwhelming vote less than an hour ago. This body determined that we do need an extension of the draft. Now the question resolves itself to how long we are going to extend the draft. Are we going to extend it for 1 year or for 2 years? In this context, for the benefit of those who want an all-volunteer army, you will get the volunteer army when we reach zero draft. So reversing the argument, or reversing the contention of those who say, "Let us take it for a year and then come back," I say: Take it for 2 years and you will have your volunteer army if you can accomplish it within 1 year. When you hit zero draft, then you have a volunteer army.

We could end the draft immediately if we had the volunteers.

I would remind all my friends concerning the review of strength: The existing law does not change and will not be changed by any action taken in this bill. We do review every year the needs, and the averages, and the strength ceiling of our military—we have to authorize it. This is the time we can do that.

Again I would suggest this. If we do have the 2-year extension and there is some flaw in the law, which may be, we could just as easily introduce the proper remedial legislation to correct that flaw much easier than we can enact an entirely new induction authority.

The committee has gone into this thing so deeply and thoroughly. The committee has ventilated this entire problem and the vote was 30 to 9 against the 1-year proposition and in favor of the 2-year proposition which again I point out to you has been asked for by the administration and the President himself. It has been asked for by the Secretary of Defense and the Department of Defense. It has been asked for by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other military advisers. It has been asked for by Mr. Kelley who is Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower. The committee has advocated it and I do hope that you will express your confidence here by extending the draft for 2 years instead of 1 year, because you have already made the decision to extend the draft.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the rejection of the Whelan amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support H.R. 6531 as it was reported from the committee on which I am a member.

Before explaining the reasons on which I predicate my support, I want to restate my approval and praise on the manner in which the hearings on this bill were conducted by the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT). Moreover, I want to compliment him on the manner in which he has handled the bill on the floor. Only late in the afternoon today when it was suggested there be a motion to limit debate the chairman of the committee replied that someone else would have to make the motion. He meant by this so far as he was concerned there would be free, untrammeled, and unlimited debate of every provision of H.R. 6531.

Now, Mr. Chairman, no one Member of this House can deny that there is any completely equitable manner in which 2 years of a young man's life must be devoted to service in the interest of his country's security. That is true no matter how compelling the reason or how noble the cause.

On the other hand our unpopular engagement in Southeast Asia has provided the means for many well-meaning persons to further cloud the considerations of Selective Service. But when all is said and done there remains a minimum need for manpower to afford an adequate national defense. This is the responsibility for all free Americans and even if the process may not be popular or may not be completely equitable it is incumbent that the needs of manpower must be filled if we are to have national security and thereby survive as a nation.

There were lengthy deliberations on H.R. 6531 in committee by the fifteen to twenty substantive changes that were made in the Selective Service Act. We considered the Gates Commission for an all-volunteer Army. Along with most members of the committee I could not be convinced this plan would satisfy the manpower needs of the armed services. Accordingly we did extend the draft for 2 years. We phased out undergraduate student deferments. We authorized the President to institute a uniform national call system. The bill we reported provides for a 3-year period of alternative service for conscientious objectors but it also provides the last year of the 3 years should be in lieu of the 6 years reserve duty for those who are drafted for 2 years. This seems to me to be eminently fair and not at all punitive. The doctors draft was continued and we provided

special pay for doctors, dentists, and veterinarians and for the first time special pay for optometrists.

The record will show I opposed the so-called Harrington amendment which would terminate induction on June 30, 1971. This of course was moving with too great of haste. Someone facetiously said, perhaps with some merit if we are going to terminate the draft in 3 months we just as well go ahead and make the new law retroactive and discharge those who had been inducted since January 1. This is because the gentleman by his amendment proposes to stop induction at the end of 3 months and we are now just at the end of the 3d month in this calendar year.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the so-called Whalen amendment to suspend inductions after June 30, 1972. If we are really interested in trying to attain a volunteer army then we should give this bill a chance to see if it will work.

I support the amendment which would prohibit the consolidation of local draft boards. We should continue these so each draftee can be given a fair hearing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I may find it impossible to be present during all the deliberations on some of the recorded teller votes on amendments which will be offered concerning pay proposals. I submit the committee has been fair. We have increased military pay by a total of $2.7 billion annually. No one can say that the committee acted to put any kind of a roadblock of any kind toward the attainment of a zero draft. I am not sure by what exact percentage we have increased military pay but I know now that the lowest grade will receive $268 a month the day he enters military service. I hope that this incentive will produce enough military manpower. Maybe it will not. It should be given a fair trial but certainly any less pay would result in fewer volunteers.

Mr. Chairman, the concern which I entertain is that if we increase military pay by the amount which we will by this bill and then it does not result in a sufficient incentive for enough volunteers to meet our manpower needs, then we can really be in deep and serious trouble. Why do I say this? Because there are so many in this country who want a volunteer army but also want to cut the overall defense budget. If we add $2.7 billion to our defense budget and it fails to produce a volunteer army then when we face an unforeseen national emergency and have no alternative but to draft numbers of our young men to meet our manpower needs there is virtually no way to go back to the old military pay scale that we have had in other national emergencies. Then with an emergency and with pay scales that will be approved by this legislation the total overall cost could be staggering.

But, Mr. Chairman, I intend to support H.R. 6531 to provide the opportunity to see if enough volunteers come forward with the new pay scale we have provided in this measure.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to focus on one particular aspect of this bill, the section dealing with increased pay for our military personnel. As you know, the House Armed Services Committee voted a 2-year $2.68 billion increase in military compensation effective immediately as compared to the administration's recommendation of phasing the increase over a 2-year period.

As a sponsor in committee of the amendment to have the immediate 2-year increase, I am especially pleased that we have an opportunity today to rectify two of the most glaring defects in the military pay system, the lack of decent standards of living for our enlisted men and the lack of incentive for our junior officers, our future military leaders, provided they remain in the service.

Presently, enlisted personnel in the E–1 grade, the lowest pay grade, with less than 2 years service receive in basic pay $143.70 per month or $3,245.88 annually if you include basic pay, subsistence, quarters, and Federal tax advantage. Even so, this works out to be less than the $1.60 Federal minimum wage for a 40-hour week for a year. Surely, our enlisted men deserve a better break than this.

Another way to look at this same problem is to consider the cost of 2 years of service to the individual. The Gates Commission study projected that the enlistee receives approximately 52 percent of what his civilian counterpart earns annually in private or public employment. This means, at the present time, the enlistee pays a tax in kind of approximately 48 percent. This in inequitable and must be corrected.

The bill as finally adopted by the committee means that the basic pay for enlistees and other enlisted personnel with ayes 197, noes 200, not voting 35, as creased by an average of 68.6 percent over current rates; in fact for the two lowest pay grades of E–1 and E–2 the bill with the amendment I offered in committee provides a basic pay increase of approximately 100 percent.

I would like to illustrate how the present bill compares with the Gates Commission recommendation embodied in H.R. 4450 which the committee considered also.

DISPOSABLE INCOME[1]

COMMITTEE BILL—H.R. 6531 COMPARISON WITH H.R. 4450—GATES COMMISSION

Pay grade and longevity	H.R. 6531	H.R. 4450
Married personnel:[2]		
O–2, under 2	$8,800	$8,940
O–1, under 2	7,614	8,034
E–5, under 2	6,100	5,780
E–4, under 2	5,737	5,364
E–3, under 2	5,344	4,847
E–2, under 2	5,050	4,693
E–1, under 2	4,760	4,512
Married personnel:[3]		
O–2, under 2	8,923	9,064
O–1, under 2	7,732	8,157
E–5, under 2	6,204	5,888
E–4, under 2	5,841	5,468
E–3, under 2	5,446	5,318
E–2, under 2	5,151	5,164
E–1, under 2	4,857	4,980
Single personnel:		
O–2, under 2	8,058	8,379
O–1, under 2	6,946	7,507
E–5, under 2	5,309	5,201
E–4, under 2	5,035	4,845
E–3, under 2	4,795	4,703
E–2, under 2	4,566	4,558
E–1, under 2	4,227	4,386

[1] Disposable income represents actual cash received after deduction of FICA and Federal income tax on basic pay.
[2] With 1 dependent.
[3] With 2 dependents.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to achieve a voluntary force through zero draft as the administration seeks we must give the President the tools he states he needs to achieve these goals. I am hopeful that the Committee's amendment will provide the wherewithal.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN). As you know, I testified at length during the Armed Services Committee hearings early this month on the voluntary military manpower procurement bill which I cosponsored. During the questioning which developed after my formal testimony, I felt very deeply that the members of the committee were sincerely committed to taking steps which could lead our Nation toward the goal of a volunteer army—a goal which President Nixon, the Department of Defense, the Gates Commission and millions of Americans, young and old, have held high among the priority reforms facing this Congress.

As coauthor of a book "How To End the Draft, the Case for an All-Volunteer Army," in 1967 with Mr. WHALEN and others in the Congress, I have been cognizant of the barriers to action on this concept to a greater degree than many Americans. I must say that the very substantial steps taken by the Armed Services Committee in reporting out H.R. 6531 have shown me the first real light of day, the first positive legislative sign that the Congress means business where a volunteer military is concerned.

I must begin by commending the members of the Armed Services Committee, as well as Selective Service Director Tarr and Assistant Secretary of Defense Roger Kelley for their leadership and foresight in fostering and supporting the pay raise provisions and other enlightened provisions of this bill.

I must also say that many Americans who are understandably anxious for progress in ending the draft, have overlooked the significance of the fact that this bill seeks an extension of induction authority for 2 years, not for the customary 4-year period. I think one of the most divisive forces among the young people of this country since 1967 has been the fact that despite significant administrative and some legislative reforms in the mechanisms of the draft, the 4-year extension of induction authority which was enacted in 1967 left no opportunity for a thorough review of our military manpower procurement policies until 1971.

I am proud to be able to say with some certainty that 1971 will not come and go without a major response from Congress to the need for revamping our priorities and our goals where military manpower is concerned. As a strong believer in our ability to attract an adequate force through voluntary enlistment, except perhaps during a very serious international emergency, I think that the pay provisions of this bill, which finally recognize the entitlement of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines to at least minimum wages, and to compensation more closely equivalent to civilian scales, will yield much larger numbers of enlistees from all walks of life.

Of course, I realize, as I pointed out in my testimony, and as is pointed out in our book and the Gates Commission report, that more than pay increases will be required to bring enlistments up to needed levels. Many internal reforms in the military services themselves are needed. Reforms that will offer greater training opportunities, greater challenge and utilization of the skills which volunteers have when they enter service, and most of all, reforms that will eliminate some of the "Mickey Mouse" which constantly badgers men in the lower ranks. I believe that if our servicemen are paid as men, and treated as men, they will serve, and willingly serve as men who stand in defense of their free nation.

It is these noneconomic reforms, Mr. Chairman, which will determine in the next several months the success or failure of the voluntary military concept. If these reforms come slowly or not at all, we will hear sounds from the Defense Department about the unworkability of a volunteer army. Those who oppose, as we all should, a merely mercenary armed force will rub their hands together with glee at the fact that the volunteer concept has not materialized.

I think that by enacting the basic provisions of H.R. 6531, Congress will have done its part in giving the volunteer military concept a chance to become a reality. But we cannot legislate morale and motivation to serve with money alone. We must recognize that to a very major extent, the success of our ability to reduce draft calls to zero will depend on reforms in the military which must go hand in hand with the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is the reason that I favor a 1-year extension of induction authority rather than a 2-year extension as provided in the language of the committee bill.

Since so much is riding on what the military itself can accomplish in the next 12 months to build up recruits, and because we are investing over $2 billion in this program, I believe Congress should reserve to itself the right to oversee the progress of the military manpower procurement program 12 months from now. I believe that a 1-year extension will provide the induction authority that is needed to maintain our force levels and our defense flexibility.

It is common knowledge that every other aspect of defense policy is religiously scrutinized by Congress each and every fiscal year. Military construction projects are authorized and funds appropriated annually. Weapon systems procurement is very closely watched, and is subject to change by congressional action on a yearly basis. Now that we have the President, the Defense Secretary, and a large portion of the Congress committed to a reduction of draft calls, and concerned about the undemocratic and undesirable aspects of a conscripted military force, I believe that manpower procurement should also be subject to yearly review. In this way, the military will know that their progress in making reforms, and in moving toward a volunteer concept will be very closely reviewed 1 year from now. A 1-year extension is an effective way to communicate to the executive branch that Congress has placed a high priority indeed on reducing draft calls to zero.

In advocating a 1-year rather than a 2-year extension, Mr. Chairman, I think certain misconceptions should be cleared up, if possible, before they are exaggerated. First, I do not favor a 1-year extension because of the opportunity it will offer for a referendum on the use of troops in Vietnam in 1972. I think that if the President comes back to us next year with a progress report on enlistments, and indicates that induction authority will be necessary for a further period, his request will be fully and fairly considered and acted upon in light of national security interests.

I do not think that a 1-year extension should be supported as any kind of an opportunity to tie the President's hands—nor do I think it will tie the President's hands—any more than they are tied by annual congressional review of military equipment procurement programs.

A number of persons have commented that a 1-year extension will serve as an inducement for registrants who may be drafted in the coming year to use legal and other extended delay tactics to postpone their induction beyond the period inductions are authorized under the extension. I think it would be a very serious mistake for anyone to adopt the view that if only a 1-year extension is passed, the likelihood is that the draft will end at the close of the 1 year. Certainly the continuation of registration and classification procedures, and the ability of the President to call on Congress to reinstitute induction authority for a further period, or during any emergency should indicate clearly that a 1-year extension does not mean an abandonment of the draft any more than a 2-year extension would imply that. The committee has not advocated and I do not advocate the institution of a volunteer military by ending the draft first and then gambling on the numbers of volunteers we can attract. The stated purpose is to responsibly build up the level of recruits through pay and other reforms, and gradually reduce draft calls to zero—all the time maintaining a force essential to our defense.

For reasons I have already stated, I think that a 1-year extension will add to and not detract from our flexibility. In my view, it is a responsible way to build in necessary oversight and review authority for the Congress over the very crucial subject of military manpower procurement. If this amendment is adopted, as I hope it will be, it should be viewed by the Congress, by the Executive and by the people in just that light.

It is in this context, Mr. Chairman, that I strongly urge the adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, the issue of whether or not to abolish the draft is a moot point. The President and most Members of Congress all along the political spectrum agree that the draft is inequitable, un-American, and outmoded. The issue now in question is when to abolish the draft. The bill before us asks for an extension of the President's authority to induct men into the Army until June of 1973.

No better authority than the President's own Commission, the Gates Commission has recommended that such Presidential authority be ended in June of this year. It further recommends that improved pay and conditions of service would attract a sufficient number of volunteers each year to maintain a stable force level of 2.5 million men. To maintain that volunteer force level, 325,000 men would have to enlist each year from the total of 1.5 million men who will anually turn 19 and who will also meet the military's enlistment requirements. In its report, the Commission noted that 250,000 "true volunteers" have already been enlisting annually within recent years despite the war and an entry pay roughly 60 percent lower than they could earn in civilian life. The Commission proposed a $2.7 billion basic pay increase to attract the remaining 75,000 men into the Armed Forces each year. And there is even some question as to the validity of maintaining a force as large as 2.6 million which the bill recommends. Representative HARRINGTON maintains in his views on the committee report that there is no evidence to prove that such a large force is necessary. If this is the case, then it should be even easier to maintain an adequate armed force through the volunteer system.

There are some who say it is too dangerous to begin the transition to an all-volunteer army while so many of our troops are still in Vietnam. However, there is no better time than the present.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, the debate underway on the extension of the Selective Service Act certainly is a discussion of one of the most significant issues to face us in the Congress this year.

It was my hope, shared by many other Members, that this year would see the enactment of meaningful draft reform. That is why I am so keenly disappointed with the legislation which has been brought to the floor of the House. It cannot be described as true reform.

My position on the subject of draft reform stems from two basic concerns which I, opposed to some of my colleagues, believe to be very closely tied.

First, it is my belief, the rights of the individual to be basic to the philosophy of which this Nation was founded, and it is my intent to do my best to promote and protect those rights. My second wish is to protect and further our national security, both internally and internationally. To some, these beliefs may seem contradictory, but let me remind you that this country is unique in that it is based on the rights of the individual to control his destiny. I realize that no individual has absolute freedom, but I do feel strongly that whatever protects the rights of individuals also protects the basic security of our Nation. It is because of these strong feelings that I have come to the conclusion that it is impossible to revise our present Selective Service System in such a way as to achieve the extent of freedom and reform which we must have. It is for this reason, that I cosponsored H.R. 4450, the Military Voluntary Manpower Procure-

ment Act of 1971. Careful and judicious study was not accorded this legislation. That it may be costly is undisputed. However, I am firmly convinced that the cost in terms of individual rights is far too great under our present draft laws. It is my deep conviction that H.R. 4450 should have been reported. New legislation should have been prepared to deal with military power procurement in the event of major wars. This legislation could have carefully specified that components of the various reserve organizations are to be fully utilized before any draft calls are issued. It should be noted that the bill which the House will consider will substantially increase the pay of Armed Forces personnel, bringing it almost to levels needed for an all-volunteer army. Having taken this action on the pay question, the committee should have completed its work and given the all-volunteer army proposal its approval. The present committee bill to extend the draft simply is not adequate and fails to meet the issues head on. I cannot support it.

There is one provision of H.R. 6531 that is of particular concern to me. It extends from 2 to 3 years the length of alternative civilian service time for conscientious objectors. This is a punitive provision and I strongly support efforts to delete it from the bill.

On October 18, 1968, President Nixon, while a candidate for the Presidency, said about the draft:

> I feel this way: a system of compulsory service that arbitrarily selects some and not others simply cannot be squared with our whole concept of liberty, justice, and equality under the law . . . The only way to stop the inequities is to stop using the system.

President Nixon's statement concisely states the case against the draft. The all-volunteer army proposals have not been seriously considered in committee. Unless the bill, H.R. 6531, to extend the draft is drastically amended on the floor of the House during this debate, I will vote no.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHALEN, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. BRAY, and Mr. LEGGETT.

The Committee divided.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair votes "aye" and sends his ballot to the tellers to be counted.

The tellers reported that there were—ayes 197, noes 200, not voting 35, as follows:

[Recorded Teller Vote No. 38]

AYES—197

Abourezk	Andrews, N. Dak.	Biaggi
Abzug	Archer	Biester
Adams	Ashley	Bingham
Addabbo	Aspin	Blanton
Albert	Badillo	Blatnik
Anderson, Calif.	Begich	Boland
Anderson, Tenn.	Bennett	Bolling
	Bergland	Brademas
		Brasco
Broomfield	Gude	O'Neill
Brown, Mich.	Halpern	Perkins
Burke, Mass.	Hamilton	Pettis
Burton	Hammer-schmidt	Pike
Caffery	Hanley	Podell
Carney	Hanna	Pryor, Ark.
Celler	Harrington	Pucinski
Clausen, Don H.	Harvey	Quie
Cleveland	Hastings	Rangel
Collins, Tex.	Hathaway	Rees
Conte	Hawkins	Reid, N.Y.
Conyers	Hays	Reuss
Corman	Hechler, W. Va.	Robison, N.Y.
Cotter	Heckler, Mass.	Roe
Coughlin	Helstoski	Roncalio
Crane	Hicks, Mass.	Rooney, Pa.
Culver	Hicks, Wash.	Rosenthal
Daniels, N.J.	Horton	Rousselot
Danielson	Howard	Roy
Dellenback	Hungate	Roybal
Dellums	Hutchinson	Ruppe
Denholm	Jacobs	Ryan
Dent	Karth	St Germain
Diggs	Kastenmeier	Sandman
Donohue	Keating	Sarbanes
Dow	Kyros	Scheuer
Drinan	Leggett	Schneebeli
Dulski	Link	Schwengel
Duncan	Lloyd	Scott
duPont	Long, Md.	Seiberling
Dwyer	McClory	Shipley
Eckhardt	McCloskey	Smith, Iowa
Edwards, Calif.	McCormack	Snyder
Eilberg	McDade	Stafford
Esch	McDonald, Mich.	Stanton, J. William
Evans, Colo.	McKay	Stanton, James V.
Fascell	McKinney	Steele
Fish	Madden	Steiger, Ariz.
Flynt	Mathis, Ga.	Steiger, Wis.
Foley	Matsunaga	Stokes
Ford, William D.	Mazzoli	Stuckey
Forsythe	Melcher	Symington
Fraser	Metcalfe	Thompson, N.J.
Frenzel	Mikva	Thone
Frey	Miller, Ohio	Tiernan
Fulton, Pa.	Minish	Udall
Fulton, Tenn.	Mink	Van Deerlin
Galifianakis	Mitchell	Vander Jagt
Gaydos	Monagan	Waldie
Giaimo	Moorhead	Whalen
Gibbons	Morse	Widnall
Goldwater	Mosher	Wilson, Charles H.
Gonzalez	Moss	Wolff
Grasso	Murphy, Ill.	Wydler
Gray	Nedzi	Yates
Green, Oreg.	Nelsen	Yatron
Griffiths	Nix	Zwach
Gross	Obey	
Grover	O'Hara	

NOES—200

Abbitt	Daniel, Va.	Ichord
Abernethy	Davis, Ga.	Johnson, Calif.
Alexander	Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.
Anderson, Ill.	de la Garza	Jonas
Andrews, Ala.	Delaney	Jones, Ala.
Ashbrook	Dennis	Jones, N.C.
Aspinall	Derwinski	Jones, Tenn.
Baker	Devine	Kazen
Baring	Dickinson	Kee
Belcher	Dingell	Keith
Bell	Dorn	Kemp
Betts	Downing	King
Bevill	Edmondson	Kluczynski
Blackburn	Edwards, Ala.	Kyl
Bow	Erlenborn	Landgrebe
Bray	Eshleman	Latta
Brinkley	Evins, Tenn.	Lennon
Brooks	Findley	Lent
Brotzman	Fisher	Lujan
Brown, Ohio	Flood	McCollister
Broyhill, N.C.	Flowers	McEwen
Broyhill, Va.	Ford, Gerald R.	McFall
Buchanan	Fountain	McKevitt
Burke, Fla.	Frelinghuysen	Macdonald, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.	Fuqua	Mahon
Burlison, Mo.	Gallagher	Mailliard
Byrnes, Wis.	Goodling	Mann
Byron	Griffin	Martin
Cabell	Gubser	Mathias, Calif.
Camp	Hagan	Mayne
Carter	Haley	Michel
Casey, Tex.	Hansen, Idaho	Miller, Calif.
Cederberg	Hansen, Wash.	Mills
Chamberlain	Hébert	Minshall
Chappell	Henderson	Mizell
Chisholm	Hillis	Mollohan
Clancy	Hogan	Montgomery
Clawson, Del	Holifield	Morgan
Collier	Hosmer	Murphy, N.Y.
Colmer	Hull	Myers
Conable	Hunt	Natcher
		Nichols
		O'Konski
		Passman
		Patman
		Patten
		Pelly
		Pepper
		Peyser
		Pickle
		Pirnie
		Poff
		Powell
		Preyer, N.C.
		Price, Ill.
		Price, Tex.
		Purcell
		Quillen
		Railsback
		Randall
		Rarick
		Reid, Ill.
		Rhodes
		Roberts
		Robinson, Va.
		Rogers
		Rooney, N.Y.
		Rostenkowski
		Runnels
		Ruth
		Satterfield
		Saylor
		Scherle
		Schmitz
		Sebelius
		Shoup
		Shriver
		Sikes
		Sisk
		Skubitz
		Slack
		Smith, Calif.
		Smith, N.Y.
		Spence
		Springer
		Staggers
		Steed
		Stephens
		Stratton
		Stubblefield
		Sullivan
		Talcott
		Taylor
		Teague, Calif.
		Teague, Tex.
		Terry
		Thompson, Ga.
		Thomson, Wis.
		Veysey
		Vigorito
		Waggonner
		Wampler
		Ware
		Watts
		Whalley
		White
		Whitehurst
		Wiggins
		Williams
		Wilson, Bob
		Winn
		Wright
		Wylie
		Wyman
		Young, Fla.
		Zablocki
		Zion

NOT VOTING—35

Annunzio	Garmatz	McMillan
Arends	Gettys	Meeds
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Poage
Boggs	Hall	Riegle
Byrne, Pa.	Harsha	Rodino
Carey, N.Y.	Jarman	Roush
Clark	Koch	Ullman
Clay	Kuykendall	Vanik
Collins, Ill.	Landrum	Whitten
Corbett	Long, La.	Wyatt
Dowdy	McClure	Young, Tex.
Edwards, La.	McCulloch	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6531) 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tonight it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask what is the request of the gentleman?

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tonight it meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. GROSS. Further reserving the right to object, is this the beginning of the T and T Club for this session of Congress and our boys will be back on Tuesday?

Mr. O'NEILL. We are hoping that there will be no T and T Club. I am sure you are aware of the fact that the leadership on both sides of the aisle have agreed after we come back and we have enough reports from the committees it is anticipated we will work 5 days 1 week and 4 days the next week. That is as soon as we have enough legislation reported by the various committees.

Mr. GROSS. But what is the necessity for coming in at 11 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. O'NEILL. There is a great possibility that if this bill is not completed by tomorrow, we may meet on Friday.

Mr. GROSS. That would be bad to meet on Friday?

Mr. O'NEILL. Well, we have informed the membership, I am sure you are aware, that the plans are when we have full reports from the committees and sufficient work, we are going into a 5-day week and a 4-day week on successive weeks, and we have more or less implied to the Congress that we would get through on Thursday until such time as after the vacation, anyway.

Mr. GROSS. But what happens to committee meetings on tomorrow morning and the completion of committee work which provides for the orderly process of getting bills to the floor of the House?

Mr. O'NEILL. All I can say with respect to that is that the leadership has spoken to the leadership on both sides of the aisle and they are in agreement.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO BE OFFERED BY MR. MIKVA TO H.R. 6531

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time in connection with an amendment which I shall offer on tomorrow to H.R. 6531.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to inform the House that I will offer the following amendment on tomorrow to that bill:

On page 19, line 23, after the figure "758,635," insert the following:

Provided, however, that on June 30, 1972, the total active duty personnel strength for all the services shall not exceed 2,350,000.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES-JAPAN COOPERATIVE MEDICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92–77)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to send to the Congress the fourth annual report of the United States-Japan Cooperative Medical Science Program.

This joint research effort in the medical sciences, undertaken in 1965 following a meeting between the Prime Minister of Japan and the President of the United States, remains focused upon widespread diseases of great concern in Asian nations: cholera, leprosy, malnutrition, parasitic diseases, tuberculosis, and certain viral diseases.

During 1970 the Cooperative Medical Science Program completed its fifth year of productive and successful biomedical research activity. A continuing review and careful selection of specific scientific objectives has been built into the Program's management to insure that they will continue to relate to disease problems in Asia.

It is obvious that the attack against these diseases is important to mankind not only in Asia, but in most regions of the world. In addition to this past year's medical research achievements, which are summarized within the enclosed report, this Program takes on additional significance because of the close cooperation between scientists in two leading nations, Japan and the United States. I look forward to strengthening further the valuable and productive relationships provided by this kind of cooperative international endeavor for the benefit of our fellow man, wherever he may chance or choose to live.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 31, 1971.*

ANNUAL REPORT ON RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92–27)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit to you the Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board for fiscal year 1970.

During that year retirement and survivor benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act totaled $1.6 billion and were paid to one million beneficiaries. Railroad unemployment and sickness insurance benefits amounted to $93 million and were paid to 170,000 claimants.

Legislation enacted during March 1970 provided for the establishment of the supplemental railroad retirement annuity program on a permanent basis with adequate financing. In August 1970, after the end of the fiscal year, legislation was enacted providing for 15-percent increases in railroad retirement annuities on a temporary basis pending a study of the railroad retirement system and its financing by a commission especially created for that purpose.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 31, 1971.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE ACT (H. DOC. NO. 92–78)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1970 the activities and accomplishments of the United States under the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 enhanced the peaceful use of outer space and fostered the spirit of international cooperation. The International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium has made significant progress in the establishment of a global satellite communications system and I take this opportunity to reaffirm the commitment of the United States to support the Consortium in this worthwhile commercial enterprise.

It is my pleasure to report to Congress, as required by section 404(a) of the Communications Satellite Act, on these activities and accomplishments.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 31, 1970.*

THE LATE MADISON FAY BOYCE

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Madison Fay Boyce was born April 29, 1913. He was 57 years old. He died of a heart attack while riding to work in a car driven by a neighbor, Mr. Temes, at 9:30 a.m. on March 30, 1971.

Madison served in the Navy during World War II and was honorably discharged on April 6, 1946.

Before he enlisted in the Navy, he worked as an accountant for a railroad in Vermont, the State where he was born, and after the war he worked in the Veterans' Administration. He started to work in the bill clerk's office at the House of Representatives in a low position on September 1, 1950. He rose to the position of chief bill clerk and was serving in that capacity when he died. He was a loyal and diligent employee and was popular with his fellow employees and all the

congressional Members who knew him. He served under the direction of the Parliamentarian of the House, the Honorable Lewis Deschler.

Madison married Margaret Holifield Wyche on January 9, 1950. His remaining relatives are one son, Madison L., and one daughter, Patricia. He is survived by one brother, Floyd, and his mother, O'Dessa Rogers Boyce.

In addition to his wife, Margaret, he is survived by a stepdaughter, Marwilda, and her daughter, Jeanine.

He was a member of the Kenneth H. Nash post No. 8 of the American Legion, the Loyal Order of Moose Lodge No. 1836, Suitland, Md. He was a charter member of the Benevolent Protective Order of Elks Lodge 2382, Front Royal, Va. He was a member of the First United Methodist Church in Pompano, Fla.

Madison's wife, Margaret, retired after 28 years of civilian service for the Department of the Army on January 11, 1970. The Boyces purchased a home for their retirement in Pompano Beach, Fla., and Madison had given notice of his retirement as of May 31, 1971.

Madison had a severe heart attack in April 1968. After 5 months of hospitalization and rest, he returned to his work as bill clerk.

The work in the bill clerk's office is important and demands meticulous attention. Every one of the many thousands of bills must be processed individually. Particularly does the work load increase in the first few months of a new Congress.

In the 91st Congress 23,575 bills and resolutions were introduced. The employees of this office work extra long hours during those months and the tension is high because each bill introduced must be carefully scrutinized for typographical and grammatical errors. There is little doubt that the tension and long hours of work contributed to Madison's last and fatal heart attack.

Some might say that a person should retire immediately after a severe heart attack, but such a statement is debatable. People do have heart attacks and they do live active and useful lives after severe heart attacks. Who can look into the future and make a decision to retire or continue working. The mystery of the diagnosis of heart condition remains unsolved. Its fatal results are visited alike on rich and poor, on those who can afford retirement and those who must continue working in order that they and their families may survive.

When we consider the tremendous number of deaths caused by heart diseases and cancer, the two great killers of our time, it should cause us more concern than it does.

When we consider the Federal expenditures in other fields, much of which seems necessary for our national survival in a dangerous and threatening world, we cannot help but wonder—my God in heaven—is it impossible for man to solve the problems between nations in order that we turn the billions we now spend in perfecting the machines of death toward the search for life. May God grant men throughout the world the will and the wisdom to solve the problem of war between nations so that we can turn our funds and our great scientific talents to the solution of those ills which beset mankind and which prematurely consigns millions to an untimely end of their life on earth.

Madison Fay Boyce, a faithful servant of the House, a dedicated patriot, a good husband and father, my sister's husband and a friend to all who knew him, is just one more casualty in the list of millions who have died because we do not understand the problem of heart disease.

We extend our love and sympathy to his family and those who loved him.

Friends may call to pay their respects to Mrs. Boyce and members of her family at Joseph Gawler's Sons, 5130 Wisconsin Avenue at Harrison Street NW., Wednesday, 7 to 9 p.m. and Thursday, 2 to 4 p.m. Services will be held at the same address Thursday, April 1, at 8 p.m. Interment will be made at Forest Lawn Cemetery, Pompano Beach, Fla.

LT. WILLIAM CALLEY

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Lt. William Calley has been tried, convicted, and is to be sentenced by a jury of his military peers for the crime of multiple murder.

I know not his guilt or innocence, for I know not the thoughts of his mind during those terrible minutes and hours in that little Vietnamese village on March 16, 1968.

However, I do feel that if he is guilty, then so is each of us in one way or the other. He alone should not suffer the penalties of an alleged moral wrong.

Lieutenant Calley's conviction and sentence will be appealed through the highest military tribunals and may well rest ultimately before the U.S. Supreme Court. This man's fate, in turn, may well be determined by the President of the United States, who has the power to commute and, or, pardon in cases of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, this is a small, dangerous world in which we live. Because of this, we must continually strive for truth and understanding. All too often we fail to recognize the truth and all too often we lack understanding.

For over a decade we, this Nation, have been engaged in a war in a foreign land, a war that has taken the God-given lives of almost 50,000 American men, perhaps hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese, both combatants and noncombatants. It is a war that has maimed over 250,000 of the God-given bodies of our men and countless numbers of our allies as well as enemies.

The blood of the cruel war lies on foreign soil, but the casualties are not limited to those who bravely served. Here at home, there are hundreds of thousands of minds being tortured as a result of this continuing conflict. There are the minds of the young and the old. There are the minds of the wives, parents, sons, daughters, and sweethearts of those who serve and have served; those who have returned scarred emotionally and physically; those who are prisoners of the enemy or missing; and those who have died.

Each of us shares this concern and certainly our Government officials, both appointed and elected, have a particular concern and responsibility.

Over and over again the question arises, "Why are we involved in Vietnam?" Over and over again the reasons are given, but less and less today do they seem to satisfy the ever-searching minds of a citizenry that has the heritage of a Nation founded and dedicated to the principles of enlightenment, truth, and understanding.

Somewhere, it appears we have let truth elude us, and because of this, understanding has escaped us.

This is a tragedy and Lieutenant Calley is a victim of this tragedy just as are those 22 Vietnamese civilians of whose murder he has been found guilty.

If this young man is guilty, then there is no gainsaying the fact. And yet, if he is guilty, then he is guilty of a crime that the average individual, were he given 10 lifetimes, in all probability never would have an opportunity to commit. If the guilt is his, it is not and cannot be his alone. It is a guilt which we all share, not because we willed these circumstances, but because we are human beings and therefore fallible.

I believe that Lieutenant Calley is entitled to every consideration and the benefit of every doubt in the days that lie ahead. He has been found guilty by his peers, but his conviction and the responsibility for it lie on my own conscience and in my own heart.

A PLEA TO RELEASE THE "PRISONERS OF WAR" IN THIS COUNTRY

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

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, I had the occasion today here in my Washington office, as I have had on a number of instances back home in my Chicago office, to meet with a particular group of earnestly dedicated civic-minded constituents of the First District of Illinois on a subject that could possibly be enlightening to some of us, but surely of significant interest to all of us. I would therefore like to share with my colleagues the appeal for help that was presented to me.

As it should be, there is great national concern for our prisoners of war in Southeast Asia and men missing in action, and I personally share that concern. The group that visited with me today expressed their concern about the plight of these men and the anguish being experienced by relatives and friends directly affected.

The appeal of the group that came to visit me today, however, was in behalf of another kind of "prisoner of war"; to wit, a monumental number of servicemen in this country who have been awarded

with less than honorable discharges from our Armed Forces and are hereafter sentenced to life punishment as a result of unfair disciplinary procedures that offer little or no hope of rehabilitation or recovery. The designation imposes a continuing penalty upon the serviceman returned to society under the stated conditions. It imposes an equivalent penalty upon society that must suffer the consequences that inevitably result from the inherent frustrations.

I say that this is a matter of interest to all of us because if not by reason of humanity or compassion, it would have to be by reason of fact that a consequential penalty has been imposed upon society in this particular frame of reference. I refer not to warranted bad or dishonorable discharges.

I have been impressed that there is an unbelievably large number of servicemen roaming the streets who are stigmatized by discharges under conditions less than honorable who have thereby been rendered helplessly incapable of adjustment and rehabilitation.

It has been indicated to me that an overwhelming majority of the men who are saddled with this undeserved type of discharge are men who have served in combat zones in Vietnam and after having rendered valiant service have been returned to society with proverbial millstones around their necks for the rest of their lives. It is for this reason that I have chosen to describe them to you as another kind of prisoner of war. As a matter of enlightened self interest, America is going to have to do something about the resulting situation.

Men who are discharged in the several categories under less than honorable conditions lose all of their veterans benefits and are handicapped in such a way as to be incapable of making a constructive contribution to society. Not only does he lose all veterans benefits, this is consequently true of his dependents and beneficiaries.

These losses, if I may remind us, significantly include loss of the opportunity for further education, and/or vocational rehabilitation under the GI Bill of Rights, Federal Civil Service preference, reemployment rights, GI Insurance, GI loans for homes, farms, and business, medical benefits, and the loss of bonuses that some States provide to veterans for time spent in Vietnam. He loses all these aids designed to help the returning soldier to more easily adjust to civilian life.

In addition to all these disadvantages, it is difficult if not impossible for a serviceman so categorized to find a job. And although it is alarming to assume that many of such men ultimately resort to a life of crime in order to survive, it has been indicated to me that there is evidence to substantiate that this is a valid assumption.

The visitors in my office today were official representatives of an organization based in my district in Chicago, called Concerned Veterans From Vietnam. This is a veterans service organization that is working in connection with other programs concentrating on finding jobs for veterans.

The commander of the organization, Barry P. Wright, and the organization's veterans affairs adviser, accompanied by three other members of the organization presented their appeal. Their team is here on a week-long lobbying campaign to get the Defense Department to end such administrative discharges and to grant amnesty for those now out of service who have been so afflicted; the commander, a Vietnam veteran himself, stated that there are more than 1,800 former servicemen in such classification. He said:

> We would like to see mobile review teams established to go to the major cities throughout the country to hold hearings on preannounced dates to review such cases. These former servicemen cannot afford the expense of coming to Washington to the Review Board and providing for their own legal counsel.
>
> Existing veterans organizations have not been able to provide adequate legal services for men discharged under less than honorable conditions. And in addition, it is difficult to establish the atmosphere of trust, confidence, and mutual understanding with organizations that are primarily geared to the interests of those with honorable discharges.

Commander Barry pointed out that "too many of the men who have this type of discharge are black men," and added:

> The possibility of a Black revolution in the United States depends greatly on whether or not all America will help to train and find jobs for our thousands of jobless veterans in the next decade. There will be over 1,000,000 Vietnam veterans returning looking for jobs. In referring to a Labor Department report showing that veterans applying for employment hit nearly two million in the last fiscal year, and that during that period over 430,000 Vietnam veterans filed claims for unemployment compensation. He pointed out that many of these men are Blacks—permanently stigmatized due to their undeserved "less than honorable" discharge classification that relegate them as a result to the status of public aid recipents.

He continued in his appeal, saying that:

> These men are going to have to be restored to a status in society that will permit them to function as responsible citizens or there's going to be a lot of trouble! They are the best trained killers in the world! These returning young men are not going to tolerate too long the kind of inherent abuse that awaits them, segregation and discrimination in particular, or status quo conditions that existed before they went into the military service.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling particular attention to this visit of these concerned constituents because America has a vested interest in their cause. America has a vested interest in any effort to channel the kind of explosive energies that Vietnam veterans will bring with them from the present war. The representatives of this organization will be here for the next several days to buttonhole Members of Congress and Pentagon officials to plead the cause of loyal American servicemen who wear a millstone around their neck as proverbial prisoners of war here in America, resulting from undeserved discharges under conditions less than honorable that prevent them from getting jobs and making the expected readjustment to civilian life. I believe those of us who are genuinely concerned will appreciate hearing about this worthy cause and will lend every possible support.

This situation can be remedied administratively by the Department of Defense. Commander Wright informs me that the Defense Department has not fulfilled a promise of 8 months ago to send a review team to Chicago to study the organization's voluminous files on less than honorable discharges. It is my hope that concerned Members of this body will contact the Department of Defense urging that all pertinent administrative action in this matter be taken without further delay.

HARRY WALKER ELECTED PRESIDENT OF STUDENT BODY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of satisfaction that I arise to call the attention of the House to what will seem to many a most extraordinary event—the election last week of a young black man as the president of the student body of the University of South Carolina.

I am personally gratified, as a native of South Carolina, by this encouraging indication of the changing attitudes in the State of my birth. Although I was born not far from the University of South Carolina—in Orangeburg—there was no chance that I would be able to attend the university. Indeed, the first black student was admitted to the University of South Carolina less than 10 years ago—in 1963.

Today, the university still has only 400 black students in a student body of 15,000—although black citizens constitute one-third of the State's population. Nevertheless, this predominantly white student body has chosen a black student to head its student government by an overwhelming vote.

This 21-year-old political science student, Harry Walker of Greenville, S.C., received more than 2,000 of the 3,900 votes cast to win without a runoff—a first for the university's student presidential elections. His nearest competitor in the field of four candidates received 807 votes.

Harry Walker's election is not, however, as extraordinary as it may seem. The young people of the Nation are not as hung up on race as their parents. They are more open, readier to accept other people for what they are rather than what they may look like. They are our hope for the future.

We hear concern expressed about the youth revolution as if it were destroying the fabric of our society. I do not believe it is. Our young people are overthrowing some of our ancient prejudices and mores; but they are putting together what it is most important that we put together—people.

This was Harry Walker's campaign theme: "Let's Put It All Together."

I had the privilege of meeting this fine young man here in Washington yesterday, and I was very impressed by his sincerity and his confidence in the youth of South Carolina. He said:

If I can do no more than instill a sense of unity on the campus, this will be more important than anything else. This is the main thing we are after.

And the student body responded.

I am sure my colleagues from South Carolina are proud of the young men and women at their university. And I am too.

ANOTHER MEASLES EPIDEMIC—YET NO ACTION BY HEW

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago we were talking of eliminating measles in the United States. We had, at that time, developed an effective vaccine and had in progress a program of immunization which had sharply reduced this disease to a level of near extinction.

But now, just 2 years after arriving on the brink of eliminating measles, we find that in many areas of the United States there are epidemics of measles and indeed we are now seeing an increase of more than 200 percent over the epidemiological year of 1970.

We have on good authority that there are between 16,000 and 20,000 cases per week of the common measles. Statistically, we see that from this figure there will result between 16 and 20 cases of encephalitis per week, one child will be mentally retarded each day of the week and there will be two deaths per week.

The picture in the areas of other such communicable diseases as polio and diphtheria are just as grim. Last year there were 28 cases of polio. This year we may have as many as 100. Diphtheria is up about 200 percent over last year. In Texas alone there have been 61 cases since the President signed the Communicable Disease Act into law last year.

As the sponsor of this act, I am concerned over the lack of enthusiasm which the administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have shown over the plight of young people susceptible to these diseases which can maim and kill.

There are very few ills which man has found a preventive cure for. Measles, polio, and diphtheria are three. Yet the President has not asked for any funds to implement the Communicable Disease Act for fiscal 1972 in spite of the fact that the Congress authorized $90 million. This lack of compassion is heightened by the fact that the administration last year failed to fund the program as the Congress had authorized.

For the fiscal year 1971, the Congress passed legislation calling for $75 million, but after HEW testified that it did not recommend this funding, we saw the authorized figure of $75 million reduced to a mere $2 million. As yet, even this figure has not been released by the Office of Management and Budget.

I would at this time like to insert in the RECORD an article from the March 19, 1971, issue of the Medical World News concerning the very imminent problem of an epidemic in America.

I would add that I feel it very unusual for an administration which has gone on record as recognizing a health crisis should balk at implementing a program which could surely curtail a very real crisis in the area of communicable disease.

The article follows:

EPIDEMICS AHEAD?

MEASLES IS OUT OF CONTROL AND IMMUNIZATION LEVELS LOW IN POLIO AND DIPHTHERIA, EXPERT WARNS

Seven-plus years after the Vaccination Assistance Act started the U.S. on a national program to eradicate polio, diphtheria, rubeola and other communicable diseases, the immunization goal may be slipping beyond grasp. Experts who a few years ago were talking confidently of eradication are now pinning their hopes on better control methods—and crossing their fingers at that.

Large segments of the population remain unimmunized, jeopardizing the herd immunity goal. Either epidemics of eradicable disease have occurred—diphtheria is a case in point (MWN, June 26, '70)—or else there have been threats of an epidemic, as with polio.

Worst of all is measles, says Dr. John J. Witte, chief of the immunization branch of the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta. Speaking at the Eighth Annual Immunization Conference in Kansas City, Dr. Witte said: "Today, measles is out of control."

Measles incidence fell dramatically after mass immunization campaigns were launched in 1966. Cases numbered 62,000 in the 1966–1967 epidemiologic year (roughly October to October) and kept falling. Yet in the winter of 1969, 16,000 were hit by the disease as compared with 7,500 the previous winter. And for the 1970–1971 year, the total may reach 70,000 cases, far above 1969–1970's total of 44,701. In some areas, the rise has been manifold (see pages following page 54 in most MWN editions). Between last October and this January 11,299 cases turned up—46% over the same period last year and 176% over the 1968–1969 figures. Says Dr. Witte: "We're back where we started five years ago. I'm ashamed of the way we've neglected measles."

Since measles encephalitis occurs in about one case per thousand measles cases, and permanent diability occurs in about one out of three encephalitis cases, this epidemic year could see 2,500 children condemned to handicaps ranging from mental retardation—requiring permanent institutional care—to learning disabilities. The failure is not in the vaccine but in delivering it to the needy, says Dr. Witte. Asked Dr. William Schaffner II, assistant professor of medicine at Vanderbilt University, "How good is the vaccine?" Answering his own question, he said, "It's no damn good in the vial."

Turning to diphtheria, Dr. Witte noted that last year's 500 cases are double the 241 reported in 1969 and the highest incidence in the past eight years. There were outbreaks in six states. And, warned Dr. Witte, "unless we improve our preschool vaccination efforts, we can expect epidemics of polio again." He added: "The time for complacency has run out. We must face up to some difficult professional challenges. We need to find the funds to purchase vaccines, the personnel to plan and administer programs, the methods to get at hard-to-reach groups."

The experts noted that DPT vaccine costs 3 cents a dose and every health department should be able to afford the cost. And another warning: "Prior to the diphtheria epidemic in San Antonio, Tex., immunization levels of schoolchildren and preschoolers there didn't differ significantly from national averages from urban areas. What happened in San Antonio could have occurred in a score of other cities."

And polio immunization levels are declining, too. In 1966, 79% of children aged one to four were adequately immunized. Last year, the figure was less than 66%. Dr. Witte is particularly worried about poverty areas of cities. "Some are ripe for a polio epidemic," he declared.

"This 66% figure may represent the national average, but let's not forget that there are pockets of susceptible individuals around the country where levels are much lower."

MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, one of the major achievements in the area of commerce occurred last year when the House passed, and the President signed into law, H.R. 15424 (Public Law 91–469), the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

This new law signaled the revitalization of our national maritime program, which had been floundering for over 10 years. If the Government had continued with the old maritime programs, we would have seen our 223 flag vessels, those contemporary cargo vessels involved in foreign trade, drop to 203 by 1908. We would also have seen an estimated loss of 10,000 seafaring jobs by that time.

However, under this new program we can expect the number of U.S.-flag vessels involved in foreign trade to have increased to 344 by the end of that time. Mr. Speaker, I am sure this is a goal all of us want to see achieved.

Yesterday the House granted rules on two pieces of legislation that are vital to the success of this program: H.R. 5352 and H.R. 4724. The first bill requests an $80,000,000 increase in authorized appropriations. This bill is the result of an Executive communication, No. 334 of February 25 of this year, by the Secretary of Commerce requesting funds for the operating-differential subsidy program for fiscal year 1971, for obligations incurred. The amount of $39,700,000 would be expended for the quarterly payment of 100 percent wage subsidy and 90 percent for all other subsidies. This was authorized in Public Law 91–469. The remainder of the funds, $40,300,000, would go toward payment of debts under the subsidy program dating as far back as 1962.

The second bill, H.R. 4724, is the maritime authorization bill of 1972. This legislation authorizes second-year appropriations for the administration's maritime program of $507,650,000. These funds are to be disbursed as follows:

First. Acquisition, construction, and reconstruction of vessels—$229 687,000;

Second. Operation subsidies—$239,145,000;

Third. Research and development—$25,000,000;

Fourth. Reserve fleet expenses, such as the fleet in the James River—$318,000;

Fifth. Merchant Marine Academy—$7,300,000;

Sixth. State marine schools—$2,200,000.

Mr. Speaker, these are extremely important pieces of legislation, and I certainly hope that the House gives them rapid and favorable consideration.

FEED GRAIN PAYMENTS TO PRODUCERS OF SUGAR BEETS

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee, by the very narrow margin of 7 to 6, voted to report H.R. 5981, a bill which will authorize feed grain payments to producers of sugar beets. Heretofore, our farm commodity programs have been used to encourage farmers already producing a certain crop to cut back on their production in order to avoid ruinous surpluses. But under this unwise bill, the Federal Government would for the first time pay farmers not to produce crops which they were not producing in the first place. Sugar beet farmers who have never grown corn will be paid not to grow corn. I respectfully invite all Members to read the minority views signed by eight members of the Agriculture Committee, the letter to all Members sent by Congressmen MILLER, KYL, FINDLEY, and myself on March 27 and the articles which appeared in the Washington Post on March 29 and 31. I include these items at this point in the RECORD:

AUTHORIZING FEED GRAIN BASES IN LIEU OF SUGAR BEET PROPORTIONATE SHARES

REPORT

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 5981) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish feed grain bases, wheat domestic allotments, and upland cotton base acreage allotments for certain growers of sugar beets, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "bases" strike out the comma and the remainder of the line and such portion of line 7 through the word "allotments";

On page 1, line 10, strike out the words "on or after January 1, 1970," and substitute the words "after December 31, 1969,";

On page 2, line 2, strike out the period after the word "beets" and insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no feed grain base shall be established for any number of acres in excess of the number of acres which were planted to sugar beets during the 1959–60 feed grain base period.";

On page 2, line 2, strike out the comma after the word "base" and the remainder of the line and all of line 3; and

Amend the title to read as follows: "To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish feed grain bases for certain growers of sugar beets."

Purpose

For several years sugar beet factories operating at Chaska, Minn., West Jordan, Utah, and Hardin, Mont., have provided facilities for the processing of sugar beets grown in these respective areas. However, due to no fault of the beet growers, these plants have ceased to operate, leaving the growers of sugar beets without a market for their product.

The Department of Agriculture has estimated that no more than 60,000 acres will be involved, but the acreage could be less than this amount. The Department states there are approximately 30,000 acres of sugar beets grown for processing at the Chaska, Minn., plant; 17,700 acres of harvested beets at the Hardin, Mont., plant; and some 13,000 acres grown for processing at the West Jordan, Utah, plant. However, the Department feels that some 9,000 of the 13,000 acres that are processed at West Jordan will be processed at another sugar beet factory, leaving a ballance of only 4,000 acres that would have no processing plant available.

The committee does not feel that this legislation will adversely affect the feed grain program. For 1971 there are approximately 113.4 million feed grain base acres in the Nation. Thus the maximum 60,000 acres involved in this legislation represent only a small fraction of the national base.

The following table shows State and National feed grain bases for 1971:

National feed grain bases, 1971

State:	*All farms*
Alabama	2,179,816
Arizona	193,668
Arkansas	590,342
California	445,878
Colorado	1,689,378
Connecticut	30,232
Delaware	161,939
Florida	680,424
Georgia	3,082,358
Idaho	81,493
Illinois	10,901,836
Indiana	5,648,229
Iowa	13,581,123
Kansas	8,658,280
Kentucky	1,990,746
Louisiana	497,232
Maine	9,194
Maryland	518,674
Massachusetts	20,318
Michigan	2,183,103
Minnesota	7,471,995
Mississippi	1,453,732
Missouri	5,529,148
Montana	136,827
Nebraska	9,480,477
Nevada	5,429
New Hampshire	9,009
New Jersey	153,755
New Mexico	702,331
New York	698,176
North Carolina	2,173,856
North Dakota	1,515,632
Ohio	3,891,946
Oklahoma	2,159,245
Oregon	51,897
Pennsylvania	1,278,237
Rhode Island	3,251
South Carolina	997,026
South Dakota	5,102,258
Tennessee	1,688,137
Texas	11,564,384
Utah	50,312
Vermont	46,370
Virginia	787,866
Washington	92,822
West Virginia	106,831
Wisconsin	3,028,546
Wyoming	72,642
Total	113,396,400

Source: USDA, ASCS, March 18, 1971.

Need for the legislation

In order to provide sugar beet growers in Montana, Minnesota, Utah, and Wyoming the opportunity to grow an alternative commodity and continue their farming operation, it is important that H.R. 5981, as amended, be passed. Without this bill it is believed that the sugar beet producers would suffer extreme hardship because of the loss of their sugar beet market.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish feed grain bases for sugar beet producers who formerly processed their beets at a processing plant which has ceased operations after December 31, 1969. It would further provide that the establishment of such feed grain base be conditional upon the production of the commodity on the base. In establishing these feed grain bases the Secretary would be precluded from awarding any farm a feed grain base larger than the number of acres on that farm devoted to sugar beets in 1959–60. It also is the intent of the committee that there be no dual benefits awarded to eligible farmers. It is expected that such a farm would not continue sugar beet production with respect to the number of acres for which he receives a feed grain base under this legislation.

The feed grain base acreage established under the bill would remain in effect for subsequent years. This would mean, of course, that the State and National totals would be increased by the amount of the new bases. Subject to the terms and conditions determined appropriate by the Secretary under this legislation, all other provisions of the existing feed grain program, such as for example, payment limitations, the allocation of new farm bases, and history, set-aside, and planting requirements would remain in effect.

Committee amendments

The bill (H.R. 5981) as introduced would have authorized the Secretary of Agriculture "to establish feed grain bases, wheat domestic allotments, and upland cotton base acreage allotments for the purposes of the Agricultural Act of 1970 with respect to producers of sugar beets who formerly processed their sugar beets at a processing plant which has ceased operations on or after January 1, 1970."

However, in the case of wheat, to the extent these farms were granted new wheat allotments, the Department stated they would be forced to overissue wheat marketing certificates. For the following years, since the total amount of certificates issued is specifically set by law, the new allotment acres would have to be taken into account and the "old" wheat allotment farms would receive a reduction in wheat allotments and lose marketing certificates.

In the case of cotton, the allotment formula set forth in the legislation would require that farms granted allotments under this bill share in the allotment in subsequent years, thereby reducing the allotment and set-aside payment on old cotton farms to the extent new farm allotments were issued. As cotton cannot be grown in the areas affected by this bill, it is not at issue.

In view of the situation regarding wheat and cotton, the Department recommended that these two commodities be stricken from the bill. The committee, accordingly, has followed the recommendations of the Department.

The committee adopted another amendment supported by the Department to limit the size of farm feed grain bases allocated under this legislation to the number of acres planted to sugar beets in 1959–60.

The committee also adopted technical amendments in regard to the effective date for eligibility and revision of the bill's title.

Cost

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the cost of this legislation for the current and next 5 fiscal years is as follows:

The Department testified that if new feed grain bases are established for 60,000 acres formerly in sugar beets, the additional set-aside payments on this new base acreage would amount to approximately $700,000 maximum in fiscal year 1972. Of the 60,000 acres established, 12,000 acres could be set aside at a cost of approximately $58 per acre per year.

The committee concurs in the Depart-

ment's estimate for fiscal year 1972 and does not anticipate any additional costs beyond $700,000 annually during any of the subsequent 4 fiscal years 1973–76. No specific 5-year cost estimate was submitted by the Department.

Hearings

Hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains on March 11 and 17, 1971, and this bill was favorably reported to the full committee on March 17, 1971 by a vote of 11 yeas and 2 nays. The full committee ordered H.R. 5981 reported to the House on March 22, 1971, by a 17 to 5 division vote.

Departmental position

The position of the Department of Agriculture is set out in the following letters, dated March 17, 1971, by Clarence D. Palmby, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and March 19, 1971, by Carroll G. Brunthaver, Acting Administrator, ASCS:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1971.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of March 11 for a report on H.R. 5981, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish feed grain bases, wheat domestic allotments, and upland cotton base acreage allotments for certain growers of sugar beets.

The Department favors the enactment of this legislation with amendments.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish feed grain bases, wheat domestic allotments, and upland cotton base acreage allotments for producers of sugar beets who formerly processed their sugar beets at a processing plant which has ceased operations on or after January 1, 1970. It would further provide that the establishment of such feed grain base, wheat allotment, or cotton allotment be conditional upon the production of the commodity on the base or allotment.

Current legislation authorizes the withholding of some base acreage and allotment in reserve for new farms. However, for the 1971 feed grain, wheat, or cotton program there is not sufficient reserve acreage in the affected States to provide the increases that could be required to implement H.R. 5981. Hence, any new base acreage or allotments assigned to farms under this bill would represent an increase beyond the allotment or base already announced for 1971.

In the case of feed grains any new farm base acreages established would stay in effect for subsequent years. Hence, the State and National totals would be increased by the amount of the new bases. In the case of wheat in the 1971 program, to the extent that these farms were granted new wheat allotments, we would be forced to overissue wheat marketing certificates. However, for subsequent years, since the total amount of certificates issued is specifically set by law the new allotment acres would have to be taken into account and the "old" wheat allotment farms would receive a reduction in wheat allotment and hence marketing certificates. Similarly, in the case of cotton, the allotment formula prescribed in the legislation would require that farms granted allotments under this bill share in the allotment in subsequent years, thereby reducing the allotment and set-aside payment on "old" cotton farms to the extent that new farm allotments are issued under the authority in this bill. The Department, therefore, recommends the deletion of the wheat and cotton provisions of this bill.

Information presently available to the Department indicates that 60,000 to 75,000 acres of land devoted to sugar beets in 1970 might be affected by the provisions in this bill.

If new feed grain bases are established for 60,000 acres formerly in sugar beets, the additional set-aside payments on this new base acreage would amount to approximately $700,000 in fiscal year 1972. Of the 60,000 acres established, 12,000 acres would be diverted at a cost of $58 per acre.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE D. PALMBY,
Assistant Secretary.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1971.

Hon. WILEY MAYNE,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MAYNE: This is in response to your request for the Department's opinion on your proposed amendment to H.R. 5981. The amendment provides "that no feed grain base shall be established for any acres which were not planted to sugar beets during the 1959–60 feed grain base period."

The Department supports this amendment as it can be implemented on a farmer certification basis.

Sincerely,

CARROLL G. BRUNTHAVER,
Acting Administrator.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H.R. 5981

We oppose H.R. 5981 because it conflicts with basic purposes of the Agricultural Act of 1970.

This bill would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to create additional feed grain base acres for allocation to sugar beet farmers who no longer have a market for sugar beets in their area. This is special legislation designed to give preferential treatment to a privileged few.

A central purpose of the Agricultural Act of 1970 and its predecessors has been to aid farmers who voluntarily agree to idle a portion of their land in order to avoid disastrous surpluses. It has never previously been the intent of Congress to pay farmers not to produce crops which they had not been producing prior to passage of the legislation. Clearly this will be the result if H.R. 5981 becomes law.

The bill gives no relief whatever to those most entitled to it, the many thousands of established feed grain producers who have long been denied fair and adequate feed grain bases under existing legislation. Their difficulties go back to the Feed Grain Act of 1961 which arbitrarily allocated a feed grain base to every farm equal to the average acreage devoted to corn and grain sorghums on that farm during the crops years of 1959 and 1960. Farmers would receive loans and direct payments if they voluntarily agreed to divert from production a portion of their feed grain base. The larger the feed grain base, the larger the direct payment.

Ever since its adoption in 1961, the 1959-60 historic base period has unfairly discriminated against producers caught with an abnormally small acreage of feed grain during that period. Special victims have been those farmers who were following recommended conservation parctices by rotating corn or sorghum acres to close cover crops during the years 1959–60. Feed grain producers whose only offense was that they tried to cooperate with Government recommended soil and water conservation programs have been unfairly penalized ever since. Saddled with smaller feed grain bases than neighbors who happened to have many acres in feed grains in 1959–60, these farmers have been denied participation in the program to the extent to which they were fairly entitled throughout 10 years of administration of the 1961 and 1965 acts. It is too early to know whether the corrective mechanism which the 1970 act provides for upward adjustment of such bases will actually be administered to end these inequities, which we must therefore assume will continue. If H.R. 5981 becomes law, feed grain farmers hurt by too rigid application of the base period will not only receive smaller payments than their grain producing neighbors, but may also receive smaller feed grain payments than sugar beet farmers being invited into the feed grain program by this special relief measure.

Information was developed at the hearing before the Livestock and Grain Subcommittee that thousands of feed grain farmers have been waiting in line many years for the assignment of additional base acres. It was estimated, for example, that from 7,000 to 10,000 Iowa farmers annually file individual appeals for more base acres with county ASCS offices in that State alone. These appeals have been largely unavailing because the Department has heretofore refused to increase the size of the national feed grain base. H.R. 5981 will subject such applicants in every feed grain-producing State to further inequity and discrimination by moving a newly created special class of sugar beet producers to the head of the line in which many of them have been waiting for 10 long years.

The sugar beet farmers for whom this program is designed do not need congressional approval to plant corn or other feed grains. They may presently devote their entire farms to feed grain production if they so desire. The sole purpose of H.R. 5981 is to make them eligible for direct payments and loan benefit provisions under the feed grain program. Beet farmers who previously were not producing corn will now be allocated feed grain bases and paid not to produce corn. We resist this unwarranted twisting of the purpose and function of the feed grain program.

We point also to the increased cost which H.R. 5981 will add to the program. The Associate Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service testified that the additional payments on the new base acreage created by this legislation will cost the Government approximately $700,000 in fiscal year 1972. There is no assurance this will not increase substantially if additional sugar beet processing plants cease operations in the future.

It is an unwieldy distortion of the feed grain program established by the 1970 act to make it the vehicle for the relief of the sugar beet producers who will benefit from this bill. This is true a fortior' when the Sugar Act of 1948 is available and can r adily be adapted to render them more appropriate assistance. The Sugar Act already provides that when there is a natural disaster, eligible growers will receive "abandonment" or "deficiency" payments to compensate them for their loss or reduction of sugar beet production.

Thus, it would be more logical to examine the possibility of extending to the victims of an economic disaster (such as the closing of a sugar beet processing facility) the same or similar benefits that are now conferred in the event of natural disaster.

In brief it makes no sense to use appropriations intended for the feed grain program for the relief of the relatively small number of beet producers who will come within the provisions of H.R. 5981. It would be just as logical to use appropriations from the wool program, the cotton program, the wheat program, or the space program for that purpose.

What possible commonsense can there be in conferring payments on a select few

farmers for not growing (i.e. setting aside) corn upon acreage where no corn has ever been grown?

This most certainly is a mischievous precedent that will haunt the farm program and the Congress for years to come.

CHARLES M. TEAGUE.
GEORGE A. GOODLING.
CLARENCE E. MILLER.
ROBERT B. MATHIAS.
WILEY MAYNE.
ROBERT D. PRICE.
PAUL FINDLEY.
JOHN KYL.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 27, 1971.

Re H.R. 5981, feed grain bases for sugarbeets.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The above bill scheduled for floor action on Monday (subject to a rule being granted) unfairly discriminates against feed grain farmers. It diverts funds intended for proper administration of the feed grain program to beet sugar producers, paying them not to grow corn upon acres where no corn has ever been grown. Relief for beet producers should be accomplished by amending the Sugar Act and not by raiding the feed grain program.

For many years, thousands of feed grain farmers have been trying unsuccessfully to enlarge their base acres in every grain producing state. Their applications have been denied because the Department of Agriculture has heretofore refused to increase the national base. H.R. 5981 would increase the national feed grain base but give the additional base acres created not to lifelong feed grain farmers, but to producers of sugar beets. This makes a mockery of the feed grain program and establishes a precedent which jeopardizes its very existence. It would be just as logical to use appropriations from the wool program, the cotton program, or even the space program for this purpose.

The beet farmers involved are already free to start planting corn or sorghum on beet acres without restriction and need no further legislative authority to do so. But Congress should not thru H.R. 5981 authorize their being paid not to plant crops which they have not previously grown.

We urge you to read the minority views of 8 members of the Agriculture Committee and to be on the floor when the bill is reached possibly as early as Monday.

CLARENCE MILLER.
JOHN KYL.
WILEY MAYNE.
PAUL FINDLEY.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 29, 1971]

GRAIN SUBSIDY IS SOUGHT FOR BEET GROWERS

(By George Lardner Jr.)

The House Agriculture Committee is seeking quick passage of legislation that would give feed-grain subsidies of $700,000 a year to sugar beet growers who have never grown feed grains.

A similar bill was whisked through the Senate Thursday on voice vote. Critics call it a blatant special-interest measure "designed to give preferential treatment to a privileged few."

The proposal, endorsed by the Agriculture Department, would provide government relief for sugar beet growers left without markets when processing plants in Hardin, Mont.; Chaska, Minn., and West Jordan, Utah, were shut down.

In reporting out the bill Thursday, a House Agriculture Committee majority defended the subsidies as justified since the processing plants were closed "due to no fault of the beet growers." The bill would affect an estimated 60,000 acres.

Eight committee members submitted a minority report attacking the measure as "a mischievous precedent that will haunt the farm program and the Congress for years to come."

The payments would be made to the sugar beet growers for not growing feed grains, such as corn, on their old sugar-beet acreage.

"It has never previously been the intent of Congress to pay farmers not to produce crops which they had not been producing prior to the passage of the legislation," the minority protested. "It would be just as logical to use appropriations from the wool program, the cotton program, the wheat program or the space program . . ."

In fact, as originally proposed by Reps. John Melcher (D-Mont.) and John M. Zwach (R-Minn.), the House bill would have given the sugar beet growers a crack at cotton and wheat subsidies as well. The Senate-passed bill gives them a choice of not growing feed grains or not growing wheat.

The House Agriculture Committee, however, decided to limit the measure to feed grain subsidies. "Cotton," the committee observed, "cannot be grown in the areas affected by the bill" and in the case of wheat, it said, old wheat farms would have to take a cut in their allotments.

Corn-belt congressmen such as Rep. Wiley Mayne (R-Iowa), one of the dissenters, contend that there is similarly no excuse for dipping into the feed grain program. The minority maintains that any relief ought to be sought under the sugar program, which Congress is expected to revise later this year.

The bill is scheduled to go before the House Rules Committee this morning with floor action scheduled later in the day unless opponents can win a delay.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 31, 1971]

BEET AID PASSED BY RULES UNIT

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

A controversial bill opening up feed-grain subsidies to sugar beet growers squeaked through the House Rules Committee yesterday by a vote of 7 to 6.

The measure was cleared for forthcoming floor debate after stiff opposition at a two-hour hearing. Several members voiced doubt that it would survive. Rep. Delbert Latta (R-Ohio) said he feared it would heap "criticism and ridicule" on the government's entire farm program.

Sponsored by Reps. John Melcher (D-Mont.) and John M. Zwach (R-Minn.), the bill would provide an estimated maximum of $700,000 a year for about 300 sugar beet growers in Montana, Wyoming, Utah and Minnesota who were left without a market when nearby processing plants were shut down.

The farmers would have to start growing corn on portions of their old sugar beet acreage, but the subsidies would be paid them for not growing corn on other sections of the land. Many of them have never grown corn anyway.

In defense of the bill, Rep. Thomas Foley (D-Wash.) said it was "designed admittedly to take care of an emergency situation." The growers face an April 9 deadline for signing up under the feed grain program.

"In other words, it's a food stamp program for the producers," Rep. Ray J. Madden (D-Ind.) said disapprovingly. "They're not in much more trouble than some of these people thrown out of work on account of unemployment."

Rep. Dave Martin (R-Neb.) said he considered the bill unfair to feed grain producers who have been trying unsuccessfully for years to get bigger acreage allotments for themselves.

Zwach, a corn farmer himself, maintained that the relief measure would have little impact on the huge feed grain program, but Corn Belt congressmen such as Iowa Republicans Wiley Mayne and John Kyl denounced it.

"If sugar beets can raid the feed grain program, why not other crops?" Mayne said. "This bill gives (the growers) federal payments for not doing something they weren't doing in the first place."

FATE OF AMERICAN PRISONERS NOW BEING HELD BY THE NORTH VIETNAMESE AND THE VIETCONG

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

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern in this country over the status and eventual fate of the American prisoners now being held by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong. As of today, some American men have been held as prisoners of war for 7 years and 5 days. This is an intolerable situation, not only for the men and their families but for the Nation as a whole.

Public opinion in the United States is constantly showing its concern over these men and their families; they are in our thoughts and our prayers; but the question persists—how long can this go on? Are not these men and their families paying a much higher price than the rest of us who are growing weary of the Vietnam war? Are not they being used by the enemy as pawns in a political game?

I devoutly hope that everything possible will be done to return these men to their families just as soon as possible. In the meantime, I feel that our Government should impress upon the enemy in the strongest terms possible that we expect the prisoners to be treated in a manner in accord with the Geneva Convention. The uncertainty with which these Americans have been confronted for so many years should be cleared up without further delay.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH PRESUMPTIONS FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would provide statutory presumption of service-connected death for all war veterans who die after 20 or more years consecutive rating as totally disabled for service-connected reasons.

The bill would authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to make payments of dependency and indemnity compensation to the dependents of a veteran who had been rated permanently and totally disabled from a service-connected disability and who dies of any condition other than misconduct.

Under current law, death compensation or DIC is provided to a veteran's dependents if he dies in service. It is also provided where a death is the result of a service-connected disability or where the service-connected disability materially contributed to the cause of

death. No consideration is given in these determinations to the fact that severe chronic disabilities materially shorten life expectancy. Nor is consideration given to the fact that a veteran rated permanently and totally disabled for many years places a severe economic factor on his dependents due to his reduced earning capacity.

The approval of this bill will eliminate these inequities.

The content of the bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 410(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) When any veteran dies after December 31, 1956, from service-connected or compensable disability, or was in receipt of or entitled to receive compensation at time of death for a service-connected disability permanently and totally disabling for twenty or more years, the Administrator shall pay dependency and indemnity compensation to his widow, children, and parents. The standards and criteria for determining whether or not a disability is service-connected shall be those applicable under chapter 11 of this title."

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT ON BEHALF OF OUR COUNTRY AND LIEUTENANT CALLEY

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, chaotic emotions and feelings continue to run high in my Capital City District.

There have been public demonstrations to dramatize mounting public sentiment against the Lieutenant Calley conviction. Local draft boards have been implored to resign. Veteran groups are organizing to fight for Calley's freedom.

My district office phones have been jammed for 2 days and enraged constituents even call me long distance at my home to express their personal resentment.

The people in my district are not buying Lieutenant Calley's verdict. They do not want arguments—they want action. They want Calley exonerated. They want him free.

I have written the President of the United States imploring him to use his office to grant an Executive pardon as soon as possible.

I ask that the text of my letter to President Nixon and the noble and unselfish statement of Lieutenant Calley—symbol of the American soldier in combat—to his convictors, which in my opinion exemplifies the highest military tradition and honor—placing country above self—follow.

March 31, 1971.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States of America, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I feel it is my responsibility to report to you that without exception every one of the many constituents from the Sixth District of Louisiana contacting me are outraged at the conviction of Lieutenant Calley. They are most vocal and adamant in demanding his immediate freedom.

I implore you to exercise the authority of your office as Commander in Chief of the U.S. military forces to relieve the chaotic state by granting an immediate executive pardon to Lieutenant Calley.

The feeling of my constituents seems consistent—they are not interested in facts, figures, arguments, or rhetoric. They understand only that a dedicated young American Army officer has been convicted of murder growing out of combat operations in wartime. And they want him free!

Mr. President, my people have enough POWs in North Vietnam. They are not going to accept Lieutenant Calley being held as a POW in the United States.

Mr. President, you and you alone have the power to stop this national indignation. Your prompt and early action in this matter is absolutely necessary to restore public confidence in their leader, save any spark of patriotism, and to halt the further demoralization of our military forces.

Very truly yours,

JOHN R. RARICK,
Member of Congress.

CALLEY PLEA: "I HAD TO VALUE THE LIVES OF MY TROOPS"

(FT. BENNING, GA., March 30.—Following is the text of the statement by Lt. William L. Calley, Jr., to the court-martial jury considering his sentence for murder at Mylai.)

Let me know if you can't hear me, sir. Your honor, court members, I asked Judge Latimer and my other attorneys not to go on in mitigation in this case.

There's a lot of things, that really aren't appropriate and I don't think it matters what type of individual I am.

And I'm not going to stand here and plead for my life and my freedom.

But I would like you to ask—ask you to consider the thousand more lives that are going to be lost in Southeast Asia, the thousands more to be imprisoned not only here in the United States but in North Vietnam and in hospitals all over the world as amputees.

I've never known a soldier, nor did I ever myself, ever wantonly kill a human being in my entire life.

If I have committed a crime, the only crime that I have committed is in judgment of my values. Apparently I valued my troops' lives more than I did that of the enemy—when my troops were getting massacred and mauled by an enemy I couldn't see, I couldn't feel and I couldn't touch—that nobody in the military system ever described as anything other than as communism.

They didn't give it a race. They didn't give it a sex. They didn't give it an age. They never let me believe it was just a philosophy in a man's mind. That was my enemy out there.

And when it came between me and that enemy, I had to value the lives of my troops and I feel that is the only crime I have committed.

Yesterday, you stripped me of all my honor: Please, by your actions that you take here today, don't strip future soldiers of their honor. I beg of you.

NATIONAL FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I feel it appropriate to recognize today an organization of young people who believe that social change is best achieved through constructive personal involvement in community action.

It is with this positive attitude that 600,000 young people have designated March 28 through April 3 as National Future Homemakers of America Week. The president of FHA has expressed a desire to make this week "a showcase for what 600,000 teenagers are doing to find solutions to some of the problems confronting today's society in preparation for a better future." These young people have chosen "FHA Cares" as the theme for their national week of observance. FHA's record confirms that assertion.

FHA is justly proud of the part its 12,054 local chapters have played in community tutoring programs for underprivileged children, especially children of migrant workers, nutrition education projects, consumer services, and in the general enhancement of homemaking education.

A number of FHA members have written me letters recently urging me to support continued funding for the consumer and homemaking education sections of the vocational education amendments to Public Law 90–576.

The adequate funding of homemaking education is important to these young people, and, as one FHA member points out:

In a time when the dollar buys less, it would seem that our decision-makers would make every effort to educate our youth to the wise use of this commodity.

I think this statement typifies the attitude of responsible concern that guides this organization.

I feel fortunate that this organization has 75,000 members in the State of Texas and 1,500 members in San Antonio, and hope that I will someday have the opportunity to personally assist them in one of their community action endeavors.

FHA's view that the strengthening of our basic social unit—the family—in turn strengthens and enriches American society is a concept that has lately lost its much-deserved prominence. We are lucky to have a national organization dedicated to perpetuating that concept.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, before another week goes by, I want to remind the House that it still has in social security a matter of unfinished business before it. With the signing into law of the 10-percent social security increase on March 17, this House did not finish its business or fulfill its obligations to the senior citizens of this Nation. This group still looks to us to finish our business. By giving an individual in his old age $70 a month to live on, this Government has hardly gone far enough in its responsibility to the elderly. Much as I disliked delaying immediate action on the social security increase, I must confess I was reluctant to go along with the amendment to the debt increase earlier this month providing for the 10 percent social security increase because I was afraid that it would be regarded as the culmination of a long struggle and Members would begin to turn their attention

to other pressing matters, feeling that they had taken care of the needs of the elderly. If the past is anything to go by, we might expect that it will be at least another session or another Congress before something further is done to increase the benefits under the social security system. The fact of the matter is that when the base payments are as low as they are, a 10-percent increase does not that measureably improve the lot of the recipients. Ten percent of $64 a month is still only $6.40—or $70 total to live on. There is still a need for further action by this Congress this session in social security. There are still opportunities for this Congress to do something further in this area.

With this aim in mind, I am announcing today, therefore, that I plan to reintroduce H.R. 1239 in the near future and am currently putting together a "Dear Colleague" letter wherein I will solicit the support of each and every Member for H.R. 1239.

What would H.R. 1239 accomplish? It would do something significant by providing a 50-percent across-the-board increase in benefits and at the same time would raise the amount of outside earnings which a beneficiary may have without suffering deductions from his benefits. In other words, H.R. 1239 would raise the benefits 50 percent and permit outside earnings to reach $3,000. While I confess even this does not go far enough, at least it would be a significant improvement in the lot of the social security recipient. It would also contribute to an improvement in the economy in this current period of deep recession. What better way can the Federal Government increase public expenditure than by directing needed money to this neglected group in our society? The day is long past when a senior citizen or anyone in our society could live on $70 minimum a month. It is time to be realistic where our senior citizens are concerned. It is time to look realistically at subsistence level estimates of the Department of Labor.

One of the best features of my bill is that this will not lead to a material increase in the social security tax because my plan calls for a redistribution of the costs of this increase. I propose that instead of the cost being split 50–50 between employer-employee that the Government step in and take over one-third of the cost out of general revenue, leaving employers and employees with one-third each. Why do I bring Federal funds into the picture. Because I am convinced that the social security system is actually defraying costs which would otherwise have to be met out of general revenue. It is relieving the burdens of old-age assistance and aid to the disabled, expenses which were not originally intended to be born fully by the trust fund. In providing for the Federal Government to assume one-third of the cost of this increase, I am simply asking the Government to pay its fair share.

In closing, I simply want to repeat that our work is not finished as far as the elderly are concerned. Much remains to be done. The 10-percent increase just passed is but a first step in the right direction. Now it is time for us to really get down to serious business and face up to what it really costs to get along today.

LT. WILLIAM CALLEY CONVICTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, Lieutenant Calley has been convicted by a military jury of premeditated murder of 22 persons in My Lai, mostly women and children. No one, Mr. Speaker, can condone the international killing of women and children. But, there must be something wrong with a system of justice which allows one man to stand trial because he is a career officer, and at the same time allow others, who perhaps participated in the same incident, to go free because they just happen to have been discharged before the indictment. There must be something wrong with a system that allows Lieutenant Calley's superior officers to avoid prosecution. If one is guilty of following orders, then those who gave the orders must be equally guilty. What is a soldier to do in the future when he disagrees with an order? Should he ignore it at his peril or should he carry it out and risk prosecution?

The Calley case will go down in history as the prime example of an attempt to find a scapegoat.

The trial will also be historical in that it will no doubt bring about a much needed revision of the law.

In the meantime, because Lieutenant Calley was a product of the system, because others with him will never be tried, and because his superior officers are apparently not to be held responsible, I believe Lieutenant Calley should be freed.

AMERICA'S GREAT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

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. There have been 17 modern Olympic games since 1896. The United States has won the competition 14 times.

RELEASE OF VIETNAMESE PRISONERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today 60 of my colleagues are joining me in introducing a resolution calling for the unconditional release of 1,600 North Vietnamese prisoners of war held in South Vietnam, equaling the number of Americans now listed as missing in action or held prisoner.

Those to be repatriated should be selected at random without regard to age or physical condition. All should be released simultaneously from the same location on the demilitarized zone at the conclusion of a ceremony during which officials of allied governments would issue a supply of rations to each prisoner released and make an appropriate public appeal to Hanoi, the National Liberation Front, and the Pathet Lao for similar humane treatment of American prisoners. The POW's would then be permitted to proceed on foot toward North Vietnam. All procedures would be planned and carried out under the supervision of the International Red Cross.

The occasion would unquestionably capture the imagination of the world. The ceremony and release would receive widespread attention through television, radio, and press coverage. For the first time, the world would be able to comprehend the number of U.S. persons now missing in action in Vietnam as well as the enormity of Hanoi's violation of the Geneva Convention on prisoners of war. Each enemy POW released would recognize, as would the entire world, that his newly gained freedom symbolized the uncertain fate of one American presently held prisoner or missing in action.

This humanitarian gesture at the DMZ would dramatize as no other way possibly could the treatment of POW's by the allies as contrasted with that of the North Vietnamese, the Vietcong, and the Pathet Lao.

This proposal has recently gained the enthusiastic support of Col. Frank Borman, President Nixon's Special Representative for Prisoners of War. Testifying before the National Security Policy Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Colonel Borman called it "a most significant proposal," and said he would "urge that this be accomplished with the maximum haste." Colonel Borman added:

> I think that the time has come to act on this proposal.

Another witness, Col. Norris Overly, who was held prisoner by the North Vietnamese, called the proposal a "tremendous idea" and told the subcommittee, "our only real weapon is world opinion."

The only risk involved is the possibility that the repatriated men might soon be back under arms against us. That, of course, is the same risk which President Nixon wisely undertook when he offered to release all of the prisoners held by the allies if the enemy would release those in their custody. Obviously, such risk in the proposal embodied in this resolution would be much smaller, and also less than the risk surrounding the valiant attempt on November 21, 1970, to rescue American prisoners held near Hanoi.

Against this modest risk can be measured these possibilities for gain:

First. The release might cause Hanoi to respond in kind. If Hanoi should release a few, we could wisely release some more.

Second. At the very minimum the release would stir world opinion—all to our advantage. The release would show, as could nothing else, the gulf in human compassion between us and the enemy.

It would show the contrast in treatment of POW's.

Third. The release would focus worldwide attention directly on the enemy's illegal and unconscionable treatment of POW's, an issue which evidently causes them their greatest difficulty in international relations, and which, according to Colonel Overly, has prompted Hanoi to release some information about those missing and permit some flow of mail.

Fourth. The released men might return home as ambassadors of goodwill. The reports they would make might help to correct propaganda-bred misapprehensions. Even if returned to arms, which seems most unlikely, they could hardly be unaffected by the humanitarian treatment they had received.

Fifth. It would do much to inspire the American people at a moment when inspiration is greatly needed. The release undoubtedly would be without precedent, the most compassionate act ever committed by any nation, large or small, in time of war. The impact of this vast drama—1,600 men turned free and returned to their homeland and their families—would touch every American's deepest emotions, not to mention its impact abroad.

Since the first American pilot was captured in August of 1964, no issue has so stirred American public sentiment as has the undetermined fate of our POW's. The unmerciful anguish to families and loved ones which this causes is an outrage to all humanity. Many do not know whether their husbands or son is alive, yet each clings to the tiny thread of hope that he will one day be returned safely.

Just how elusive and frustrating this hope can be was recently demonstrated when the North Vietnamese released a film clip containing the pictures of over 60 prisoners of war. It has not been possible to positively 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. Such inhuman disregard for the sensibilities of these families can only be described as sadism.

Short of outright release, nothing would be more welcome to the families of those men who are listed as missing in action than a confirmation of their status as either prisoner, dead, or unknown. It would end the agonizing uncertainty which now plagues their everyday existence.

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. The proposal we are making today would lift the spirits and hopes of men held captive, their families—in fact, all people of compassion. It would reaffirm in an effective, dramatic way our country's willingness to assume risk in order to promote the safety and freedom of our men in captivity.

Text of resolution and list of cosponsors follows:

H. CON. RES. 247

Whereas, 1,600 American servicemen are held prisoners-of-war, or are missing in action in Indochina; and

Whereas, North Vietnam, the National Liberation Front and the Pathet Lao continue to violate the standards set forth in the Geneva Convention which require humane, decent treatment of prisoners-of-war; and

Whereas, every opportunity should be pursued which will focus attention on the plight of these American servicemen and the anguish suffered by their families and friends, and bring to bear against North Vietnam the force of world opinion in behalf of humane policies; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that,

It is the sense of the Congress that allied authorities should:

(1) Arrange the immediate unconditional release of 1,600 North Vietnamese prisoners-of-war now held in South Vietnam, equaling the number of Americans now listed as missing in action or imprisoned in Southeast Asia.

(2) Effect the release of all such prisoners simultaneously from the same location on the demilitarized zone at the conclusion of a ceremony during which officials of allied governments would issue a supply of rations to each prisoner released and make an appropriate public appeal to North Vietnamese, National Liberation Front, and Pathet Lao leaders for similar humane treatment of prisoners they hold. Prisoners would then be permitted to proceed on foot toward North Vietnam.

(3) Plan and carry out all procedures under the close supervision of the International Red Cross, and take special precautions to prohibit forced repatriation.

LIST OF COSPONSORS

John B. Anderson (R–Ill), Mark Andrews (R–ND), Bill Archer (R–Tex), Walter S. Baring (D–Nev), Mario Biaggi (D–NY), Jonathan B. Bingham (D–NY), William S. Broomfield (R–Mich), John Buchanan (R–Ala), James A. Burke (D–Mass), Bill Chappell, Jr. (R–Fla).

James C. Cleveland (R–NH), R. Lawrence Coughlin (R–Pa), John W. Davis (D–Ga), John Dellenback (R–Oreg), Thaddeus Dulski (D–NY), Florence Dwyer (R–NJ), Don Edwards (D–Calif), Dante B. Fascell (D–Fla), Paul Findley (R–Ill), Edwin B. Forsythe (R–NJ).

L. H. Fountain (D–NC), Bill Frenzel (R–Minn), James G. Fulton (R–Pa), Edward A. Garmatz (D–Md), Ella T. Grasso (D–Conn), Charles H. Griffin (D–Miss), Charles S. Gubser (R–Calif), Seymour Halpern (R–NY), Ken Hechler (D–WVa), Craig Hosmer (D–Calif).

Jack F. Kemp (R–NY), Peter N. Kyros (D–Me), Sherman P. Lloyd (R–Utah), James A. McClure (R–Idaho), Spark M. Matsunaga (D–Hawaii), Wiley Mayne (R–Iowa), Patsy T. Mink (D–Hawaii), Wilmer Mizell (R–NC), F. Bradford Morse (R–Mass), John T. Myers (R–Ind).

Robert N. C. Nix (D–Pa), Richard H. Poff (R–Va), Charlotte T. Reid (R–Ill), J. Kenneth Robinson (R–Va), Howard W. Robison (R–NY), Robert A. Roe (D–NJ), Fred B. Rooney (D–Pa), Philip E. Ruppe (R–Mich), James H. Scheuer (D–NY), William A. Steiger (R–Wis).

Charles M. Teague (R–Calif), John H. Terry (R–NY), Vernon W. Thomson (R–Wis), Charles Thone (R–Nebr), Joseph P. Vigorito (D–Pa), Lawrence G. Williams (R–Pa), Larry Winn, Jr. (R–Kans), Wendell Wyatt (R–Oreg), John Wydler (R–NY), Clement J. Zablocki (D–Wis).

FEDERAL FIREFIGHTER'S RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to extend to Federal firefighters the same preferential retirement treatment now accorded Federal law enforcement personnel under the hazardous duty provisions of the civil service retirement system. This legislation is similar to that which the Congress approved late in the 91st Congress but which was vetoed by President Nixon.

Under my bill, Federal firefighters, for the first time, would be eligible for full retirement after attaining age 50 with 20 years of service. The annuity would be computed at the rate of 2 percent of the employee's high 3-year average salary multiplied by his total years of service.

The same criteria used to justify preferential treatment to law enforcement personnel will, under this legislation, be applied to Federal firefighters, as it should be. Firefighting requires a staff of active, vigorous, and physically capable men. We also need this legislation to provide an incentive to encourage younger men to enter and remain in Federal service, and older men to leave it at an early age.

The occupation of firefighting is one of the most hazardous in the world. The fact that the firefighters' fatality rate is 275 percent greater than the rate for the overall work force certainly substantiates this statement.

Federal firefighters are required daily to handle chemicals and radioactive materials. Nuclear materials are becoming commonplace at numerous Federal installations and in the event of a nuclear accident, the Federal firefighter is the first one called upon to respond.

Firefighters perform their duties during emergency situations, all times of the day and night, exposed to extreme heat and cold. This type of duty is often heavy, performed in extreme high temperatures. Noted physicians say that this is a burden on the cardiovascular system. The pulse rate increases and the stroke volume of the heart decreases.

Federal firemen also perform much of their duties in the extreme cold. Authorities, in their research, have found that this may produce persistent hypertension. A firefighter is exposed to carbon dioxide and other poisonous gases, which unquestionably do damage to the heart and vascular system.

At a nearby Federal installation, in a 5-year period, 10 percent of the firefighting force was lost because of heart ailments—the average age of these men was only 44 years.

I have in my district a number of military installations. One is the Naval Ordnance Laboratory at Indian Head, Md. I do not know of any place in the world more hazardous than that facility, where they make propellants, rockets, and torpedoes, and the firefighters there have an unbelievably difficult and hazardous job.

I urge my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Retirement, Health Benefits, and Insurance to join me in seeking prompt action on this measure.

PROPOSAL THAT LT. WILLIAM CALLEY BE INVITED TO ADDRESS JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, today I propose that an American citizen be invited to address a joint session of Congress.

Today, I propose that Army Lt. William Calley be invited to speak to the American people to tell them his side of the story.

Today, I propose that an American soldier—just an average guy in civilian life—be allowed to speak to the men and women of all 50 States to let them know that we are all his codefendants.

Today, I introduce a House concurrent resolution.

It seems appropriate at this season of the year that Lieutenant Calley's trial come to an end. For we can be like Pontius Pilate and wash our hands and say that "This is none of my affair." It has been done before.

Today, there is a far greater issue than the trial of Lt. William Calley, for this is but another chapter in a continuing story where a scapegoat is sought—and in this case it is Lt. William Calley.

Let me remind you of a ship named the *Pueblo*. It seems to me that a great many people have forgotten that story. We hush that one up.

After the men of this ship were sent into a battle zone, ill-protected and almost completely defenseless—they were captured. They suffered indignities at the hands of the enemy. These men suffered physical pain wearing the uniform of the United States.

And what was their reward? They were to be tried.

Well, the American people rose up as one at this indignity. That service involved—the Department of Defense—was unable to slaughter a scapegoat.

But they were successful in halting the career of a dedicated Navy officer—and to the end of time the story of Captain Bucher and his crew will be a blot on the history of the United States.

Lieutenant Calley is a man who volunteered—he was sent to an Army school to learn to kill. War is never a pleasant little interlude like a football game, to be trite, it is pure unmitigated hell.

One visit to a service hospital or a VA hospital will expose you to human suffering you can never imagine. The injuries which these men suffered in the service of their Nation will be with them to the end of their days, but we seem to be more interested in washing our hands of any affair that is unpleasant.

Lieutenant Calley has been tried under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. That code was passed by the Congress.

I think it is time that somebody stood up here and said we are his accusers, let us invite this American serviceman here to tell his story.

The television cameras roll as the astronauts or the President address the Congress. Newsmen and dignitaries fall all over themselves to be seen and heard at these pleasant events.

Well, I can assure you of one thing.

If a young man who is a citizen of this Nation is invited here to tell you to your face, and through that medium of the American people, he can look into the faces of a vast majority of the people of this Nation and tell them that he has been stripped of his honor.

He can say in his own words what he feels. It seems to me that this would be a perfectly legitimate function of the Congress, for maybe the laws relating to military justice are somewhat less perfect than many would have us to believe.

It is not a question of My Lai or any other area. It is not a question of the *Pueblo* or the men that suffered there.

This is a question of the morale of our servicemen and the fiber of our Nation. If we do not accept as a people the problems as well as the tributes, then this Nation has sunk to a low point.

It is a great thing to be here and congratulate ourselves on the success of a flight to the moon.

But I wonder how many will join me in being willing to sit and listen to a young man who might have been sentenced to death.

And he got life imprisonment—a fate which might be far worse.

He said at the conclusion of his trial that he did not plead for his life or his freedom, but he did plead for the men who are still over in that hellhole—defending your liberty and my liberty.

Is this the America we were taught to love?

Drafted and urged to enlist, a young Florida boy was taught to kill. Sent to a land where he could not know the enemy, where his fellow servicemen have been killed and maimed by women and children, by an enemy that is unseen, he does not even have the knowledge that his Nation is behind him.

I have never understood limited warfare. War is no game. The killing and slaughter of young Americans is no laughing matter, it is not a romantic adventure—it is terror and sorrow, suffering and anguish.

Think of the anguish of the wives and children of men who are imprisoned—never knowing whether they are married or widowed—children with a father or half-orphan.

While William Calley volunteered and we sent him into this abyss, another fellow that goes by the name of Muhammed Ali walks around with a few million dollars in his pockets from a sporting event.

The scenario in Vietnam is no sporting event.

Calley had friends who were killed. He knew a horror and an agony that those comfortable in their little corners cannot know.

Go ahead and wash your hands of this affair.

Go ahead and say it is none of my affair.

And there will be other Calleys and other *Pueblo*'s.

Since we have been so prone to bring those with pleasant achievements among our midst, let us bring in this young Army officer. It will not take much of the time of the people of this Nation.

But it might help us to understand the horror that is being inflicted on young Americans in a war which was not declared and which goes on without the Nation making any resolve or sacrifice to win.

Let others do the suffering as long as it does not affect my little corner of the world, seems to be said.

And it will continue to be somebody's brother, somebody's son, who will be brought home in a flag-covered coffin.

Today, I propose that Lt. William Calley be invited to address a joint session of Congress. A great many platitudes might end at that point.

A young American citizen might have a chance to tell his side of the story—and maybe there will be some people who might have a new understanding.

I do not plead for his life or his freedom.

But I do plead that he be given the opportunity to speak to the American people.

H. CON. RES. 250

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the facts and circumstances surrounding the events at My Lai and the subsequent conviction of Lieutenant William Calley for participation therein, raise issues in the minds of American citizens which transcend the interests of military justice, and require that Lieutenant Calley be given an opportunity to address the Nation on the floor of the Congress convened in joint session.

REVENUE-SHARING PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania Mr. FLOOD), is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in inserting into the RECORD the remarks of Gov. Milton J. Shapp, which were delivered before the National Press Club on today:

REMARKS OF GOV. MILTON J. SHAPP

With frequent regularity, the nation's Governors journey to Washington—individually or in groups—to meet with the President, confer with Cabinet officials, to lobby in Congress and address the National Press Club.

Often, the Governor's are followed by—or preceded by—the Mayors of the nation's cities.

Invariably, the message is the same: the states and cities of America are in desperate financial shape and the federal government must bail them out with some form of revenue sharing.

Usually, the dialogue turns out to be a debate without particulars. Some Governors and Mayors support the concept of revenue sharing in principle. Others support the Nixon plan whatever that may be. Some are for other forms of federal help. Others are for the proposals of this or that Senator. The general theme though is consistent. The cities and states lack the broad tax base, must live within balanced budgets and thus are unable to finance their expanding needs.

Against this background of growing national debate, I am happy, if somewhat apprehensive, to be here today to address the National Press Club as the Democratic Governor of the nation's third largest state.

I say I am apprehensive because I am sure you are sitting there expecting to hear the same old pitch for revenue sharing in the same old way with minor modifications here and there.

Well, I've decided not to make the same old pitch because I don't happen to agree with it. The Nixon proposals simply do not apply to the problems of 1971 let alone for 1972 and successive years.

I built a successful business by making decisions based upon need and logic. I don't believe we can solve our governmental problems by continuing to make our decisions on the basis of politics.

Now don't misunderstand me. As Governor of Pennsylvania I would be glad to be the beneficiary of a windfall called revenue sharing.

Call it the Nixon Plan, the Muskie Plan, the Governor's Plan, the Mayors' Plan, or anyone else's plan, I'll take the money. Pennsylvania needs it.

Last month, in Pennsylvania, we enacted a new tax package featuring for the first time an income tax based on line 50 of the federal tax return. Coupled with some basic reforms and additional business taxes, that package will, for the first time in many years, place Pennsylvania on a solid financial basis. This is quite a step forward considering the fact that on March 1st we ran out of money; that we were on the brink of insolvency, facing a debt, projected until June or 1972, of $1.55 billion.

Nonetheless, even with the passage of new taxes and the economies that we are introducing into the operations of government, we will barely meet our obligations for present programs in fiscal '71–72, to say nothing about the need to finance many new programs of vital public need.

Take, for example, mass transportation in Pennsylvania. The Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA) which services Philadelphia and the surrounding counties, is in serious financial trouble. To modernize SEPTA and place it on a solid financial footing, between 800 million and a billion dollars will be needed over the next five years.

That money can't come from Philadelphia, nor can it come from the state. Only last week, the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia warned that Philadelphia faces "fiscal chaos" in the 1970s. The report projected cumulative deficits for this one city alone totaling $1.325 billion over the next five years.

The Federal Reserve report also made clear that the projected amount of $54 million which Philadelphia would receive annually would still leave a deficit of over one billion dollars in five years merely to continue to finance existing programs even if President Nixon's revenue sharing program was enacted.

The Nixon proposal is nothing more than a red herring to obscure the real problems our nation faces and to give the illusion that the administration is concerned about the people's problems. Also, what is happening today is that public officials, focusing so strongly on the abstract concept of revenue sharing, have failed to perceive the vital inter-relationship of fiscal policy with economic and social policy.

You have often heard Governors, Mayors and Congressmen say that money alone will not solve our problems.

But too often that statement is accompanied by a single preoccupation with getting money alone.

I hope that we can stimulate a broader debate throughout the nation, one which would place equal priority on the need for economic growth and the demand for social progress.

Perhaps no other issue of modern times illustrates the three-fold problem of fiscal necessity, economic growth and social progress better than the welfare system.

During the next fiscal year, the welfare rolls in Pennsylvania are expected to exceed 900,000 cases.

In New York State, Governor Rockefeller announced last week a proposal to place a one-year residency requirement on welfare recipients, justifying his claim on the statement that his state faces an unusually serious situation under the terms of the Supreme Court residency ruling.

And in California, Governor Reagan has flatly and simply called for the elimination of three-quarters of a million people from the welfare rolls at a projected saving of $700 million.

Each response has been in terms of money.

Neither Rockefeller nor Reagan has spoken in terms of people.

I have proposed that the federal government take over the operation of the entire welfare system. I believe that the machinery of public assistance, designed to meet the crisis of the 1930's Depression, simply no longer applies to the problems of the seventies.

The rise in the welfare caseload represents a fiscal crisis of grave magnitude that can not be handled by the states. The soaring caseload not only reflects uncontrollable state costs due to federal laws and court decisions regarding eligibility for welfare, but it is also indicative of a stagnant national economy.

It points up our social failure to provide meaningful programs of education, job training, and employment, for all our citizens, of wasting so much of our precious national resources in a senseless war instead of taking care of our people's real needs.

Therefore, I propose that government, on every level, begin to think in terms of a three-cornered solution to our problems. One is the generation of new sources of revenue for our cities and states, which should include some block grant revenue sharing funds combined with a federal takeover of the welfare program.

A second is the need for positive federal action to stimulate economic growth.

Third, an expansion of programs for social progress.

My thoughts regarding the need for federal takeover of the welfare systems were presented to the Joint Economic Committee on January 22nd. I shall not expand on this concept here except to illustrate that under Nixon's revenue sharing proposals, Pennsylvania's state government would receive $123 million next year but welfare costs alone will increase over $150 million. And that we would presently save almost $700 million if Washington took this load over. Many of our problems are caused by high unemployment.

Ten years ago, when John Kennedy became President, the economy faced the same type of stagnation which we are witnessing today—high unemployment, slow growth and sluggish production.

The Kennedy Administration demonstrated that the tools of the federal government could be used in a constructive manner to stimulate the economy. Public works, Manpower Retraining, Area Redevelopment, Aid to Education, new incentives for housing and stepped up urban assistance all were put to work to prime the economy.

Some of these programs in their particulars, would not necessarily be the ones we need today. But surely the federal government must adopt the principle of putting its vast resources to work for the cause of economic growth.

As Leon Keyserling recently pointed out, "unless reasonably full employment and production are restored within a reasonable time, all of the economic and social problems with which the states and localities are wrestling will be further aggravated to a degree which cannot be compensated for by revenue sharing." A program for revenue sharing would be but a part, and minor part at that, of the entire program needed by our federal government. There is urgent need to develop a long-range economic and social budget for the United States, properly quantifying broad production and employment targets.

I understand the President says he is now a Disciple of Keynes. He has presented his own version of deficit spending in the guise of a full employment budget. He claims that he is now prepared to use the tools of the federal government to get us out of the recessionary spiral we are in.

But once again, we see evidence that his words are not consistent with his actions.

Why, is the administration holding back on billions of dollars already appropriated for eduation and urban programs and mandated from the highway trust fund?

Last weekend at the Democratic Governors' Conference in St. Loius, I said that while Nixon talks a good game about revenue sharing he was following instead a policy of revenue snaring.

I don't believe, we will see this unimaginative administration use the tools at its command with any sort of determination. I think we will see more words, fewer deeds and a lot of expressed hope that somehow the economy will improve itself. I might add this is a philosophy followed by all Republican administrations since 1924—all of which have evolved in deep recession or depression.

If we are going to stimulate the economy the administration must have to *believe it can* be stimulated. And it seems to be the peculiar failing of the present Administration that it has no faith in the potential of human ingenuity applying the tools of government to generate true prosperity.

Finally, as a third point, I want to talk briefly about the question of social progress.

Where will we be, as a nation, with all the revenue at our disposal unless we use it wisely for the benefit of all our people?

What good, indeed, will economic growth be unless it benefits not only the few at the top but the millions at the bottom?

The nation is quieter today than it has been.

But perhaps our misery has simply gone underground.

The poor are not always visible.

And the angry are not always shouting.

Sometimes both poverty and anger are transformed into quiet despair and invisible frustration.

Whatever the present mood, the fact is that America still has not lived up to its commitment to equal rights for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Nor have we been sufficiently innovative in devising new approaches to learning for millions of people at the bottom of the ladder whose livelihood depends upon manual employment and other forms of low paying jobs, many of whom languish on welfare because they lack the skills and knowledge to hold jobs in our modern society.

A lot of jobs are disappearing because of the sluggish economy and because of automation.

In their place are other jobs but these require skills and training which still are not available to or earmarked for those most in need.

Is it any wonder that the welfare rolls increase when unemployment is so high and unemployability is so obvious?

During the recent crisis in Pennsylvania, we faced the possibility of laying off about five hundred people in custodial jobs in our Department of Property and Supplies. The move was intended to effect some economies. The plan was almost approved when the Secretary of Property and Supplies said to me: "Governor, you know what's going to happen when you lay those people off? They'll all be on welfare." I decided to use the same number of dollars to keep these people employed and our buildings clean. This inci-

dent points up clearly the predicament we are in.

Either we provide relevant training that leads to meaningful employment or else we continue to witness the continued rise in the welfare rolls.

For a brief period during the sixties, it seemed as if the nation had finally captured the commitment to social progress.

But I believe it has been lost and must be regained if this nation is to survive.

And behind the national problem, of course, lies the international situation. Let's face it. We shall not succeed here in America until we end, once and for all, our involvement in Indo China. And we shall not succeed, even then, unless we transfer some of the huge defense budget into meaningful revenue sharing programs.

These, then, are the priorities as I see them and I would like to close this discussion with a brief statement of my own position on the specific question of revenue sharing so that you will have, on the record, the position of the Governor of Pennsylvania.

A month ago, when the National Governors' Conference met here in Washington, I made a four-point proposal for adoption which included the following items:

1. FULL FEDERALIZATION OF WELFARE PROGRAMS

The present costs of public assistance are uncontrollable by the states. These are mainly federally-established programs, but in those states seeking to provide a minimum standard of health and decency to people on welfare, the states alone or the states and their local governments together now bear the lion's share of the load.

During 1971, the Federal Government should assume all costs for welfare that exceed 90% of each state's costs for 1970.

Next, each year between 1972 and 1976, the Federal Government should assume an additional 20% of this welfare burden. Thus by 1976, the Federal Government would be paying 100% of all welfare costs for each state.

2. STATE AND CITY DRAWING RIGHTS

States and cities should be able to obtain in advance from the Federal Treasury or the Federal Reserve, under a program of special Federal Drawing Rights, monies that are due them under Federal grant formulas in any given fiscal year. This, in effect, will provide a fiscal shock absorber for state and local governments to permit better fiscal planning of their finances, and to prevent chaos when they run out of money. Most cities and states, unlike the Federal government, cannot resort to deficit financing, even in case of dire emergency.

3. FEDERALLY GUARANTEED LOANS FOR STATES AND CITIES

Our states and cities today pay higher than prime interest rates because the lenders look upon states and cities as increasingly poorer risks. Yet, our states and cities must borrow billions upon billions over the next decade.

A Federal agency should be established to fully guarantee loans made by our cities and states. This would lower the interest rate on such borrowing and save many millions of dollars for state and local taxpayers. Such a guarantee plan for our steamship lines already exists under the Federal Maritime Act. Certainly our states and cities are at least equally worthy of support.

4. REVENUE SHARING

The President's formula for general revenue sharing is inadequate. In calling for the reclassification of categorical grants into bloc grants, it is nothing more than a case of scrambling the same egg twice. Its distribution has little to do with per capita income or need, and its reward for "state and local fiscal effort" tends to reinforce the current regressive real estate and sales taxes.

I recommend a formula with incentives to encourage:

(a) states to adopt graduated income taxes;

(b) procedures for allocation of shared revenues to local governments to encourage consolidation of inefficient units.

I also recommend that general revenue sharing be a four-year authorization with annual appropriations rather than a permanent appropriation as a percentage of the personal income tax base as proposed by the President.

I am not calling for revenue sharing by itself or for federalization of welfare programs by itself. I am saying that the states and the cities need both in order to accomplish the needed fiscal relief. And we need both immediately.

If these four points were adopted into law, they would do much to place our states and cities on a more adequate financial base, provide incentives for reform and reorganization of our state and local governments, provide a more equitable distribution of Federal funds than either revenue sharing or federalization of welfare alone, and continue a federal-state-local partnership which has been creative and productive in many instances during the past 40 years.

America's economy can be stimulated. America's cities can be turned into thriving communities. And our states can be made to fulfill their constitutional duties to their citizens.

Our people can be assisted in their quest to live enriched lives.

We have the capital, we have the resources, we have the most innovative people in the world. We can resolve our problems if we utilize all our great advantages in a logical and constructive way.

But, we cannot improve our lot if the Administration continues to hack out programs for public relations or political purposes and ballyhoos these concoctions as the salvation of the nation.

I place the Nixon proposal for revenue sharing in this category. It is not based upon realism. It won't make a dent in solving our fiscal problems.

Welfare takeover is a much more meaningful program. Federal assumption of welfare costs would relieve the states of enormous sums in their budgets so they in turn could relieve the cities of a larger share of educational costs.

But neither revenue sharing nor welfare takeover will solve our nation's fiscal problems. We desperately need major programs to stimulate the economy, programs that will offer real opportunities for our people to live more fruitful lives.

Until we take meaningful steps in this direction everything else we do constitutes nothing more than a holding action.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. JAMES HILLIARD POLK, JR.

The Speaker pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, March 31, 1971, Gen. James Hilliard Polk, Jr., Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Army Europe and Seventh U.S. Army, also Commander Central Army Group NATO, retired from active duty. Jimmy Polk is one of the outstanding soldiers of this generation. He retires after 37 years 10 months as an officer in the U.S. Army and in addition to that spent 4 years as a cadet at the U.S. Military Academy. It might be more accurate to say that he has been a part of the U.S. Army ever since he was born. He was born on an Army post—Camp McGraw, Batangas, Philippine Islands, December 31, 1911, of Army parents. He has literally been in the Army ever since.

Since August 1961 with the exception of 9 months as Assistant Chief of Staff for Force Development, Headquarters, U.S. Army, he has served in command positions of great responsibility in U.S. Army Europe. I know of no one who has served longer or with greater distinction in USAEUR than he has. During this service, because of the unique requirements of seven of his last eight assignments, he has been a soldier-diplomat. His first assignment which required exceptional ability in military-diplomatic assignments started when he served as Assistant Chief of Staff G3, Land Forces, Central Europe, beginning in July 1957. From that time until his retirement with the exception of 9 months duty as ACSFOR, he has been involved in major international assignments.

General Polk's retirement in one sense marks the end of an era. It is very likely that he is the last senior army commander to have served in the horse cavalry which has produced its full share of senior commanders. Many of its officers and men continue to wear the crossed sabers even though they subsequently served with armored cavalry, armory, or air cavalry.

He entered the U.S. Military Academy in the summer of 1929, graduated in June 1933 and was commissioned second lieutenant of cavalry assigned to the 8th Cavalry Regiment. Between his graduation and December 7, 1941, he served as a cavalry unit officer, a student at the cavalry school and as instructor, U.S. Military Academy. After graduating from the command and general staff school he was assigned to the 6th Cavalry Recon Squadron and from then until the end of World War II he served consecutively as executive officer, 106th Cavalry Group Mechanized, commanding officer, 6th Cavalry Group Mechanized, and commanding officer, 3d Cavalry Group Mechanized, all in the European theater of operations.

During his service in the European theater of operations both he and his regiment were frequently cited for bold and aggressive action. General Polk was three times decorated for gallantry, once by Gen. George S. Patton, Jr. During this period his regiment was authorized its own patch by the commanding general, 3d U.S. Army and General Polk still wears this patch on his right shoulder.

After brief occupation duty in Germany at the end of World War II, he returned to the United States and became Chief of Tactics at the Ground General School, Fort Riley, Kans., and later attended the Armed Forces Staff College. In 1948, he was ordered to Tokyo, Japan, and served in the G2 section of the U.S. Far East Command for the next 3 years.

Early in the Korean war, General Polk became Assistant Chief of Staff, G2 of the X Corps and participated in three campaigns. In August 1951, he returned to attend the National War College and was later assigned as an instructor at the Army War College at Carlisle Barracks, Pa. He was then made Chief of Staff of the 3d Armored Division at

Fort Knox, Ky., and participated in the gyroscope movement of the division to West Germany. In July 1956 he was promoted to brigadier general and served as assistant division commander for 1 year.

Following this tour, General Polk's career began to broaden into the field of soldier-diplomat assignments. For 2 years he served as Assistant Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations, Land Forces Central Europe, at NATO Headquarters at Fontainbleau, France.

In July 1959, he returned to the United States and became the director of the policy planning staff in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

In June 1961 he was promoted to major general and ordered back to West Germany to command the 4th Armored Division. He became U.S. Commander, Berlin, on January 2, 1963.

General Polk became Commanding General of V Corps U.S. Army on September 1, 1964, and was promoted to lieutenant general on September 4, 1964. After 18 months as Commanding General V Corps and 9 months as ACSFOR he returned to U.S. Army Europe as Deputy Commander in Chief USAREUR and Commanding General 7th Army.

In June 1967 he was designated Commander in Chief U.S. Army Europe and 7th U.S. Army in which capacity he served until he relinquished command on March 20, 1971.

He was promoted to general officer rank July 31, 1956, and served for nearly 15 years as a general officer, of which nearly 4 were in the grade of general.

General Polk's citations and decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star with one oak leaf cluster, the Legion of Merit with two oak leaf clusters, the Bronze Star Medal, the Legion of Honor—Commander—the Croix de Guerre—with Palm Decoration, the Grand Cross with star and sash, the American Campaign Medal, the Europe Africa Middle East Campaign Medal, the American Defense Service Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the Army of Occupation Medal—with clasp for Germany and Japan—the Korean Service Medal, the Air Medal, the Republic of Korea Presidential United Citation, the United National Service Medal, and the American Forces Expeditionary Medal.

He is married to the former Josephine Leavell and they are the parents of two children, Mrs. Josephine Polk Schwartz of El Paso, Tex., and James Hilliard Polk, III of New York City. Following his retirement, General and Mrs. Polk will reside in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in congratulating General Polk on his retirement and I express my appreciation to him for the distinguished service which he has rendered to his country in both war and peace.

THE CALLEY TRIAL—A CALL UPON THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have all been shocked by the Calley trial.

There can be no excuse, no justification, for the barbarity at My Lai. We must not, however, look for solace in the victimization of one of our own.

I, myself, have committed actions which resulted in enemy deaths.

I do not labor under any delusion of the morality of these actions, but I do persevere in my belief that men in times of war are necessarily motivated by a different set of values.

What I consider to be the most dreadful aspect of the entire My Lai incident is the fact that one individual has been singled out as the scapegoat so that society may be expurgated from responsibility for the My Lai incident.

It is my belief that Lieutenant Calley carried out his duty as he saw it in My Lai. Many others, including myself, have faced the same issue which must have been foremost in his mind on that day.

I now stand with Lieutenant Calley, having shared the dilemma of deciding between the morality of civilization and duty to a particular authority.

As a lawyer, former prosecutor, and former judge, I firmly believe that the judicial process ought to be completely removed from the realm of political influence. The fundamental injustice, however, of singling out one human being in an attempt to purge the conscience of a nation, makes me feel compelled to speak my mind in this anguish.

I wish that I could free Lieutenant Calley.

However, in the absence of having that authority myself, I do now call upon the President of the United States to relieve this loyal officer of any deprivation of honor, liberty, or property.

HISTORIC SPRINGFIELD PLANTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to authorize the National Park Service to acquire historically rich Springfield Plantation and to incorporate it in the Natchez Trace Parkway.

As you know, the Natchez Trace was a Post Road in the early 1800's over the prehistoric Indian trails running from Natchez, Miss. to Nashville, Tenn. The earliest settlers of the Southwest moved down the Trace. It was, also, down the Natchez Trace that Gen. Andrew Jackson marched his troops to meet the British at the Battle of New Orleans during the War of 1812.

It was near this historic path that Thomas Marston Green, Jr., completed his home, Springfield, in 1790. Green and his father, Thomas Marston Green, Sr., were among the most influential voices in the movement to free Natchez and all of Spanish west Florida from Spanish rule. These efforts culminated in the formation of the Mississippi Territory in 1798. Thomas Green, Jr., was the second man ever to serve Mississippi as a Representative to Congress becoming a Territorial Delegate to Congress in 1802.

It was at Springfield, as tradition has it, that Aaron Burr was held for a time pending his preliminary hearing on the charge of treason in the winter of 1806–07.

Tradition also has it that Springfield was the site of the famous and controversial marriage of Andrew Jackson to Rachel Robards in 1791; a marriage reportedly performed by Thomas Marston Green, Sr.

Mr. Speaker, Springfield is rich in history of the early period of the territory and of the early growth of our Nation. It is a genuine and unique piece of the American saga. It is, indeed, worthy of preservation and would be a prized addition to the beautiful Natchez Trace Parkway at any price. It will be especially valuable now as the present owner, Mr. James H. Williams of St. Louis, Mo., has offered to donate the house and 15 acres of adjoining land to the Park Service.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, will authorize the National Park Service to accept this donation and to acquire other land by purchase, or other means, which is necessary for proper use and administration of the area. I urge the consideration of every Member of this worthy and valuable project.

THE NEED FOR WAGE AND PRICE ECONOMIC DISCIPLINE—NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCFALL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MCFALL. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that when a state of imbalance exists long enough, it becomes the new state of balance. This principle is sharply illustrated by our national economy, which has been in a state of imbalance so long now that there is real danger of accepting high unemployment, low productivity, and inflated prices as the national state of balance. Unless we perceive clearly what is happening and describe it accurately, the imbalance will persist and, indeed, become more acute.

So let us dismiss rhetoric and political hyperbole and state the case accurately: We are in a state of emergency.

The fact that we have been living in an emergency condition for more than 2 years does not make it any less an emergency. And it would be tragic if we failed to assess the seriousness of the situation because we have gradually become accustomed to the rising prices and increased unemployment.

A noted economist, Gardiner C. Means, has said:

An economy which is running well should have neither inflation nor serious unemployment. Those who suggest that a 2 or 3 percent annual rise in prices is acceptable are simply not looking for a well-running economy. Likewise, those who accept 3.4 percent unemployment as anything except an interim goal are accepting a badly running economy. They are saying that, rather than interfere with the abuse of market power,

they are satisfied that there should continuously be more than 2½ million workers looking for work and unable to find it; that the country should aim to throw away some $20 billion of potential production a year, and that the burden of avoiding inflation should be placed on those least able to bear it.

Mr. Speaker, the current administration has accepted as a necessary evil new levels of unemployment—far in excess of the 3.4 percent it inherited when it took office. Each new level—4½ percent, 5 percent, 5½ percent, 6 percent—was accepted as an inevitable price to pay in the fight against inflation, and now we have the sorry statistics of 5½ million unemployed, many of them over a long period of time.

When 5½ million Americans are unemployed, we are in a national emergency, and we must act accordingly.

This Congress would be callous, indeed, if it did not take steps to alleviate the plight of the jobless and the many thousands of Americans who have to meet increased prices with reduced incomes. It is not enough for us to criticize from the sidelines the President's economic "game plan" or his failure to call the signals clearly and decisively on wage and price increases that accelerate inflation.

We have a responsibility to act, as the representatives of the people, to meet the current emergency and to restore balance to our crippled economy.

Our long-range goal must be to eliminate unemployment without producing inflation. Our short-term goal must be a rapid expansion of our artificially restricted economy in order to make an immediate and drastic reduction in unemployment.

To that end, I have sponsored the accelerated public works bill, in which 150 of my colleagues have joined as cosponsors. Hearings have been held and Chairman BLATNIK's Public Works Committee has reported out the House bill, and in the Senate hearings have been held on the companion bill introduced by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH. I am hopeful of early passage of this measure to provide Federal funds for necessary public works projects in areas of substantial unemployment. This would give a quick boost to the economy and stimulate production, while providing thousands of jobs where they are needed most.

But this is only a beginning.

We must act, too, to slow down the inflationary spiral that has been advancing at a rate of 5 percent per year.

It is not useful at this stage to fix blame for the failure to halt inflation or to point out the futility of inflation alerts after the fact. What is essential now is a concerted bipartisan effort to reverse the trend.

I am convinced that the first step must be a system of wage-price guidelines. Therefore, my colleague, JOHN MONAGAN, of Connecticut, and I have joined in the introduction of the Monagan-McFall wage-price guidelines bill, H.R. 2502 to establish a temporary Emergency Guidance Board to facilitate economic recovery with minimum inflation by establishing price and wage guidelines and encouraging voluntary adherence to these guidelines.

This proposal is made in the belief that all Americans want to do their share in combating the menance of inflation, and they will welcome guidelines that are established on a fair, nondiscriminatory basis.

The construction workers—who have suffered disproportionately the effects of unemployment and underemployment—were understandably disturbed last month when the President announced his decision to suspend the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act in Federal contracts, a move which he justified as necessary in fighting inflation. Fortunately, he has seen fit to rescind that decision. In his announcement from San Clemente this week, he outlined a new plan for controlling wage increases in the construction trades, while reinstating the applicable provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act. Certainly it is far more reasonable and equitable to adopt wage guidelines than to undercut the prevailing wage scale. But is it wise and is it fair to single out one group to bear the burden of the battle against spiraling prices? Administration spokesmen say the President has no plans to take similar action to stabilize wages in other industries—nor has he announced any plan to stabilize prices in industries that supply the construction field.

The President talks of accepting "the discipline of a free society" and the "discipline of a full employment budget." Americans do not reject the discipline of a free economy—as long as it is imposed evenly, on all sectors. But it is repugnant to our sense of fairness to see the construction trades made the sacrificial goat. And it is equally repugnant to see the steel industry singled out as the villain in price increases. If one group is to be disciplined, all should be disciplined, in a just and democratic manner.

We do not need scapegoats or villains. We do not need the recriminations of inflation alerts that have all the effects of locking the barn door after the horse is stolen.

What we need is prevention—not recrimination.

In this legislation, we are proposing preventive measures in the fight against inflation through a system of guidelines for price and wage changes, to be established and administered by an impartial board of five members, in consultation with leaders of business, labor, and consumers.

This is emergency legislation, designed to meet an immediate and temporary need. The life of the proposed Emergency Guidance Board would be limited to 18 months, subject to extension to 30 months, if needed, by a concurrent resolution of Congress.

I am glad to note that this measure already has gained a number of cosponsors, and it is my hope that the Members from both sides of the aisle who joined in sponsoring the accelerated public works bill will also join in this effort to meet the economic emergency head on with meaningful legislation.

This proposal is now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I hope that the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, will accord it the same high priority that Chairman BLATNIK gave to the accelerated public works bill. Both are emergency measures, both designed for immediate and maximum impact on the recession-inflation that has kept the Nation in a jittery state of imbalance over the past 2 years.

FIFTY-ONE BOEING 747'S NOW MILLION-MILERS, FLIGHT HOURS PASS 200,000

(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, I take pride in announcing further accomplishments of the Boeing 747 jumbo jet. While these first aircraft have only been in service a little over 1 year their utilization sets news records almost daily.

As of March 18, 51 Boeing 747's have logged 1 million miles or more in flight. Of these, 21 have flown more than 1.5 million miles.

Total flight time logged by the 109 superjets delivered was 201,765 hours. The high-time airplane had 4,093 hours in its logbook. In all, 81 of the 747's in airline operation have logged more than 1,000 flight hours.

For the week ending March 18, average mechanical schedule reliability, the percentage of flights which departed on time or were not delayed more than 15 minutes for mechanical reasons was 95 percent.

Boeing 747's first entered commercial service January 21, 1970, and by mid-March of this year had carried 8.5 million passengers on 39,500 revenue flights. Average utilization has been 8.6 hours per airplane per day since first delivery.

RECLAMATION PROJECTS ONE STEP CLOSER

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to recognize the groundwork accomplished in the Appropriations Committee and the testimony before the committee justifying the next step in the construction of the China Meadows Dam of the Lyman project and a $500,000 appropriation for rehabilitation and repair work necessary on the Riverton project.

These are excellent reclamation projects that make the best use of the water. Each has a favorable cost-benefit ratio. These projects not only benefit Wyoming but the whole country. I am happy they are one step closer to reality with testimony now being presented by Commissioner Ellis Armstrong, Bureau of Reclamation, and other Interior Department officials before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee.

I would like to record here my sincere hope that these appropriations will be approved. I will present detailed testi-

mony to the committee in due course and welcome the interest and support of all my colleagues who share my concern for the development and growth of rural America.

THE RIGHTS OF THE NATIVES OF ALASKA

(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, I rise today to bring before the House an issue of historic importance for all citizens of this country, but especially for the original Americans—the native peoples. All of us know something of the history of the original Americans. In school we read stories about taming the Great West—Government soldiers were always portrayed as heroes bearing the banner of civilization. With the passing years we have come to look on events differently. The U.S. record, while better than that of most nations' dealings with their native peoples, certainly could have been improved upon. The American Indians were pushed farther and farther West treaties were negotiated, broken, and renegotiated, reservations were established.

Through the Indian Claims Commission, Congress has provided the machinery for reexamining the taking of lands formerly occupied by most native Americans. But to this day one of the largest of all Indian land rights issues remains unresolved. I refer to the rights of the natives of Alaska who have occupied and used the lands of the State for a period extending far back beyond the time Europeans first knew there was an Alaska.

Many years ago—probably thousands of years ago—aboriginal people migrated into what is now Alaska. They faced a cruel and harsh land of extreme temperatures and sparse animal and plant life. Through basic human ingenuity and ability they conquered the elements, made those lands livable, and established their homes. In order to do so these people had to roam widely over the lands hunting for the occasional caribou and fishing for the salmon.

These living patterns have continued to this day. At the present time approximately 60,000 descendents of the original inhabitants of Alaska still live on those lands. These people—composed of Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts—have, by virtue of their historic use and occupancy of the lands, a legal claim to substantial portions of the State of Alaska.

When the United States "purchased" Alaska from Russia in 1867, it did not compensate the original Alaskans, nor in any way extinguish their legal title to these lands. To this day our Government has never extinguished that title.

Resolution of the land rights of the Alaska Natives has been repeatedly postponed by the Congress. The time has now come for a just and final resolution of those rights. Until the Congress acts to confirm the Natives' title in part of their land and compensate them for taking the rest of their lands, it will be impossible for any development to proceed in the State of Alaska. The claims of the Alaska Natives hang as an overriding cloud on the title to virtually every acre of land in that State.

In order to achieve a just and equitable settlement of these rights, the Alaska Natives have organized themselves and prepared a settlement proposal. The Alaska Federation of Natives—AFN—is the spokesman for the various groups of Alaska Natives on this issue. Their proposal has been developed over the course of several years of consideration and negotiation. I am today introducing that proposal for the consideration of the House. Twenty-four other Members of this body have joined as cosponsors.

The basic elements of the bill are simple enough. It calls for an extinguishment of all Native land claims. In return, the Natives would receive, first, 60 million acres—approximately 16 percent of their actual land claims; second, $500 million over 9 years; and third, a perpetual 2 percent overriding royalty on gross revenues derived from future natural resource development on Federal and State lands in Alaska.

As important as the financial terms are, the structure and standards for distributing the settlement proceeds. The Natives of Alaska are organized on a regional basis. They have come to recognize 12 distinct regions based on historical factors of heritage, language, subsistence use patterns, and geography. The 12 regions are the actual political structure of the Alaska Natives. Under my bill this structure would be recognized by the creation of 12 regional corporations, each controlled and managed by the Natives themselves. Since the bill is basically a settlement of land rights, each region would receive title to a part of the 6 million acres proportional to the size of the region. In order to provide initial capital for organization, each region would receive $8 million. Thereafter, funds would be distributed to the regional corporations in proportion to the population residing in that region. These provisions, designed by the Natives themselves, give meaning and substance to past declarations that our Government will pursue a policy of self-determination for native peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to sponsor this legislation. Enactment of this bill would mean that the final chapter in the history of our Government's dealings with the landrights of original Americans would be written with justice and honor. The Congress has an opportunity to insure that past wrongs are in part righted by what we do in this session. While the details of this issue are complex, the principles are simple. Congress is dealing with valid property right in an enormous amount of land. We can and must deal with those rights fairly. This bill represents such a fair deal. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and urge its prompt consideration and approval by the appropriate committees, the House, the Senate, and the President.

THE SELLING OF THE PENTAGON

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with each passing day the evidence grows in support of the view that the CBS television network laid a gigantic egg with its recent documentary, "The Selling of the Pentagon." Both the Washington Post and the Washington Evening Star have questioned the network's judgment and objectivity in putting the documentary together.

One segment of the film included mention of the Caterpillar Tractor Co. whose world headquarters is located in my home town of Peoria, Ill. The impression given was that Caterpillar had arranged for a briefing of community leaders by members of the military in order to curry favor with the Pentagon in order to secure defense contracts. Nothing could be more ridiculous. Sales for Caterpillar during 1970 totaled more than $2 billion—that is billion—dollars and less than 3 percent of that total consisted of defense contracts.

An article appearing in the March 20, 1971, edition of Barron's brings out some interesting and thought-provoking points regarding the present and past activities of the CBS network and I would urge my colleagues to set aside a few minutes to read the article carefully. I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

BROADCAST LICENSE: CBS HAS FORFEITED ACCESS TO THE NATION'S AIRWAVES

We cannot help but admire a man who defends his principles and sticks to his guns. Last Tuesday evening Richard S. Salant, president of the News Division of the Columbia Broadcasting System, gave a nationwide television audience a demonstration of doggedness which in other circumstances, might well have commanded our respect. Under fierce attack from Congress and the White House for airing the controversial documentary, "The Selling of the Pentagon," Mr. Salant refused to give an inch. Perhaps with an eye on the clock—the 11–12 p.m. slot, while not exactly prime time, is still too valuable to waste—the CBS executive took no more than a moment or so to rebut "only a few" of the critics' charges; however, he assured his viewers, "We have an answer for every one. . . ." Then, boldly switching to the offensive, the head of CBS News asserted: "We are proud of 'The Selling of the Pentagon.' . . . We are confident that when passions die down, it will be recognized as a vital contribution to the people's right to know." Lesser media of communications may occasionally run a correction or retraction; The Washington Post, not long ago, printed an extraordinary confession of error. CBS News, which is made of sterner stuff, stands defiantly on the record.

Quite a record it is, too. As to "The Selling of the Pentagon," Mr. Salant addressed himself to merely two of the many points of criticism raised. Regarding the rest, the chief critics—including the Vice President of the United States, senior editor of Air Force magazine and a non-partisan citizens' organization known as Accuracy in Media (AIM), which plans to lodge a complaint with the National Association of Broadcasters—make a compelling, and thus far uncontroverted, case. In particular, CBS stands accused of various misstatements, including the amount spent by the Pentagon on public affairs, and the true identity of those responsible for a certain military briefing (not, as alleged, Peoria's Caterpillar Tractor Co., "which did $39 million of business with the Defense Department last year," but the local Association of Commerce). Far worse were the omissions and distortions, including two episodes in which tapes were clipped and reassembled to convey false impressions of what the speakers said. Specific lapses aside, even the untutored eye could scarcely fail to de-

tect, in a so-called documentary, pervasive malice and editorial bias.

On the CBS television network—which includes five wholly owned stations and 198 affiliates—slanted (or, in view of his authority and tenure, perhaps the word should be Salanted) journalism has long been the name of the game. As in "The Selling of the Pentagon," moreover, the thrust has tended to be violently against what most of the country would regard as its basic interests, institutions and values. In a prize-winning "documentary," key sequences of which subsequently proved false, CBS News professed to uncover "Hunger in America"; contrariwise, in an equally distorted report from Cuba, the television camera found, in effect, that Cubans under Castro never had it so good. Not content merely to cover (albeit in its own fashion) the news, CBS time and again has sought to make news. Shortly after NBC scooped the competition by airing an LSD-stimulated interview with Dr. Timothy Leary, WBBM–TV, CBS outlet in Chicago, participated in a headline-making, and illegal, pot party, which became the object of an investigation by the Federal Communications Commission. In a similar, if far more brazen, exploit—on which both Vice President Agnew and Mr. Salant touched last week—CBS sought to stage, and to film, an invasion of Haiti. One picture supposedly is worth a thousand words. High time the U.S. got the picture.

As last Tuesday's performance suggests, it isn't pretty. Among other sins of omission and commission, CBS News failed to mention that it was paid to produce one of the films at which it scoffed. In depicting a press conference, during which the briefing officer, replying to 34 questions, gave three no-comment answers, the camera focused on the latter. Statements made on tape by two Pentagon spokesmen, a Marine colonel and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, were cut up, transposed and pieced together again in a way that made both of them seem unresponsive and foolish. Rep. Edward Hebert (not Herbert, as the caption later had it), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, turned up on the screen with this gracious—and, despite Mr. Salant's subsequent remarks, wholly misleading—introduction: "Using sympathetic Congressmen, the Pentagon tries to counter what it regards as the antimilitary tilt of network reporting (Ed. note: where would it ever get such an idea?). War heroes are made available for taped home district TV reports from pro-Pentagon politicians."

All this is reprehensible enough. Far worse—in a format presumably dedicated to fact—are the extremist opinions which it was used to convey. Here is a disillusioned and slightly incoherent ex-Air Force officer: "I feel that the military information arm is so vast, has been able to become so pervasive by the variety and the amounts and the way and the sheer numbers it's able to present its viewpoint to the American people, I think this attitude it was able to develop allowed Vietnam to happen. . . ." Here is CBS-News' own dispassionate Roger Mudd: "On this broadcast we have seen violence made glamorous, expensive weapons advertised as if they were automobiles, biased opinions presented as straight facts. Defending the country not just with arms but also with ideology, Pentagon propaganda insists on America's role as the cop on every beat in the world."

Anyone—even CBS, though it won't concede as much—can make mistakes. What the record shows, however, is a pattern of distortion and slanted reporting stretching back over the years. In 1963, so a revealing article and exchange of letters in The New York Times Magazine has disclosed, President Kennedy gave an exclusive interview to Walter Cronkite of CBS News on such literally inflammatory issues as the Buddhists in South Vietnam and the allegedly repressive government of Ngo Dinh Diem. In the editing process, the footage shrank from 30 minutes to 12, and, according to Pierre Salinger, then White House press secretary, "the result was a partial distortion of JFK's opinion of President Diem. In the actual interview . . . President Kennedy spoke of his respect and sympathy for the problems of President Diem. When the film was shown to the public, only the unfavorable Presidential remarks remained, and JFK's praise of Diem had been deleted. The impression was left that JFK had no confidence at all in Diem, and when he and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, were later shot to death in a military coup, there were persistent charges from Madame Nhu and others that the President's statements had given aid and comfort to Diem's enemies. JFK was deeply hurt by the accusations."

Prior to the Republican convention the following year, CBS News struck again. According to Senator Barry Goldwater (R., Ariz.), Daniel Schorr, then serving as correspondent abroad, "took it upon himself to put out a news report to portray the idea that I was trying to forge links with far-rightist, neo-fascist groups in Germany . . . Schorr dealt heavily in false facts which neither he nor CBS newsmen in this country made any attempt to check with my office." So it has gone year by year. In 1968, after a storm of protest, a Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce investigated television coverage of the Democratic national convention in Chicago. In viewing the video tape of the CBS coverage, the Congressional probers noted a passage in which Walter Cronkite cried that the police "were severely manhandling a minister." According to the Committee Report: "The accompanying action shows police merely attempting to get a man dressed in clerical garb into a patrol wagon, using what the investigators felt was reasonable force to overcome the man's resistance." The Report concluded, in part: "In an attempt to give an overall impression, it might be said that the coverage presented over the air does, in retrospect, seem to present a one-sided picture which in large measure exonerates the demonstrators and protestors and indicts the city government of Chicago and, to a lesser degree, the Democratic Party."

The long reel of distortion continues to unwind. In her nationally syndicated column, Alice Widener, frequent contributor to Barron's, has chronicled some of the gamier episodes. In the fall of 1969, Frank Kearns, CBS correspondent in Rome, broadcast a report on alleged Italian opinion in the criminal case against the man who hi-jacked a commercial airliner from San Francisco. Mr. Kearns chose to quote the views of a single editor, that of the Communist newspaper "Unita," who described the hi-jacker a "Robin Hood . . . who made a fool of the repressive and hated FBI." Again, on "Face the Nation," CBS devoted a half-hour of Sunday time to Tom Hayden, revolutionist of the so-called New Left. Mrs. Widener wrote: "He was permitted by reporter Martin Agronsky of CBS, and two other reporters, to get away with intellectual murder. . . . Thus it came about that at the end of the program, the arrogant co-founder of the anarchic Students for a Democratic Society made an unchallenged statement about 'the poverty around the world that the United States is responsible for.'" Abbie Hoffman, convicted of inciting to riot in Chicago, appeared on the Merv Griffin show wearing a shirt made from the American flag (on the air, CBS thoughtfully blipped it out.) Small wonder that Desmond Smith of CBS once told TV Guide: "There's been a great deal of manipulation from the left. The left and SDS have been getting a great deal of play. Americans are starting to feel they're not getting the whole story."

Since then the credibility gap, notably with respect to so-called documentaries, has widened beyond belief. Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary defines documentary as follows:—"adj. (1) contained or certified in writing; (2) relating to, or employing, documentation in literature or art; broadly, factual, objective." The noun, of course, posseses the same qualities. Neither word belongs in the CBS lexicon. In the famous charade on "Hunger in America," the narrator's off-screen voice said: "Hunger is easy to recognize when it looks like this. This baby is dying of starvation. He was an American. Now he is dead." Heart-rending, but untrue. The baby was born prematurely, and, according to an FCC report, died of "septicemia due to meningitis and peritonitis. . . . There was no evidence to show that either the mother or father was suffering from malnutrition. . . ." Far less attention than it warrants has been paid the outrageous report on Cuba last September, which, by actual count of Accuracy in Media, contained 10 major doubtful statements, including: "For Cuba's poor, things are a good deal better than they used to be . . . the Cuban poor man doesn't want to leave. . . . Schools are free, everyone must go. There is a quite equality of the races now in Cuba. . . ."

So ran the script. However, as AIM pointed out in a letter to CBS News, real life refuses to follow it. On the contrary, the organization cited specific examples of working-class Cubans who risked their lives to flee the Castro regime. One, a Negro bricklayer, was quoted in The New York Times as saying: "Not only is there not enough to eat, but they make you spend extra hours in the fields after a 54-hour work week." As to schooling, AIM pointed out that on January 5, 1969, Castro admitted that 400,000 school-age children were not in school. Brotherhood of man? AIM quoted Erneldo Oliva, an Afro-Cuban and one of the first Castro appointees, to the effect that even under Batista, "whom we rejoiced to see go," Negroes were judges, Senators and high officials. Today only one black man holds an important post. An American Negro, who defected to Castro for five years, returned in 1968 saying that he would rather live in an American jail than remain. Citing the list of inaccuracies, AIM solicited comment from Richard S. Salant, head of CBS News, which was duly forthcoming (and, with the rest of the correspondence, put into the Record). Nine times out of 10, the criticism went unanswered.

Last Tuesday Mr. Salant took a stab at answering criticism of CBS' role in "financing a secret and illegal invasion of Haiti." Here, word, for word, is his rebuttal. "We did not finance the planned invasion. We did nothing illegal. No significant amount of money even inadvertently found its way to persons involved in the invasion plan. The Department of Justice found no unlawful activities on the part of CBS News. And John Davitt, Chief of the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, said, quote: "CBS advised us of the facts, advised the Bureau of Customs that they were there, and that they were filming these episodes.' At one point the Treasury Department asked us not to withdraw from the project. But the short answer to the Vice President is that he is attacking a journalistic investigation that never became a broadcast about an invasion that never took place."

For a short answer, not bad. But let's take a longer look at "Project Nassau," as CBS called it and it is known in the Report of the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Let's note at once that the executive producer, Perry Wolff, served in the same capacity on "The Selling of the Pentagon." Let's also dispose of Mr. Salant. If CBS News did not "finance the proposed invasion," it did, according to the House Report, provide funds for the leasing of a 67-foot schooner which was to be utilized by

the invasion force, reimburse expenses for the transportation of weapons to be used by the conspirators, make payments to the leader of the conspiracy "with full knowledge of his identity and his criminal intentions." "Significant," of course, is what lawyers call a word of art; while exact figures were never forthcoming from CBS, the House Report states that "Project Nassau" cost more than $200,000. CBS cooperation with the government was grudging, and, the Report indicates, evoked at official instance (a CBS cameraman blew the whistle to the authorities).

But let the Subcommittee speak for itself. "The implications of what has been learned are disquieting. To the average viewer, unsophisticated in the intricacies of television production, a network news documentary typically represents a scrupulously objective reporting of actual events shown as they actually transpired. If 'Project Nassau' is any indication, this is not always true. During the preparation of this news documentary, CBS employes and consultants intermingled and interacted with personages actively engaged in breaking the law. Large sums of money were made available to these individuals with no safeguards as to the manner in which these funds would be put to use. Events were set up and staged solely for the purpose of being filmed by the CBS camera. An individual who was retained as a consultant, and later an employe, of CBS, was allowed to or instructed to appear in the actual filming and to provide narration for it. . . .

"The CBS News organization, or at least the individuals charged with the immediate supervision of the project, displayed a shocking indifference to the real possibility that their organization and funds were being made use of to further illegal activities. The control exercised of CBS Management in New York over the activities of the producer in the field seems to have been practically nonexistent . . . Had the decision . . . not to proceed with the documentary been founded on a recognition of any of the deficiencies indicated above, the only remaining question would be why the decision was so long in coming. But, under the circumstances, the rationale for the decision is itself far from reassuring. Rather than responding to any taint of artificiality or fraud in the considerable volume of film which had been prepared, the decision was apparently made on the basis that the project was journalistically unsatisfactory in view of the unfinished nature of the enterprise."

The law requires, television quiz shows and commercials to be honest. Unfortunately, however, the public enjoys no similar protection against "documentaries," a credibility gap which the Subcommittee hopes to bridge. We would like to offer a proposal or two of our own. Believe it or not, Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System Inc., serves as Chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information. Unlike Vice President Agnew, who backed away from the idea, we suggest that he be asked to resign. Moreover, to judge by the record cited above (which has exhausted our space, but barely scratched the surface), CBS television stations stand wide open to challenge on their license renewals, and we urge concerned, public-spirited citizens—as well as the FCC—to respond. CBS, in our view, has forfeited its access to the nation's airwaves. The time has come to turn it off.

TELEGRAM TO FORMER PRESIDENT JOHNSON REGARDING THE CALLEY TRIAL

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, along with the majority of the American public, I was shocked by the decision in the trial of Lt. William Calley, Jr. That sentiment is widespread and growing. One indicator is the amount of mail, telegrams, and telephone calls I have already received from the citizens in my own congressional district vehemently opposed to the trial decision.

I have not only registered my objections to President Nixon in a telegram, but also have sent a wire to former President Lyndon B. Johnson, asking him to lend his enormous prestige to this injustice in this grave hour.

The substance of my telegram follows:

MARCH 31, 1971.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
LBJ Ranch,
Johnson City, Tex.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a Congressman from the "loyal opposition" who supported your leadership as Commander-in-Chief from 1963 to 1969, I beg you to throw the weight of your enormous prestige into the battle to save a man unjustly singled-out, accused and convicted for carrying out the foreign commitments of the United States Government.

Lieutenant Calley's life, the honor of the United States Army, the future effectiveness of the American military mission, and history's judgement of your national leadership in a time of crisis are at stake. The Lieutenant was the instrument of a necessary and agreed upon war policy. He was only one of 534,000 men in combat in Southeast Asia in 1968.

Not having the courage to oppose you as President and Commander-in-Chief, congressional fainthearts, their advancemen in the "fourth estate," and the American apologists for communism have combined to use the Calley trial to further their own selfish or anti-American ambitions. With the Lieutenant's conviction, you, myself, every man who has ever faced the horrors of combat in defense of his nation's policy, and the overwhelming majority of the American public stand "convicted" of being right in opposing communism's world wide war against all free people.

The greatest shame of the Calley trial is that the United States Army did not have the guts to withstand the planned, distorted and malicious pressure to find a "scapegoat" for the war. The trial shall be long remembered as the time when the Army forgot its primary mission—"to close with and destroy the enemy"—but became conscious of its television ratings and "public image."

Mr. President, I know your goals in the prosecution of the war were necessary and honorable; I know you to be a peace-loving man and never lightly sent men into combat; I know for a fact that you abhor the tragedies of war as much if not more than any man; and I also know that you would not be part of condemming a man, government, or nation for the proper fulfillment of a necessary national duty.

On behalf of hundreds of my Congressional District who have protested the Calley trial and decision; on behalf of the millions of men who have worn the uniform of the United State Army; on behalf of men in the future who will be called upon to defend our country because the enemies of freedom will not give up their design of world subjugation; on behalf of the parents and families of those lost defending our policy and our nation's honor; on behalf of all these Mr. President, I beg you to speak out now to help save Lieutenant Calley, the Army, and our nation's honor in this grave hour.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

STRIPPERS MINE ON

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there follows an article in the March 28, 1971, Washington Post, written by Robert Cassidy:

UPHILL BATTLES RAGE, STRIPPERS MINE ON

(By Robert Cassidy)

HAZARD, KY.—Paul Ashley, president of the Appalachian Group to Save the Land and People (AGSLP), halted the tour beside a tiny stream known locally as Young's Fork, a tributary of the Kentucky River. A dozen or so members of the Louisville Audubon Society gathered round as he dipped a test tube in the slow-running water. When Ashley added a few drops from another vial, the water turned red.

"That's a sign of acidity," said Ashley, a former coal miner who is now a schoolteacher and conservationist. Placing the water in a measuring device and holding it up to the sunlight, Ashley showed the group that the water had an acid factor of 4.0. Good drinking water, he said, should measure slightly more than 7. "Nothing can live in that," he said, pointing to the stream.

The Audubon Society members had come to the coal country of Eastern Kentucky for one specific purpose: to study strip mining firsthand.

In graphic terms, they saw what strip mining does to a formerly natural area. They saw the red-brown silt that clogged streams—runoff from a strip mine operation run by the Kentucky Oak Mining Co. several miles outside of Hazard. They saw the "highwalls," sheer escarpments 100 feet high, left when the strippers cut the sides of the mountain to get at the coal. They saw the coal operators' feeble attempts to reclaim the land by planting a few scraggly pine trees on a hillside with a 60 degree sope. They saw roads torn up by overloaded coal trucks.

For many of the Audubon visitors, most from Louisville and Lexington, the trip to Hazard was like a voyage to some uncharted wilderness. Most Blue Grass Kentuckians never visit the coal counties, except as curiosity seekers. One Louisville housewife said, "Everybody should come down here at least once, just to see what it is like." Another visitor, appalled by the rape of the land, commented. "They should have sent the astronauts here. They didn't have to send them 240,000 miles to see a barren part of the universe."

A few years ago, it would have been fair to say that Hazard was as far away as the moon in that man's mind. With the increasing awareness of the environment, the public acceptance of the ecological theory that "Everything affects everything else," strip mining has again become a critical issue in Kentucky and in the nation.

Evidence of this trend can be seen in the following:

West Virginia outlawed strip mining in 22 counties this month.

A half dozen bills are in the congressional hopper, including one by the Nixon administration and another that would ban strip mining completely in six months. Chances are good for a congressional hearing on the subject.

The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), the nation's largest consumer of strip mined coal (about 15 million tons a year), has been sued by three conservation groups for allegedly violating the 1969 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by agreeing to purchase strip mined coal without considering the environmental impact.

Technically speaking, strip mining is only one type of surface mining, which also includes such methods as open-pit mining of

copper. Strip mining involves using mammoth earth-moving machinery to remove the soil, rocks, and vegetation (called the "overburden") covering the coal. Then the coal is removed. One such machine in use in Illinois is 20 stories tall and can gobble up 210 tons of earth in one bite.

The other method used for surface mining coal is augering, which involves boring into a coal seam with giant screws, often as large as 7 feet in diameter. Many a coal operator uses both stripping and augering, as well as deep or underground mining, to get the maximum yield from his seam.

The magnitude of the problem can best be grasped by looking at the statistics. Surface mining accounted for 36 per cent of the estimated 590 million tons of coal mined in the U.S. in 1970. In Kentucky, 50 million—42 per cent—of the 120 million tons produced in 1970 were stripped or augered. It has been estimated that 25,000 men are employed in coal surface mining, including 20,000 of the 90,000 members of the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA).

By 1965, 1.3 million acres had been upset by strip mining, and another 480,000 acres have been added since then, according to the U.S. Bureau of Mines. The Interior Department estimates that by 1980, 5 million acres—an area roughly the size of the State of New Jersey—will have been torn up by strip mining and augering. Although 22 states have surface mining laws, the bureau estimates that only 56,000 acres have been reclaimed thus far—and nearly half of these by nature.

Another measure of the impact on the environment is the fact that a normal forest hillside loses about one ton of soil per acre every year, but a strip mine spoil bank—the pile of "overburden" material—loses 400 tons of soil per acre every year.

Two reasons have been given for the sudden increase in the use of surface-mined coal. First, the energy crisis has put a tremendous burden on coal burning power plants. In the early 1960s, energy planners placed their bets on atomic power as the solution to America's energy needs. But conservationists, mostly in the suburban Northeast, have been surprisingly successful in stopping construction of atomic power plants. It is not stretching the facts to say that the battle against the Long Island Lighting Company's proposed atom-powered plant in Shoreham, N.Y., has increased the demand for strip-mined coal from places like Hazard.

The second major factor was the 1969 Coal Mine Health and Safety Act. This landmark law, though poorly administered has scared the daylights out of most smalltime "dog hole" operators. The tough safety regulations require expensive equipment, and the small operators would rather invest their cash in strip-mining equipment. Under Kentucky law, investing in heavy equipment is especially lucrative since there is no sales tax on equipment purchased to "expand" a coal mining operation.

Nationally the legislative battles over strip mining present a mixed picture, with those favoring its total abolition facing an uphill fight.

In West Virginia, for example, the crusade for abolition was taken up by John D. Rockefeller IV, the 33-year-old secretary of state and a Democartic gubernatorial prospect for 1972.

Rockefeller found himself in a tight political situation before the legislative session opened last January. He could have remained neutral, or he could have come out for partial control: for limiting the areas where coal could be stripped, or for prohibiting stripping on certain steep slopes only.

After much fact-finding and soul-searching, he decided that abolition was the only answer. He supported state Sen. Si Galperin's bill to that effect.

The legislative session is history now. Galperin's bill was replaced by a compromise passed in the last half hour of the session. The new law bans strip mining only in those counties where such mining has not begun. It is still permitted in 33 counties, most of them in the rich coal lands of Southern West Virginia.

Apparently, Rockefeller and his allies were unable to overcome the coal operators' claims that abolition would ruin the state's economy. Rockefeller's counter argument was that the necessary skills were easily transferable to other industries, especially highway building.

When he made his statement at a public hearing at the state capital in Charleston, the audience was hostile. It was learned later that the West Virginia Surface Mining Assn. had packed the meeting with supporters brought in by chartered buses.

The West Virginia case points up the difficulty of trying to legislate a national problem on a state-by-state basis. Many in West Virginia felt that it was unfair to ask their state to make economic sacrifices while others permitted stripping. The burden has now been put on Congress to make national standards.

In the Senate, Democrats Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin and Henry Jackson of Washington have introduced bills. The House has bills from Republican John Saylor of Pennsylvania and Democrats Lloyd Meeds of Washington and Ken Hechler of West Virginia. And there is the administration's bill, the Mined Area Protection Act of 1971, which covers not only coal but all surface mining.

Of these, Hechler's is the toughest. It would end stripping in six months, not the two years that the administration would give the states to write regulations. It provides for stiffer fines, and for citizen class action suits against alleged violators. It includes all federal lands and Indian lands; the administration bill does not. It places authority in a regulatory agency, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), rather than an administrative one, the Interior Department, where the administration would place it. (Hechler has had a running battle with Interior for the last year over the administration of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act. He was instrumental in getting Under Secretary Fred J. Russell fired.)

Hechler's bill declares that "The public has a right to enjoy a safe and healthy human environment" protected by government; the administration bill has no such declaration.

It is too early to tell what Congress will do. Some compromise may be worked out, if hearings are held. Strip mining bills have been offered in the past, but have not even been debated. The coal lobby will use any means necessary to fight national control of stripping.

This process may already have begun. In the recently concluded West Virginia legislative session, Rep. Hechler—the miner's friend and the coal operator's foe—was probably redistricted out of a job.

THE STRIPMINING OF AMERICA

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the February 1971, issue of the Sierra Club Bulletin, Mr. Wayne Davis, professor of zoology at the University of Kentucky, gives an excellent analysis of the present crisis situation we are in with regards to strip mining of coal.

His description of the deplorable aftermath of the strip miners in Kentucky reflect what is also true of so many other areas of the United States. His stand against the strip mining of coal in the United States is well supported within his article which I present below for the information and use of my colleagues:

THE STRIPMINING OF AMERICA

(By Wayne Davis)

Kentucky is being destroyed by stripmining. Not slowly and surely, but rapidly and at an ever accelerating rate. And the disease that affects Kentucky soon may spread to more than half our other states.

Most Sierrans are aware of the problem of acid mine drainage. Sulfur impurities in coal, when excavated and exposed to the air, invite invasion by bacteria which manufacture sulfuric acid. The result is streams with a pH so low that nothing survives but bacteria. The damage is permanent; some sickly red streams run dead a hundred years after mining operations have ceased, with little prospect of improvement in sight.

The extent of the problem is enormous. Keith O. Schwab, of the Federal Water Quality Administration in Cincinnati, has data showing 12,000 miles of degraded streams from mine acid drainage in the Appalachian states. "We can ill afford to lose more streams to mining pollution," he said, "but this is exactly what is happening."

Acid mine drainage has been with us as long as we have been mining coal. It comes from deep mines and surface mines. It has long been accepted by most local people as a price they must pay for an economy which removes the coal and burns it up as quickly as possible. Progress means removing the wealth, destroying it, and leaving the land and streams permanently impoverished.

Acid mine drainage, considered one of the most vicious of industry by-products, is trivial however compared to the massive onrush of destruction caused by the incredibly rapid move to surface mining.

In surface mining heavy machinery removes the soil, including trees, grass and everything else on the surface, to expose the coal seam beneath. In the steep hill country of Eastern Kentucky, this means pushing massive amounts of spoil down the mountainside. Even the largest trees are broken and pushed over. The magnitude of the devastation is difficult to imagine for anyone who has not seen it. Man's ever accelerating technology, now rushing forward faster than the speed of thought, has designed machinery which will move 100 cubic yards of dirt with a single bite. Such shovels, standing as high as a 12 story building, are used around the clock, as is the smaller equipment at many of the mountain stripping sites. With profits running as high as 50 percent annual return on the dollar invested and the minimum price of Eastern Kentucky coal having doubled over a 6 month period last year, the rush is on while the getting is good. Western Sierrans who watched the timber barons' frenzied efforts to cut as many big trees as they could before Congress established a national park will understand the rape of Kentucky. As stripping grows and as people become more informed, the opposition forces encompass an ever larger segment of the public.

When rain falls upon a strip mine site massive quantities of mud wash into the streams. A study by the U.S. Forest Service in Kentucky showed streams carried as much as 46,000 ppm of suspended sediment, compared to a maximum of 150 ppm in adjacent forested watersheds. Stream bed burdens of as much as 66,500 cubic feet of sediment per square mile of watershed were observed in the stripped areas. In addition to the stream beds the woodland flood plains were also made a muddy mess from silt. Subsequent rains not only brought down more silt but moved part of the previous loads on

downstream, affecting more of our watercourses.

Bethlehem Steel Corporation has mined the high quality low sulfur coal needed for processing steel from deep mines in Eastern Kentucky for many years without arousing the displeasure of conservationists. However, their decision in 1969 to strip 40,000 acres in several counties changed them from an acceptable responsible corporation into the number one target and rallying point for the anti-stripping forces. Stripmining not only puts permanent scars on the mountainsides, but it also kills the streams, which are public property.

Silt kills streams by destroying the nature of the bed. Many aquatic invertebrates upon which fish feed live beneath stones in the gravel-covered bottom of a stream. A fine load of silt from the clay-banks above glues down the stones, making them inaccessible and preventing the free movement of oxygen-carrying water among the gravel and beneath the stones.

The effect upon spawning of fish is similar. Most species of game fish lay eggs in the gravel of the stream bottom. If a fine layer of silt washes off the strip mine spoils and covers the eggs, they are deprived of sufficient oxygen for development and fail to hatch. Thus the stripminers rob the public of a valued resource.

Although land destruction occurs, acid mine drainage and silt are the best known effects of stripmining, a less known but equally dangerous factor may be the raising of the mineral ion concentration of the water effecting its usability by man and his industries. The U.S. Public Health Service sets standards for drinking water quality and the various industries have their own tolerance levels depending upon the purpose of the water they use.

The U.S. Forest Service has done studies on the effects of stripmining on water quality in Eastern Kentucky. In a report they point out that although the U.S. Public Health Service's Maximum Permissible Level for sulfates in water is 250 ppm, on severely disturbed watersheds in Eastern Kentucky they found concentrations ranging up to 2100 ppm. Whereas the tolerance level for manganese is 0.05 ppm., concentrations of up to 74 ppm were found, and for iron, whose recommended maximum level is 0.3 ppm, concentrations ranged up to 88 ppm.

Why the tremendous increase in stripmining activity? Many reasons have coalesced to result in today's frenzy.

The use of electrical power, pushed along by Madison Avenue's request that we live better electrically, have been growing at 7 percent per year, a rate which doubles consumption every 10 years. Coal is a major energy source for power generators.

Even with nuclear reactor power generators increasing at a rate that doubles their numbers every 2.4 years, with this rate expected to continue at least through 1980, the demand for power is increasing so fast that coal powered generators also are being built.

The scarcity of natural gas, which caused gas companies in the East to deny service to many new industrial customers in 1970, and the ever increasing dependency of this country on foreign oil sources, has increased the interest in coal, one resource which is still in abundant supply.

The new mine safety law has helped push operators out of deep mining into the stripmining business. Stripping produces three times as much coal per man as an underground operation and requires less machinery and investment. It is safer for the workers and more profitable to the operators. The result has been that the strip mine has risen from 29 percent of the production 10 years ago to 36 percent today. In the steep Appalachian hills of 9 states strip mine benches now extend for 20,000 miles. Since only 4.6 billion of the estimated 108 billion tons of strippable coal have been harvested, one can see what the future holds.

As the acceleration of stripmining proceeds, attempts to regulate it are frustrated. Although Kentucky has a fairly good mining reclamation law and some honest, conscientious people in the Division of Reclamation, law enforcement has broken down. An employee of the Division told me that during the summer of 1970 permits were issued to over 100 new operators. Since anyone who can borrow enough to get a bulldozer into operation can go into business and get rich now, there is a flood of new people into stripmining. The enforcement officer said that some of these inexperienced operators could not operate within the law even if trying to do so and spills of spoil onto public highways and into the streams are the result.

The business is so lucrative that an operator has been quoted as saying that if we will leave him alone for just two years he doesn't care if we outlaw stripmining, for by that time he would be rich enough to retire.

Operators are getting rich and selling out to the big corporations. The giants of oil and steel, smelling the killing at hand, have been rushing into the fray like a pack of sharks to a bleeding swimmer. The major stripmining operations are subsidiaries of such corporations as Gulf Oil, Humble Oil, U.S. Steel and Bethlehem Steel. TVA is also heavily involved.

If you think coal mining is only a problem for Kentucky and such well known coal states as West Virginia, Pennsylvania and Illinois, you are in for a surprise. A total of 26 states have strippable reserves of coal. We easterners will not even be in the running when the big time arrives, because the states with the largest reserves of strippable coal are North Dakota, Montana and Wyoming. If we draw a line from Pennsylvania to the coal-laden northwestern tip of Georgia, every state west of the line except Wisconsin, Minnesota and Hawaii has some coal deposits. With the industry's trend toward building power plants where the coal is, the destruction of parts of your state may be even now on the shallow horizon.

Stripmining as a big business has moved into Ohio. Ben A. Franklin of the New York Times reports that 5 billion tons of low grade fuel, long considered too marginal for mass mining, lie near the surface in Ohio, and the boom is on from Cincinnati to the east-central border to recover it. In 346,000 acre Belmont County alone 200,000 acres have been sold, leased or optioned to the strippers. Two giant electric shovels, each 12 stories high, scoop up farms, barns, silos, churches and roads to uncover the coal, piling the rubble into strip mine spoil banks. Franklin quotes Ohio Congressman Wayne Hays, whose home is in Belmont County, as saying "They're turning this beautiful place into a desert," but Ford Sampson, head of the Ohio Coal Association, is credited with the line, "Are we going to cut off the electric power because some guy has a sentimental feeling about an acre of coal?"

Perhaps a better example of what we are up against is illustrated by the opinion of James D. Riley, a vice president of Consolidation Coal Company, who spoke to the American Mining Congress in Pittsburgh in 1969. To the thunderous applause of the assembled strip miners, Mr. Riley declared that the conservationists who demand a better job of land reclamation are "stupid idiots, socialists and commies who don't know what they are talking about. I think it is our bounden duty to knock them down and subject them to the ridicule they deserve."

What can be done? First we must insist that Americans take their heads out of the sand and recognize the fact that power demand cannot continue to rise as it has been. Nothing—whether the power demand, the production of coal, the number of people, the number of cars, or the gross national product—can continue indefinitely to rise at an exponential rate in a finite world. The sooner we face reality on this the sooner we can begin to attack the problems.

So the next time the power tycoons tell you they must double power capacity by 1980 you should reply, "Nonsense—long before 1980 we must plan and put into practice a program to level off power consumption at something like present levels or less."

Second we must have federal regulations of mining practices. Any local efforts to regulate this or any other industry encounter the standard and somewhat justified reply that regulation would put them at a disadvantage with their competitors in other states.

Dr. Robert Kuehne says that in Kentucky we could not have designed a better system to ruin the maximum number of streams in a shorter period. Instead of mining watersheds that are already destroyed until all the coal is gone, the economic system assures that we skip around in such a way as to kill all our streams in the coal country.

The Committee on Resources and Man of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council has pointed out that the culmination of oil production in this country is now at hand and the culmination of natural gas will arrive at the end of this decade. We are now dependent upon foreign sources for 20 percent of our oil supplies, and by the end of this decade this is expected to rise to 40–45 percent. Although coal reserves are much greater, we should not continue to treat them as the common enemy to be destroyed with all speed by the system found to be so effective in getting rid of our oil and gas.

We simply cannot afford to continue the present pattern of exploitation of the fossil fuels.

A FAIR MINIMUM FAMILY INCOME

(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 am pleased today to be able to introduce what I believe to be historic legislation for the benefit of our senior citizens, the blind and disabled, and the needy families throughout our land.

What I propose is relatively simple: that we recognize the minimum family budgets calculated by our U.S. Department of Labor and use these budgets as a basis for establishing the principle of a "fair minimum family income" for the poor, the aged, the blind, and the severely disabled.

The cost of what I propose in its initial years is within the sums discussed for full Federal assumption of welfare and medicaid costs on the basis of the legislation passed by the House last year. The cost would rise over a 5-year period as we seek to establish the fair minimum income level. But I think we eventually are going to pay this cost because the American conscience will not tolerate indefinitely the neglect of the Nation's poor—when we have the resources to give them decent standards of living.

My legislation proposes benefits based upon the different needs of families of different sizes. It would begin by assuring an aged, blind, or severely disabled individual an income of $1,800 a year, or $150 a month, and raise that over a 5-year period to $2,300 a year.

A needy couple—which would include millions of senior citizens—would be guaranteed an income of $3,100 a year in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972, and would raise this income guarantee to $3,600 a year over a 5-year period. My bill provides for a cost of living factor which would keep these income guarantees from being destroyed by inflation—the level would rise with the cost of living during the 5-year transition period.

In the case of needy families, the annual income guarantee would rise from $2,950 for a parent and one child in the first year of the program to a guarantee of $5,600 a year for a family of six or more persons. These levels would rise in 5 years to $3,550 a year for a two-person family and to $8,600 for a family of six or more persons.

These may seem like large figures when compared to what we have been paying in our welfare programs. The figures we often read on welfare payments are not strictly comparable, however. The publicized current figure seldom include nonwelfare income, food stamps, and other family support.

The program I propose offers a guarantee of a fair minimum family income and would provide for the payment from the Federal Treasury of the difference between what the needy person receives in earnings, social security benefits, food stamps and other income. It is designed to bridge the gap—often a large one—between what the least fortunate individuals and families receive income and what they need for a minimally decent standard of living.

I might point out that the fair minimum family budget which I have chosen for this legislation is the lowest of three budgets calculated regularly by the Bureau of Labor statistics. It is below what the Bureau considers to be a "decent" family budget and even below the "intermediate" budget which is rated below the decent living standard.

My legislation provides initially for the Federal Government to assume the full cost of the existing welfare and the full cost of the medicaid program. This would relieve a great financial burden of the States and make possible a simplified national welfare system. This system would be more efficiently administered, would include work incentives, and would reduce many of the indignities and abuses of the present State-Federal system.

I do not propose this as a substitute for revenue sharing, however. I have supported revenue sharing in previous Congresses and I have reintroduced today my legislation, amended to provide for approximately $2 billion in shared revenue in fiscal 1972, based upon one-half of 1 percent of the taxable personal income.

It is my belief that the need for revenue sharing is greatest at the local government level. The ad valorem tax on property is wholly inadequate for local revenue needs and the limited areas of local governments make other local revenue measures, such as municipal income taxes, difficult to impose and collect with any sense of equity. I have proposed, therefore, that 75 percent of shared Federal revenue be passed on to the local governments according to federally approved plans developed by the Governor of each State and based on population, population density, per capita income and other factors reflecting need.

At the point, Mr. Speaker, I include the text, first of my welfare reform proposal:

H.R. —

An act to authorize the payment by the United States of all the financial obligations under existing Federal-State welfare programs under the Social Security Act and waiving matching payments from the respective States for the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1971, and to replace said programs with a national plan of income to enable the aged, blind, or severely disabled persons and families with children to attain a standard of living sufficient to provide for basic human needs, to provide incentives for employment and training to improve the capacity of employment of such persons and family members, and otherwise to improve their living conditions, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Fair Minimum Income Act of 1971."

TRANSITIONAL PROVISION

SEC. 101. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of providing the payment by the United States of the total cost of the Federal-State programs during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1971, provided for in titles I, IV, X, XI, XIV, XVI, XIX and 707, part B, title IV relating to child welfare services and section 410 relating to the authorization to locate missing parents of children, thereby waiving any and all matching payments, if any, by the respective States required thereunder, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for said fiscal year a sum sufficient to carry on the purposes of this section.

TITLE IV ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL FAIR MINIMUM INCOME PLAN

SEC. 102. Title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) is amended by adding after part C the following new parts:

"PART D—FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN

"APPROPRIATIONS

"PART D—NATIONAL FAIR MINIMUM INCOME PLAN

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 441. For the purpose of providing a national fair minimum annual income plan throughout the Nation and to provide for the basic human needs of aged, blind, or severely disabled persons, couples, and families with children, in a manner which will strengthen their lives, encourage work training and self-support, and enhance personal welfare and dignity, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1972, and for each fiscal year thereafter a sum sufficient to carry out the purpose of this part.

"ELIGIBILITY FOR AND AMOUNT OF NATIONAL FAIR MINIMUM BENEFITS

"Eligibility

"SEC. 442. (a) Each aged, blind, or severely disabled person, couple or family (as defined in section 445)—

"(c) whose income in a base year, other than income excluded under section 443(b) is less than the national fair minimum income standard applicable to said base year, as provided in section 443(e) and

"(2) whose resources, other than resources excluded pursuant to section 444(b), are less than $2,500 in the case of an aged, blind, or severely disabled person, and are less than $5,000 in the case of a couple or of a family, shall in accordance with and subject to the other provisions of this part, be paid the benefits provided in section 442(b) herein.

"Amount of Benefits

"(b) The benefits payable for a payment quarter to each person, couple, or family eligible therefor under section 442(a) and (d) of this part shall be a sum equal to one-fourth of the difference between the income in the base year of such person, couple, or family, other than income excluded under section 443(b) of this part, and the national fair minimum income standard applicable to such person, couple, or family for such base year; *Provided, however,* that such benefits shall be computed and paid to the nearest dollar and that the minimum benefits payable shall not be less than $15 for any payment quarter (as defined in section 445(n) of this part), notwithstanding any other provision herein.

"(c) In addition to the benefits provided for in section 442(b) of this part, there shall be paid to each person, couple, or family eligible under section 442(a) of this part, a benefit equal to 50 cents for each dollar of earned income in a base year, as defined in section 443(a)(1), not to exceed a total of $2,800 in each year in excess of the national fair minimum income standard applicable to such person, couple, or family.

"Period for Determination of Benefits

"(d)(1) Eligibility for and benefits under this part shall be determined by the Secretary for each payment quarter on the basis of income in the base year other than income excluded under section 443(b), and the national fair minimum income standard applicable to said base year, on the basis of the Secretary's estimate of the income for such quarter, after taking into account such income in the base year. Eligibility for and the benefits hereunder for any payment quarter shall be redetermined at such time or times as may be provided by the Secretary and such redeterminations shall be effective prospectively for such quarter.

"(2) The Secretary shall by regulation prescribe the cases in which and the extent to which the amount of benefits for any payment quarter shall be reduced by reason of the time elapsing since the beginning of such quarter and before the date of filing the application for the benefit.

"(3) The Secretary may, in accordance with regulations promulgated by him, prescribe the cases in which and the extent to which income received in one period (or expenses incurred in one period in earning income) shall, for the purposes of determining eligibility for the amount of benefits, be considered or received (or incurred) in another period or periods.

"Special Limits on Gross Income

"(d) The Secretary may, in accordance with regulations promulgated by him, prescribe the circumstances under which the gross income from a trade or business (including farming) will be considered sufficiently large to make an aged, blind, or severely disabled person, couple, or family ineligible for such benefits provided in section 5 of this part.

"National fair minimum income standards

"(e)(1) For purposes of this part, national fair minimum income standards for an aged, blind, or severely disabled person, couple, or a family of a given size shall be the amounts shown in the following table, adjusted as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection:

Person, couple or family size	National fair minimum annual income standard for fiscal year beginning July 1, in—					
	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977 [1]
Aged, blind, or severely disabled person	$1,800	$1,900	$2,000	$2,100	$2,200	$2,300
Couple	3,100	3,200	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600
Family of:						
2 persons	2,950	3,050	3,150	3,250	3,350	3,550
3 persons	3,300	3,650	4,100	4,450	4,800	5,100
4 persons	4,150	4,550	4,950	5,350	5,750	6,250
5 persons	5,000	5,400	5,800	6,200	6,600	7,150
6 or more	5,600	6,200	6,800	7,400	7,800	8,600

[1] And thereafter.

"(2) Between April 1 and June 30 of each calendar year, beginning with 1973, the Secretary (A) shall adjust the national fair minimum annual income standard for each such person, couple, or family by size in the table in paragraph (1) by increasing such amount by the percentage by which the average level of the price index for each year ending on March 31 exceeds the average level of the price index for the year ending on March 31, 1972, and (B) shall promulgate the amounts so adjusted as the national fair minimum annual income standards applicable under this part which shall be conclusive for purposes of this part for the fiscal year beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation, *provided, however,* that such adjustment shall be made and promulgated to the nearest fifty dollars.

"(3) As used in this subsection, the term 'price index'" means the Consumer Price Index (all items—United States city average) published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

"Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam

"(f) For special provisions applicable to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, see section 1108(e) of the Social Security Act, as amended.

"INCOME

"Meaning of Income

"Sec. 443(a). For purposes of this part, income means both earned income and unearned income; and

"(1) earned income means only—

"(A) remuneration for services performed as an employee (defined in section 210(j) of the Social Security Act), other than remuneration to which section 209(b), (c), (d), (f), or (k), or section 211, therein, would apply; and

"(B) net earnings from self-employment, as defined in section 211 in said act (without the application of the second and third sentences following clause (C) of subsection (a)(9)), including earnings for services described in paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) of subsection (c); and

"(2) unearned income means all other income, including—

"(A) any payments received as an annuity, pension, retirement, or disability benefit, including veteran's or workmen's compensation and old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, railroad retirement, and unemployment benefit;

"(B) prizes and award;

"(C) the proceeds of any life insurance policy;

"(D) gifts (cash or otherwise), support and alimony payments, and inheritances; and

"(E) rents, dividends, interest, and royalties.

"Exclusions From Income

"(b) In determining the income of a family there shall be excluded—

"(1) subject to limitations (as to amount or otherwise) prescribed by the Secretary, the earned income of each child in the family who is, as determined by the Secretary under regulations, a student regularly attending a school, college, or university, or a course of vocational or technical training designed to prepare him for gainful employment;

"(2) (A) the total unearned income of an aged, blind, or severely disabled person, couple, or of all members of a family in a calendar quarter which, as determined in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Secretary, is received too infrequently or irregularly to be included, if such income so received does not exceed $30 in such quarter and (B) the total earned income of an aged, blind, or disabled person, couple, or of all members of a family in a calendar quarter which, as determined in accordance with such criteria, is received too infrequently or irregularly to be included, if such income so received does not exceed $30 in such quarter;

"(3) an amount of earned income of a member of the family equal to all, or such part (and according to such schedule) as the Secretary may prescribe, of the cost incurred by such member for child care which the Secretary deems necessary to securing or continuing in manpower training, vocational rehabilitation, employment, or self-employment;

"(4) any costs (whether in the form of insurance premiums or otherwise) incurred for medical care or for any other type of remedial care recognized under Federal, State, or local government law, including costs under part E of this title, except as provided in section 452(a)(10);

"(5) any assistance (except food stamps and veterans' pensions) which is based on need and furnished by any State or political subdivision of a State or any Federal agency, or by any private charitable agency or organization (as determined by the Secretary);

"(6) allowances under section 432(a) of the Social Security Act;

"(7) any portion of a scholarship or fellowship received for use in paying the cost of tuition and fees at any educational (including technical or vocational education) institution; and

"(8) home produce of an aged, blind, or severely disabled person, couple, or a member or members of a family utilized for his or their home consumption.

"RESOURCES

"Exclusions From Resources

"Sec. 44. (a) In determining the resources of an aged, blind, or severely disabled person, couple, or family there shall be excluded—

"(1) the home, household goods, and personal effects; and

"(2) other property which, as determined in accordance with and subject to limitations in regulations of the Secretary, is so essential to such person's, couple's, or family's means of self-support as to warrant its exclusion.

"Disposition of Resources

"(b) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations applicable to the period or periods of time within which, and the manner in which, various kinds of property must be disposed of in order not to be included in determining a family's eligibility for benefits under this part. Any portion of the benefits paid for any such period shall be conditioned upon such disposal; and any benefits so paid shall (at the time of the disposal) be considered overpayments to the extent they would not have been paid had the disposal occurred at the beginning of the period for which such benefits were paid.

"DEFINITIONS

"Composition of Family

"Sec. 445. (a) Two or more individuals—

"(1) who are related by blood, marriage, or adoption,

"(2) who are living in a place of residence maintained by one or more of them as his or their own home,

"(3) who are residents of the United States, and

"(4) at least one of whom is a child who (A) is not married to another of such individuals and (B) is in the care of or dependent upon another of such individuals, shall be regarded as a family for purposes of this part and parts A, C, and E. A parent (of a child living in a place of residence referred to in paragraph (2)), or a spouse of such a parent, who is determined by the Secretary to be temporarily absent from such place of residence for the purpose of engaging in or seeking employment or self-employment (including military service) shall nevertheless be considered (for purposes of paragraph (2)) to be living in such place of residence.

"Definition of Child

"(b) For purposes of this part and parts C and E the term 'child' means an individual who is (1) under the age of eighteen, or (2) under the age of twenty-one and (as determined by the Secretary under regulations) a student regularly attending a school, college, or university, or a course of vocational or technical training designed to prepare him for gainful employment.

"DEFINITION OF MEMBER

"(c) 'Member' shall include father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, brother, sister, stepfather, stepmother, stepbrother, stepsister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, nephew, niece or any other individual who is related to another individual by blood, marriage, or adoption, as provided by appropriate State law.

"Income and Resources of Noncontributing Adult

"(d) For purposes of determining elegibility for and the amount of benefits payable under this part there shall be excluded the income and resources of any individual, other than a parent of a child (or a spouse of a parent), which, as determined in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Secretary, is not available to the other member of the couple or other members of the family; and for such purposes such individual—

"(1) in the case of a child, shall be regarded as a member of the family for purposes of determining the family's eligibility for such benefits but not for purposes of determining the amount of such benefits, and

"(2) in any other case, shall not be considered a member of the couple or of the family for any purpose.

"Aged, Blind, and Severely Disabled Recipients of Benefits

"(e) If an aged, blind, or disabled person or couple is receiving benefits under this part, then for the period for which such benefits are received, such person or couple shall not be regarded as a member of a family for purposes of determining eligibility for and the amount of benefits under this part.

"Definition of Aged Persons

"(f) 'Aged person' means an individual who is sixty-five years of age or over

"Definition of Blind Person

"(g) 'Blind person' means an individual who is blind as determined in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Secretary.

"Definition of Severely Disabled Person

"(h) 'Severely disabled person' means an individual, 18 years of age or older under a severe disability, as determined in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Secretary.

Definition of Couple

"(i) 'Couple' means any two individuals who are aged, blind, or severely disabled, or any combinaiton thereof, who are related by blood, marriage or adoption, who are living in a place of residence maintained by one or both of them as his, her, or their own homes, and who are residents of the United States.

"Exclusion from Definitions of Aged, Blind, Severely Disabled Person and Couple

"(j) The terms 'aged person', 'blind person' 'severely disabled person' and 'couple' shall exclude any individual who is an inmate of a public institution (except as a patient in a medical institution).

"Definition of National Fair Minimum Income Standard

"(k) 'national fair minimum income standard' means the amount of annual income in a base year determined by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this part to enable an aged, blind, severely disabled person or a couple or family to attain a standard of living sufficient to provide for basic human needs.

"(1) 'benefits' means the money payments payable under this part on or after July 1, 1972, to eligible persons, couples, or families. 'Benefits' also include money payments which are not included within the meaning of such term under the preceding sentence, but which would be so included except that they are made on behalf of any such persons, or couple, or family to another individual who (as determined in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary) is interested in or concerned with the welfare of such person, couple, or family; the secretary shall provide for

"(1) determination by him that such person, or a member or members of a couple, or of a family, has, by reason of his physical or mental condition, such inability to manage funds that making payments to him would be contrary to his welfare and, therefore, it is necessary to provide such assistance through payments described in this sentence;

"(2) making such payments only in cases in which such payments will, under the rules otherwise applicable under this part for determining the amount of benefits to be paid (and in conjunction with other income and resources), meet all the basic human needs of the person, couple, or family to whom such payments are made;

"(3) undertaking and continuing special efforts to protect the welfare of such person, couple, or family and to improve, to the extent possible, capacity for self-care and to manage funds;

"(4) periodic review by the Secretary under paragraph (1) of this subsection to ascertain whether conditions justifying such determination still exist, with provision for termination of such payments if they do not and for seeking judicial appointment of a guardian or other legal representative, as described in section 1311 of this title, if and when it appears that such action will best serve the interests of such person, couple or family; and

"(5) opportunity for a fair hearing before the Secretary on the determination referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection for any person, couple, or family with respect to who it is made.

"Definition of Quarter

"(m) 'quarter' means a calendar quarter ending on March 31, June 30, September 30 or December 31.

"Definition of Payment Quarter

"(n) 'payment quarter' means a quarter with respect to which (or with respect to any part thereof) a claim for benefits is made under this part.

"Definition of Base Year

"(o) 'base year' means a period of four consecutive quarters immediately preceding the completed quarter immediately prior to a payment quarter.

"Definition of Month

"(p) 'month' means a calendar month.

"Definitions of United States

"(q) 'United States,' when used in a geographical sense, means, except when otherwise provided, the fifty states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

"Definition of State

"(r) 'State,' except where otherwise provided, means each of the fifty states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Guam.

"PAYMENTS AND PROCEDURES

"SEC. 446. (a)(1) Benefits shall be paid at such time or times and in such installments as the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes of this part.

"(2) Payment of benefits under this part may be made to the aged, blind, or severely disabled person, or to any one or more members of the couple or of the family, or, if the Secretary deems it appropriate, to any person, other than such person, member or members of the couple, or of the family, who is interested in or concerned with the welfare of such person, couple, or family, in accordance with such regulations of the Secretary.

"(3) Whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that any payments of benefits to families made with respect to a child are not being or may not be used in the best interests of the child, he may provide for such counseling and guidance services with respect to the use of such payments and the management of other funds by the member of the family receiving such payments as he deems advisable in order to assure use of such payments in the best interests of such child, and may provide for advising such relative that continued failure to so use such payments will result in substitution therefore for payments as provided in the second sentence of section 445(1) of this title, or in seeking appointment of a guardian or legal representative as provided in section 1311 of this title, or in the imposition of criminal or civil penalties authorized under State law if it is determined by a court of competent jurisdiction that such member is not using or has not used for the benefit of the child any such payments made for that purpose; and the provision of such services or advice by the Secretary or the taking of the action specified in such advice shall not prevent such payments with respect to such child from being considered benefits under this part.

"Overpayments and Underpayments

"(b) Whenever the Secretary finds that more or less than the correct amount of benefits has been paid with respect to any aged, blind, or severely disabled person, or couple, or family, proper adjustment or recovery shall, subject to the succeeding provisions of this subsection, be made by appropriate adjustments in future payments with respect to such person, couple, or family, or by recovery from or payment to such person or to any one or more members of such couple or of such family. The Secretary shall make such provision as he finds appropriate in the case of payment of more than the correct amount of benefits with respect to an aged, blind, or severely disabled person, or couple, or family, with a view to avoid penalizing such person, or members of a couple, or of a family who were without fault in connection with the overpayment, if adjustment or recovery on account of such overpayment in such case would defeat the purposes of this part, or be against equity or good conscience, or (because of the small amount involved) impede efficient or effective administration of this part.

"EARNINGS AND REVIEW

"(c)(1) The Secretary shall provide reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to any individual who is or claims to be an aged, blind, or severely disabled person, or a member of a couple or of a family and is in disagreement with any determination under this part with respect to eligibility of such person, couple, or family for benefits, the number of members of the family, or the amount of benefits, if such individual requests a hearing on the matter in disagreement within thirty days after notice of such determination is received. Until a determination is made on the basis of such hearing or upon disposition of the matter through default, withdrawal of the request by the individual, or revision of the initial determination by the Secretary, any amounts which are payable (or would be payable but for the matter in disagreement) to any individual who has been determined to be such person or a member of such couple or family shall continue to be paid; but any amounts so paid for periods prior to such determination or disposition shall be considered overpayments to the extent they would not have been paid had such determination or disposition occurred at the same time as the Secretary's initial determination on the matter in disagreement.

"(2) Determination on the basis of such hearing shall be made within ninety days after the individual requests the hearing as provided in paragraph (1).

"(3) The final determination of the Secretary after a hearing under paragraph (1) shall be subject to judicial review as provided in section 205(g) of the Social Security Act to the same extent as the Secretary's final determinations under section 205; except that the determination of the Secretary after such hearing as to any fact shall be final and conclusive and not subject to review by any court.

"Procedures; Prohibition of Assignments

"(d)(1) The provisions of sections 206 and 207 and subsections (a), (d), (e), and (f) of section 205 of the Social Security Act shall apply with respect to this Act to the same extent as they apply in the case of title II of said Act.

"(d)(2) The benefits paid under this part or medical assistance under part E shall not be subject to any tax under any Federal, state or local government law otherwise imposed on any aged, blind, or severely disabled person, member of a couple or of a family, or members of a couple or family.

"Applications and Furnishing of Information

"(e)(1) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations applicable to aged, blind, or severely disabled persons, couples, families, or members thereof with respect to the filing of applications, the furnishing of other data and material, and the reporting of events and changes in circumstances, as may be necessary to determine eligibility for an amount of family assistance benefits under this part.

"(2) In order to encourage prompt reporting of events and changes in circumstances relevant to eligibility for or amount of payments under this part, and more accurate estimates of expected income or expenses by such persons, couples, family, or members of such couples or families for purposes of such eligibility and amount of benefits, the Secretary may prescribe the cases in which and the extent to which—

"(A) failure to so report or delay in so reporting, or

"(B) inaccuracy of information which is furnished by such persons, couples, or members and on which the estimates of income or expenses for such purposes are based,

will result in treatment as overpayments of all or any portion of payments of such benefits for the period involved.

"Furnishing of Information by Other Agencies

"(f) The head of any Federal agency shall provide such information as the Secretary needs for purposes of determining eligibility for or amount of benefits under this part, or verifying other information with respect thereto.

"REGISTRATION AND REFERRAL OF FAMILY MEMBERS FOR MANPOWER SERVICES, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 447. (a) Every individual who is a member of a family found to be eligible for benefits under this part, other than a member to whom the Secretary finds paragaph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of subsection (b) applies, shall register for manpower services, training, and employment with the local public employment office of the State as provided by regulations of the Secretary of Labor. If and for so long as any such member is found by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to have failed to so register, he shall not be regarded as a member of a family but his income which would otherwise be counted under this part as income shall be so counted; except that if such member is the only member of the family other than a child, such member shall be regarded as a member for purposes of determination of the family's eligibility for benefits under this part, but not (except for counting his income) for purposes of determination of the amount of such benefits. No part of the benefits under this part may be paid to such member during the period for which the preceding sentence is applicable to him; and the Secretary may, if he deems it appropriate, provide for payment of such benefits during such period to any person, other than a member of such family, who is interested in or concerned with the welfare of such family.

"(b) A member of a family eligible under this part shall not be required to register pursuant to subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that such member is—

"(1) unable to engage in work or training by reason of illness, incapacity, or advanced age;

"(2) a mother or other relative of a child under the age of six who is caring for such child;

"(3) the mother or other female caretaker of a child, if the father or another adult male relative is in the home and not excluded by paragraph (1), (2), (4), or (5) of this subsection (unless the second sentence of subsection (a), or section 448(a), is applicable to him);

"(4) a child who is under the age of sixteen or meets the requirements of section 445(b)(2); or

"(5) one whose presence in the home on a substantially continuous basis is required because of the illness or incapacity of another member of the household. A person or such member who would, but for the preceding sentence, be required to register pursuant to subsection (a), may, if he wishes, register as provided in such subsection.

"(c) The Secretary shall make provision for the furnishing of child care services in applicable cases and for so long as he deems appropriate in the case of (1) members of families registered pursuant to subsection (a) who are, pursuant to such registration, participating in manpower services, training, or employment, and (2) members of families referred pursuant to subsection (d) who are, pursuant to such referral, participating in vocational rehabilitation.

"(d) In the case of an aged, blind, or severely disabled person, or member of a couple, or of any member of a family receiving benefits under this part who is not required to register pursuant to subsection (a) because of such person's or member's incapacity, the Secretary may, within his discretion, make provision for referral of such person or such member to the appropriate State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and (except in such cases involving permanent incapacity as the Secretary may determine) for a review not less often than quarterly of such person's or such member's incapacity and his need for and utilization of the rehabilitation services made available to him under such plan. If and for so long as such person or such member is found by the Secretary to have refused without good cause to accept rehabilitation services available to him under such plan, he shall be treated as an individual to whom subsection (a) is applicable by reason of refusal to accept or participate in employment or training.

"DENIAL OF BENEFITS IN CASE OF REFUSAL OF MANPOWER SERVICES, TRAINING, OR EMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 448. (a) For purposes of determining eligibility for and amount of benefits under this part, a member of a family who has registered as required under section 447(a) shall not be regarded as a member of a family, but this income which would otherwise be counted as income of the family under this part shall be so counted, if and for so long as he has been found by the Secretary of Labor, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing (which shall be held in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as a hearing under section 446(c) (1) and (2)), to have refused without good cause to participate or continue to participate in manpower services, training, or employment, or to have refused without good cause to accept employment in which he is able to engage which is offered through the public employment offices of the State, or is otherwise offered by an employer if the offer of such employer is determined by the Secretary of Labor, after notification by such employer or otherwise, to be a bona fide offer of employment; except that if such member of a family is the only member of the family other than a child, such member shall be regarded as a member of the family for purposes of determination of the family's eligibility for benefits, but not (except for counting his income) for the purposes of determination of the amount of its benefits. No part of the benefits of any such family may be paid to such member during the period for which the preceding sentence is applicable to him; and the Secretary may, if he deems it appropriate, provided for payment of such benefits during such period to any person, other than a member of such family, who is interested in or concerned with the welfare of the family.

"(b) No family shall be denied benefits under this part, or have benefits under this part reduced, because a member of such family is (or would, but for subsection (a), be) a member of such family refuses work under any of the following conditions:

"(1) if the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lockout, or other labor, dispute;

"(2) if the wages, hours, or other terms or conditions of the work offered are contrary to or less than those prescribed by Federal, State, or local law or are substantially less favorable to such member than those prevailing for similar work in the locality;

"(3) if, as a condition of being employed, such member would be required to join a company union or to resign from or refrain from joining any bona fide labor organization; or

"(4) Such member has the demonstrated capacity, through other available training or employment opportunities, of securing work that would better enable him to achieve self-sufficiency.

"TRANSFER OF FUNDS FOR ON-THE-JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 449. The Secretary shall, pursuant to and to the extent provided by agreement with the Secretary of Labor, pay to the Secretary of Labor amounts which he estimates would be paid as benefits under this part to individuals participating in public or private employer compensated on-the-job training under a program of the Secretary of Labor if they were not participating in such training. Such amounts shall be available to pay the costs of such programs.

"PART E—MEDICAL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE FOR AGED, BLIND, OR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS, COUPLES, AND FAMILIES

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 451. For the purpose of enabling the Secretary on and after July 1, 1972, to furnish medical assistance on behalf of aged, blind, or severely disabled persons, couples, or families, who are eligible under Part D of this Title, and whose income (including benefits under Part D of this Title) and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary services, medical care, including rehabilitation and other services to help such persons and members of such couples or of such families attain or retain capability for independence or self-care, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this part.

"PROGRAM PROVISIONS

"SEC. 452(a) To carry out the purposes of section 451, the Secretary shall provide, under such regulations as he may promulgate,

"(1) for granting an opportunity for a fair hearing and review under section 446(c) to any individual whose claim for medical assistance under this part is denied or is not acted upon with reasonable promptness;

"(2) for utilization of medical and other professional personnel as are found necessary for the proper and efficient administration of this part, and for the training and effective use of paid subprofessional staff with particular emphasis on the full-time or part-time employment of recipients of benefits under Part D of this title and other persons of low income, as community service aides, in the administration of this part and for the use of nonpaid or partially paid volunteers in a social service volunteer program in providing medical care and services to applicants and recipients and assisting any advisory committee established by the Secretary under this part;

"(3) safeguards which restrict the use of or the disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of this part;

"(4) that all individuals wishing to make application for medical assistance under this part shall have opportunity to do so, and that medical care and services shall be furnished with reasonable promptness to all eligible individuals;

"(5) establishing and maintain standards for private or public institutions in which recipients of medical assistance under this part may receive medical care and services.

"(6) medical care and services equal in amount, duration, and scope to all persons, couples or families eligible for benefits under part D, whose circumstances and conditions are about the same except that the making available of services described in section 453(b)(4) or (14) of this part to individuals meeting the age requirement prescribed therein shall not, by reason of this paragraph (6), require the making available of any such care and services, or the making available of such care and services of the same amount, duration, and scope, to individuals of any other ages, and further that the making available of supplementary medical insurance benefits under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to individuals eligible therefor, of the cost of the deductibles, cost sharing, or similar charges under such part B for individuals eligible for benefits under such part, shall not, by reason of this paragraph (6), require the making available of any such benefits,

or the making available of medical care and services of the same amount, duration, and scope, to any other individuals;

"(7) (A) for entering into cooperative agreements with State and local government agencies responsible for the administration of health services, vocational rehabilitation services, or other services provided for in this part, leading to maximum utilization of such services in the administration of this part; and

"(B) to the extent prescribed by the Secretary, for agreements with any agency, institution, or organization, receiving payments for part or all of the cost of plans or projects under the Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children's Services Act of 1935 as amended (42 U.S. sec. 701 ff)

"(i) providing for utilizing such agency, institution, or organization in furnishing medical care and services which are avialable under such plan or project under said Act, and

"(ii) making such provision as may be appropriate for reimbursing such agency, institution, or organization for the cost of such medical care and services furnished any individual for which payment would otherwise be made with respect to him under this part;

"(8) that, in determining whether an individual is blind or severely disabled, there shall be an examination by a physician skilled therein, or in determining blindness by an optometrist, whichever such individual may select in the case of blindness;

"(9) that no enrollment fee, premium, deduction, cost sharing, or similar charge will be imposed on any recipient of medical assistance under this part;

"(10) in the case of eligible individuals 65 years of age or other who are covered by either or both of the insurance programs established by title XVIII of the Social Security Act, whether under this part, all or any deductible, cost sharing, or similar charge imposed with respect to such individual under the insurance program established by said title XVIII is not made the portion thereof which is met shall be determined on a basis reasonably related (as determined in accordance with standards approved by the Secretary) and included in this part to the individual's, couple's, or family's income or income and resources as the case may be;

"(11) for the taking into account, except to the extent prescribed by the Secretary, the costs (whether in the form of insurance premiums or otherwise) incurred for medical care or for any other type of remedial care recognized and paid for under State law or any Federal law which are substantially the same as those provided for under this Act, in order to prevent double payment for the same medical and other services;

"(12) that no lien may be imposed against the property of any individual prior to his death on account of medical assistance under this part paid or to be paid on his behalf under this part (except pursuant to a judgment of a court on account of costs incorrectly paid on behalf of such individual), and that there shall be no adjustment or recovery (except, in the case of an individual who was 65 years of age or over when he received such assistance, from his estate, and then only after the death of his surviving spouse, if any, and only at a time when he has no surviving child who is under 21 or is blind or severely disabled) of medical assistance correctly paid on behalf of such individual under this part;

"(13) such safeguards as may be necessary to assure that eligibility for medical assistance, medical care and services under this part will be determined, and such assistance, care, and services be provided, in a manner consistent with simplicity of administration and the best interests of the recipient;

"(14) in cases of medical care and services on behalf of aged persons who are patients in institutions for mental diseases—

"(A) for having in effect such agreements or other arrangements with State or local government authorities concerned with mental diseases, and, where appropriate, with such institutions, as may be necessary for carrying out this part, including arrangements for joint planning and for development of alternate methods of care, arrangements providing assurance of immediate readmittance to institutions where needed for individuals under alternate plans of care, and arrangements providing for access to patients and facilities, for furnishing information, and for making reports;

"(B) provide for an individual plan for each such patient to assure that the institutional care provided to him is in his best interests, including, to that end, assurances that there will be initial and periodic review of his medical and other needs, that he will be given appropriate medical care and services within the institution, and that there will be a periodical determination of his need for continued treatment in the institution;

"(C) provide for the development of alternate plans of care, making maximum utilization of available resources, for recipients 65 years of age or older who would otherwise need care in such institutions, including appropriate medical care and services which are appropriate for such patients to help them attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care, or likely to prevent or reduce their dependency, as may be prescribed by the Secretary; and

"(D) methods of determining the reasonable cost of institutional care for such patients;

"(15) in cases of medical assistance in behalf of aged persons who are patients in public institutions for mental diseases, develop and implement comprehensive mental health program, including provision for utilization of community mental health centers, nursing home, and other alternatives to medical care and services in public institutions for mental diseases.

"(16) descriptions of—

"(A) the kinds and numbers of professional medical personnel and supporting staff that will be used in the administration of this part and of the responsibilities they will have,

"(B) the standards, for private or public institutions in which recipients of medical assistance under this party may receive medical care or services, that will be utilized,

"(C) the cooperative arrangements with State and local government health agencies and State and local government vocational rehabilitation agencies entered into with a view to maximum utilization of and coordination of the provision of medical care and services with the services administered or supervised by such agencies, and

"(D) other standards and methods to assure that medical or remedial care and services provided to recipients of medical assistance are of high quality;

"(17) that any individual eligible for medical assistance (including drugs) may obtain such assistance from any institution, agency, community pharmacy, or person, qualified to perform the service or services required (including an organization which provides such services, or arranges for their availability, on a prepayment basis), who undertakes to provide him such services;

"(18) Effective July 1, 1972, for consultative services by health agencies and other appropriate agencies of the State and local governments, to hospitals, nursing homes, home health agencies, clinics, laboratories, and such other institutions as the Secretary may specify in order to assist them—

"(A) to qualify for payments under this part,

"(B) to establish and maintain such fiscal records as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of this part, and

"(C) to provide information needed to determine payments due under this part on account of medical care and services furnished to individuals:

"(19) effective July 1, 1972,

"(A) for the taking of all reasonable measures to ascertain the legal liability of third parties to pay for medical care and services available under this part and arising out of injury, disease, or disability,

"(B) that where the Secretary knows that a third party has such a legal liability he will treat such legal liability as a resource of the individual on whose behalf the medical care and services are made available,

"(C) that in any case where such a legal liability is found to exist after medical assistance has been made available on behalf of the individual, the Secretary will seek reimbursement for such assistance to the extent of such legal liability;

"(20) effective July 1, 1972—

"(A) for a regular program of medical review (including medical evaluation of each patient's need for skilled nursing home care) or (in the case of individuals who are eligible therefor under this part) need for care in a mental hospital, a written plan of care, and, where applicable, a plan of rehabilitation prior to admission to a skilled nursing home;

"(B) for periodic inspections to be made in all skilled nursing homes and mental institutions within each State by one or more medical review teams (composed of physicians and other appropriate health and social service personnel) of (i) the care being provided in such nursing homes (and mental institutions) to persons receiving assistance under this part, (ii) with respect to each of the patients receiving such care, the adequacy of the services available in particular nursing homes (or institutions) to meet the current health needs and promote the maximum physical well-being of patients receiving care in such homes (or institutions), (iii) the necessity and desirability of the continued placement of such patients in such nursing homes (or institutions), and (iv) the feasibility of meeting their health care needs through alternative institutional or noninstitutional services; and

"(C) for the making by such team or teams of full and complete reports of the findings resulting from such inspections together with any recommendations to the Secretary;

"(21) for agreements with every person or institution providing medical care and services under this part under which such person or institution agrees—

"(A) to keep such records as are necessary fully to disclose the extent of the services provided to individuals receiving medical assistance under this part, and

"(B) to furnish the Secretary with such information, regarding any payments claimed by such person or institution for providing medical care or services under this part, as the Secretary may from time to time request:

"(22) any skilled nursing home receiving payments under this part must—

"(A) supply to the licensing agency under this part full and complete information as to the identity (i) of each person having (directly or indirectly) an ownership interest of 10 per centum or more in such nursing home, (ii) in case a nursing home is organized as a corporation, of each officer and director of the corporation, and (iii) in case a nursing home is organized as a partnership, of each partner; and promptly report any changes which would affect the current accuracy of the information so required to be supplied;

"(B) have and maintain an organized nursing service for its patients, which is under the direction of a professional registered nurse who is employed full time by such nursing home, and which is composed of sufficient nursing and auxiliary personnel to provide adequate and properly supervised nursing services for such patients during all hours of each day and all days of each week;

"(C) make satisfactory arrangements for professional planning and supervision of menus and meal service for patients for whom special diets or dietary restrictions are medically prescribed;

"(D) have satisfactory policies and procedures relating to the maintenance of medical records on each patient of the nursing home, dispensing and administering of drugs and biologicals, and assuring that each patient is under the care of a physician and that adequate provision is made for medical attention to any patient during emergencies;

"(E) have arrangements with one or more general hospitals under which such hospital or hospitals will provide needed diagnostic and other services to patients of such nursing home, and under which such hospital or hospitals agree to timely acceptance, as patients thereof, of acutely ill patients of such nursing home who are in need of hospital care; except that the Secretary may waive this requirement wholly or in part with respect to any nursing home meeting all the other requirements and which, by reason of remote location or other good and sufficient reason, is unable to effect such an arrangement with a hospital; and

"(F) from July 1, 1972, such provisions of the Life Safety Code of the National Fire Protection Association (21st Edition, 1967) as are applicable to nursing homes; except that the Secretary may waive in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, for such periods as he deems appropriate, specific provisions of such code which, if rigidly applied, would result in unreasonable hardship upon a nursing home, but only if the Secretary makes a determination (and keeps a written record setting forth the basis of such determination) that such waiver will not adversely affect the health and safety of the patients of such skilled nursing home; and except that the requirements set forth in the proceeding provisions of this subclause (i) shall not apply in any State if the Secretary finds that in such State there is in effect a fire and safety code, imposed by State law, which adequately protects patients in nursing homes; and (ii) meet conditions relating to environment and sanitation applicable to extended care facilities under subchapter XVIII of this chapter; except that the Secretary may waive in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, for such periods as he deems appropriate, any requirement imposed by the proceeding provisions of this subclause (ii) if the Secretary finds that such requirement, if rigidly applied, would result in unreasonable hardship upon a nursing home, but only if the Secretary makes a determination (and keeps a written record setting forth the basis of such determination) that such waiver will not adversely affect the health and safety of the patients of such nursing home;

"(23) for the licensing of administrators of nursing homes as provided in section 454(c) of this part;

"(24) such methods and procedures relating to the utilization of, and the payments for, medical care and services available under this part as may be necessary to safeguard against unnecessary utilization of such care and services and to assure that payments (including payments for any drugs provided under this part) are not in excess of reasonable charges consistent with efficiency, economy, and quality of such care and services.

"DEFINITIONS

"Definition of Medical Assistance

"SEC. 453. (a) For purposes of this part—'medical assistance' means payment of part or all of the cost of the following medical care and services (if provided in or after the third month before the month in which the recipient makes application therefor) for aged, blind, or severely disabled persons, or members of couples, or members of families, who are eligible for, or are receiving benefits under part D of this title, and whose income, resources as set forth in 442(a) of said part D, and such benefits are insufficient to meet all of such costs—

"(1) inpatient hospital services (other than services in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases);

"(2) outpatient hospital services;

"(3) other laboratory and X-ray services;

"(4) (A) skilled nursing home services (other than services in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases) for individuals 21 years of age or older (B) effective July 1, 1972, such early and periodic screening and diagnosis of individuals who are eligible under this part and are under the age of 21 to ascertain their physical or mental defects, and such health care, treatment, and other measures to correct or ameliorate defects and chronic conditions discovered thereby, as may be provided in regulations of the Secretary;

"(5) physicians' services, whether furnished in the office, the patient's home, a hospital, or a skilled nursing home, or elsewhere;

"(6) medical care, or any other type of remedial care recognized by the Secretary, furnished by licensed practitioners within the scope of their practice as defined by State law;

"(7) home health care services;

"(8) private duty nursing services;

"(9) clinic services;

"(10) dental services;

"(11) physical therapy and related services;

"(12) prescribed drugs, dentures, and prosthetic devices; and eyeglasses prescribed by a physician skilled in diseases of the eye or by an optometrist, whichever the individual may select;

"(13) other diagnostic, screening, preventive, and rehabilitative services;

"(14) inpatient hospital services and skilled nursing home services for individuals 65 years of age or over in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases; and

"(15) any other medical care, including institutional services in intermediate care facilities (other than a public nonmedical facility), and any other type of remedial care recognized, and specified by the Secretary; except that such term does not include—

"(A) any such payments with respect to care of services for any individual who is an inmate of a public institution (except as a patient in a medical institution); or

"(B) any such payments with respect to care or services for any individual who has not attained 65 years of age and who is a patient in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases.

"Inclusion of Osteopaths and Their Services in Definitions of Physician, Medical Care and Services, and Hospitalization

"(b) 'physician' and 'medical care and services' and 'hospitalization' include osteopathic practitioners or the services of osteopathic practitioners and hospitals within the scope of their practice as defined by State law.

"Definition of Medical Care and Services

"(c) 'medical care and services' means those set forth in subsection 453(a)(1) through (15).

"Other Definitions

"(d) The definitions in section 445 of part D shall be applicable to this part.

"Licensing of Administrators of Nursing Homes

"SEC. 454. (a) For purposes of section 452(a)(23) of this part, every nursing home must operate under the supervision of an administrator licensed in the manner provided in this subsection.

"(1) Licensing of nursing home administrators shall be carried out by the agency of the State responsible for licensing under the healing arts licensing act of the State, or, in the absence of such act or such an agency, or when the Secretary finds such agency is not properly carrying out the functions and duties in the next paragraph,

"(2) It shall be the function and duty of such agency or board to—

"(A) develop, impose, and enforce standards which must be met by individuals in order to receive a license as a nursing home administrator, which standards shall be designed to insure that nursing home administrators will be individuals who are of good character and are otherwise suitable and who, by training or experience in the field of institutional administration, are qualified to serve as nursing home administrators;

"(B) develop and apply appropriate techniques, including examinations and investigations, for determining whether an individual meets such standards;

"(C) issue licenses to individuals determined, after the application of such techniques, to meet such standards, and revoke or suspend licenses previously issued by the board in any case where the individual holding any such license is determined substantially to have failed to conform to the requirements of such standards;

"(D) establish and carry out procedures designed to insure that individuals licensed as nursing home administrators will, during any period that they serve as such, comply with the requirements of such standards;

"(E) receive, investigate, and take appropriate action with respect to, any charge or complaint filed with the board to the effect that any individual licensed as a nursing home administrator has failed to comply with the requirements of such standards; and

"(F) conduct a continuing study and investigation of nursing homes and administrators of nursing homes within the State with a view to the improvement of the standards imposed for the licensing of such administrators and of procedures and methods for the enforcement of such standards with respect to administrators of nursing homes who have been licensed as such.

"(3) Such agency or board shall have the power to grant any waiver for a period which ends after being in effect for two years or June 30, 1974, whichever is the earlier, with respect to any individual who during all of the calendar year immediately preceding the year in which such waiver is granted has served as a nursing home administrator, of any of the standards developed, imposed, and enforced by such agency or board pursuant to subparagraph (2)(A) of this subsection other than such standards as relate to good character and suitability if—

"(a) If there is provided in the State (during all of the period for which waiver is in effect), a program of training and instruction designed to enable all individuals, with respect to whom any such waiver is granted, to attain the qualifications necessary in order to meet such standards.

Authorization of appropriations; limitation of grants

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1972 and the two succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to make grants to States for the purpose of assisting them in instituting and conducting programs of training and instruction of the type referred to in paragraph (a)(3) of section 454.

"(c) The National Advisory Council on Nursing Home Administration appointed pursuant to the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396g(f)(1)) shall cease to exist as of December 31, 1972, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

"(d) As used in this section, the term—

"(1) 'nursing home' means any institution or facility defined as such for licensing purposes under State law, or, if State law does not employ the term nursing home or if there is no such State law, the equivalent term or terms as determined by the Secretary; and

"(2) "nursing home administrator" means any individual who is charged with the general administration of a nursing home whether or not such individual has an owner-

ship interest in such home and whether or not his functions and duties are shared with one or more other individuals.

"Observance of Religious Beliefs

"SEC. 455. Nothing in this part shall be construed to compel any person to undergo any medical screening, examination, diagnosis, or treatment or to accept any other health care or services provided under this part for any purpose (other than for the purpose of discovering and preventing the spread of infection or contagious disease or for the purpose of protecting environmental health), if such person objects (or, in case such person is a child, his parent or guardian objects) thereto on religious grounds.

"Advisory Council on Medical Assistance; creation; composition; appointment of members; Chairman; representative activities and interests; majority representation of consumers; terms of office; special advisory professional or technical committees; compensation and travel expenses; meetings

"SEC. 456. For the purpose of advising the Secretary on matters of general policy in the administration of this part (including the relationship of this part and title XVIII of the Social Security Act) and making recommendations for improvements in such administration, there is hereby created a Medical Assistance Advisory Council which shall consist of twenty-one persons, not otherwise in the employ of the United States, appointed by the Secretary without regard to the provisions of title 5 governing appointments to the competitive service. The Secretary shall from time to time appoint one of the members to serve as Chairman. The members shall include representatives of State and local agencies and nongovernmental organizations and groups concerned with health, and of consumers of health services, and a majority of the membership of the Advisory Council shall consist of representatives of consumers of health services. Each member shall hold office for a term of four years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment, five at the end of the first year, five at the end of the second year, five at the end of the third year, and six at the end of the fourth year after the date of appointment. A member shall not be eligible to serve continuously for more than two terms. The Secretary may, at the request of the Council or otherwise, appoint such special advisory professional or technical committees as may be useful in carrying out this subchapter. Members of the Advisory Council and members of any such advisory or technical committee, while attending meetings or conferences thereof or otherwise serving on business of the Advisory Council or of such committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. The Advisory Council shall meet as frequently as the Secretary deems necessary. Upon request of five or more members, it shall be the duty of the Secretary to call a meeting of the Advisory Council: *Provided, however,* That the members of said Council who are serving their terms on June 30, 1971, and whose terms do not expire on that day, under the provisions of the Social Security Act prior to amendment by the National Fair Minimum Income Act of 1971, shall serve out their terms under such section which expires after June 30, 1971.

"PART F—ADMINISTRATION

"Agreements with States and Local Governments

"SEC. 461. (a) The Secretary may also enter into an agreement with any State or local government under which such State or local government will make, on behalf of the Secretary, the benefit payments provided for under part D or payments for medical care and services under part E with respect to all or specified persons, couples, or families in the State or in the local government jurisdiction who are eligible for such benefits or medical assistance or will perform such other functions in connection with the administration of part D or part E as may be agreed upon. The cost of carrying out any such agreement shall be paid to the State or local government by the Secretary in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as may be agreed upon.

"PENALTIES FOR FRAUD

"SEC. 462. The provisions of section 208 of the Social Security Act, other than paragraph (a), shall apply with respect to benefits under part D, medical assistance under part E and allowances under part C, of this title, to the same extent as they apply to payments under title II.

"REPORT, EVALUATION, RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATIONS, AND TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 463. (a) The Secretary shall make an annual report to the President and the Congress on the operation and administration of parts D and E, including an evaluation thereof in carrying out the purposes of such parts and recommendations with respect thereto. The Secretary is authorized to conduct evaluations directly or by grants or contracts of the programs authorized by such parts.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to conduct, directly or by grants or contracts, research into or demonstrations of ways of better providing financial assistance to aged, blind, severely disabled persons, couples, and families or of better carrying out the purposes of parts D and E, and in so doing to waive any requirements or limitations in such parts with respect to eligibility for or amount of benefits or medical assistance for such persons or couples or members of couples or of families, or groups thereof as he deems appropriate.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to provide such technical assistance to States or local governments and to provide, directly or through grants or contracts, for such training of personnel of States or local governments, as he deems appropriate to assist them in more efficiently and effectively carrying out their agreements under this part and parts D and E.

"(d) In addition to funds otherwise available therefor, such portion of any appropriation to carry out part D or E as the Secretary may determine, but not in excess of $20,000,000 in any fiscal year, shall be available to him to carry out this section.

"OBLIGATION OF DESERTING PARENTS

"SEC. 464. In any case where an individual has deserted or abandoned his spouse or his child or children and such spouse or any such child (during the period of such desertion or abandonment) is a member of a family receiving benefits under part D or medical assistance payments under part E, such individual shall be obligated to the United States in an amount equal to—

"(1) the total amount of the benefits paid to such family or medical assistance to such family during such period with respect to such spouse and child or children, reduced by

"(2) any amount actually paid by such individual to or for the support and maintenance of such spouse and child or children during such period, if and to the extent that such amount is excluded in determining the amount of such benefits or medical assistance;

except that in any case where an order for the support and maintenance of such spouse or any such child has been issued by a court of competent jurisdiction, the obligation of such individual under this subsection (with respect to which spouse or child) for any period shall not exceed the amount specified in such order less any amount actually paid by such individual (to or for the support and maintenance of such spouse or child) during such period. The amount due the United States under such obligation shall be collected (to the extent that the claim of the United States therefor is not otherwise satisfied), in such manner as may be specified by the Secretary, from any amounts otherwise due him or becoming due him at any time from any officer or agency of the United States or under any Federal program. Amounts collected under the preceding sentence shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"TREATMENT OF BENEFITS UNDER PART D AS INCOME FOR FOOD STAMP PURPOSES

"SEC. 465. Benefits paid under part D of this title shall be taken into consideration for the purpose of determining the entitlement of any household to purchase food stamps, and the cost thereof, under the food stamp program conducted under the Food Stamp Act of 1964."

MANPOWER SERVICES, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, CHILD CARE, AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES PROGRAMS

SEC. 103. Part C of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 630 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"PART C—MANPOWER SERVICES, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, CHILD CARE, AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES PROGRAMS FOR RECIPIENTS OF BENEFITS UNDER PART D

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 430. The purpose of this part is to authorize provision, for individuals who are members of a family receiving benefits under part D, of manpower services, training, employment, child care, and related supportive services necessary to train aged, blind, severely disabled persons, couples or such members of families, prepare them for employment, and otherwise assist them in securing and retaining regular employment and having the opportunity for advancement in employment, to the end that such persons, couples or families will be restored to self-supporting, independent, and useful roles in their communities.

"OPERATION OF MANPOWER SERVICES, TRAINING, AND EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 431. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall, for each person registered pursuant to part D, in accordance with priorities prescribed by him, develop or assure the development of an employability plan describing the manpower services, training, and employment which the Secretary of Labor determines each person needs in order to enable him to become self-supporting and secure and retain employment and opportunities for advancement.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall, in accordance with the provisions of this part, establish and assure the provision of manpower services, training, and employment programs in each State for persons registered pursuant to part D.

"(c) The Secretary of Labor shall, through such programs, provide or assure the provision of manpower services, training, and employment and opportunities necessary to prepare such persons for and place them in regular employment, including—

"(1) any of such services, training, employment, and opportunities which the Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide under any other Act;

"(2) counseling, testing, coaching, program orientation, institutional and on-the-

job training, work experience, upgrading, job development, job placement, and follow up services required to assist in securing and retaining employment and opportunities for advancement;

"(3) relocation assistance (including grants, loans, and the furnishing of such services as will aid an involuntarily unemployed person, or member of a couple or of a family receiving benefits under part D who desires to relocate to do so in an area where there is assurance of regular suitable employment, offered through the public employment offices of the State in such area, which will lead to the earning of income sufficient to make such person, couple, or family; and

"(4) special work projects.

"(d) (1) For purposes of subsection (c) (4), a 'special work project' is a project (meeting the requirements of this subsection) which consists of the performance of work in the public interest through grants to or contracts with public or nonprofit private agencies or organizations.

"(2) No wage rates provided under any special work project shall be lower than the applicable minimum wage for the particular work concerned.

"(3) Before entering into any special work project under a program established as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of Labor shall have reasonable assurances that—

"(A) appropriate standards for the health, safety, and other conditions applicable to the performance of work and training on such project are established and will be maintained,

"(B) such project will not result in the displacement of employed workers,

"(C) with respect to such project the conditions of work, training, education, and employment are reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant,

"(D) appropriate workmen's compensation protection is provided to all participants, and

"(E) such project will improve the employability of the participants.

"(4) With respect to individuals who are participants in special work projects under programs established as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of Labor shall periodically (at least once every six months) review the employment record of each such individual while on the special work project and on the basis of such record and such other information as he may acquire determine whether it would be feasible to place such individual in regular employment or in on-the-job, institutional, or other training.

"ALLOWANCES FOR INDIVIDUALS UNDERGOING TRAINING

"SEC. 432. (a) (1) The Secretary of Labor shall pay to each person, or member of a couple or of a family receiving benefits under part D and is participating in manpower training under this part an incentive allowance of $30 per month. If one or more members of a couple or of a family are receiving training for which training allowances are payable under section 203 of the Manpower Development and Training Act and meet the other requirements under such section (except subsection (l)(1) thereof) for the receipt of allowances which would be in excess of the sum of the benefits under part D payable with respect to such month to the couple or to the family, the total of the incentive allowances per month under this section for such members shall be equal to the greater of (1) the amount of such excess or, if lower, the amount of the excess of the training allowances which would be payable under such section 203 as in effect on March 1, 1970, over the sum of such benefit, and (2) $30 for each such member.

"(2) The Secretary of Labor shall, in accordance with regulations, also pay, to any such person, or member of a couple or of a family participating in manpower training under this part, allowances for transportation and other costs to him which are necessary to and directly related to his participation in training.

"(3) The Secretary of Labor shall by regulation provide for such smaller allowances under this subsection as he deems appropriate for individuals in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

"(b) Allowances under this section shall be in lieu of allowances provided for participants in manpower training programs under any other Act.

"(c) Subsection (a) shall not apply to any person or member of a couple, or of a family who is receiving benefits under Part D and who is participating in a program of the Secretary of Labor providing public or private employer compensated on-the-job training.

"UTILIZATION OF OTHER PROGRAMS

"SEC. 433. In providing the manpower training and employment services and opportunities required by this part the Secretary of Labor, to the maximum extent feasible, shall assure that such services and opportunities are provided in such manner, through such means, and using all authority available to him under any other Act (and subject to all duties and responsibilities thereunder) as will further the establishment of an integrated and comprehensive manpower training program involving all sectors of the economy and all levels of government and as will make maximum use of existing manpower and manpower related programs and agencies. To such end the Secretary of Labor may use the funds appropriated to him under this part to provide the programs required by this part through such other Act, to the same extent and under the same conditions as if appropriated under such other Act and in making use of the programs of other Federal, State, or local agencies, public or private, the Secretary may reimburse such agencies for services rendered to persons under this part to the extent such services and opportunities are not otherwise available on a nonreimbursable basis.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 434. The Secretary of Labor may issue such rules and regulations as he finds necessary to carry out his responsibilities under this part.

"APPROPRIATIONS; NONFEDERAL SHARE

"SEC. 435. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor for each fiscal year a sum sufficient for carrying out the purposes of this part (other than sections 436 and 437), including payment of not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of manpower services, training, and employment and opportunities provided for individuals registered pursuant to section 447. The Secretary of Labor shall establish criteria to achieve an equitable apportionment among the States of Federal expenditures for carrying out the programs authorized by section 431. In developing these criteria the Secretary of Labor shall consider the number of registrations under section 447 and other relevant factors.

"(b) If a non-Federal contribution of 10 per centum of the cost specified in subsection (a) is not made in any State (as required by section 402(a)(13)), the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may withhold any action under section 404 on account thereof and if he does so he shall instead, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the appropriate State agency or agencies, withhold any payments to be made to the State under section 403(a) until the amount so withheld (including any amounts contributed by the State pursuant to the requirement in section 402(a)(13)) equals 10 per centum of such costs. Such withholding shall remain in effect until such time as the Secretary of Labor has assurances from the State that such 10 per centum will be contributed as required by section 402(a)(13). Amounts so withheld shall be deemed to have been paid to the State under such sections and shall be paid by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Secretary of Labor.

"CHILD CARE

"SEC. 436. (a) (1) For the purpose of assuring that members of families receiving benefits under part D will not be prevented from participating in training or employment by the unavailability of appropriate child care, there are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to any public or nonprofit private agency or organization, and contracts with any public or private agency or organization, for part or all of the cost of projects for the provision of child care, including necessary transportation and alteration, remodeling, and renovation of facilities, which may be necessary or appropriate in order to better enable a member (of a family) who has been registered pursuant to part D to undertake or continue manpower training or employment under this part, or to enable an individual who has been referred pursuant to section 447 (d) to participate in vocational rehabilitation, or to enable a member of a family which is or has been (within such period of time as the Secretary may prescribe) eligible for benefits under such part D to undertake or continue manpower training or employment under this part; or to better enable an individual who is receiving assistance to needy families with dependent children, or whose needs are taken into account in determining the need of any one claiming or receiving such assistance under state welfare programs to participate in manpower training or employment.

"(2) Such grants or contracts for the provision of child care in any area may be made directly, or through grants to any public or nonprofit private agency which is designated by the appropriate elected or appointed official or officials in such area and which demonstrate a capacity to work effectively with the manpower agency in such area (including provision for the stationing of personnel with the manpower team in appropriate cases). To the extent appropriate, such care for children attending school which is provided on a group or institutional basis shall be provided through arrangements with the appropriate local educational agency.

"(3) Such projects shall provide for various types of child care needed in the light of the different circumstances and needs of the children involved.

"(b) Such sums shall also be available to enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to any public or nonprofit private agency or organization, for evaluation, training of personnel, technical assistance, or research or demonstration projects to determine more effective methods of providing any such care.

"(c) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may provide, in any case in which a family is able to pay for part or all of the cost of child care provided under a project assisted under this section, for payment by the family of such fees for the care as may be reasonable in the light of such ability.

"SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

"SEC. 437. (a) No payments shall be made to any State under title V, or part A or B of this title, with respect to expenditures for any calendar quarter beginning on or after the date part D becomes effective with respect to such State, unless it has in effect an agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under which it will provide health, vocational rehabilitation,

counseling, social, and other supportive services which the Secretary under regulations determines to be necessary to permit an individual who has been registered pursuant to part D to undertake or continue manpower training and employment under this part.

"(b) Services under such an agreement shall be provided in close cooperation with manpower training and employment services provided under this part.

"(c) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall from time to time, in such installments and on such conditions as he deems appropriate, pay to any State with which he has an agreement pursuant to subsection (a) up to 90 per centum of the cost of such State of carrying out such agreement. There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

"ADVANCE FUNDING

"SEC. 438. (a) For the purpose of affording adequate notice of funding available under this part, appropriations for grants, contracts, or other payments with respect to individuals registered pursuant to section 447 are authorized to be included in the appropriation Act for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which they are available for obligation.

"(b) In order to effect a transition to the advance funding method of timing appropriation action, subsection (a) shall apply notwithstanding that its initial application will result in enactment in the same year (whether in the same appropriation Act or otherwise) of two separate appropriations, one for the then current fiscal year and one for the succeeding fiscal year.

"EVALUATION AND RESEARCH; REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 439. (a)(1) The Secretary shall (jointly with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare) provide for the continuing evaluation of the manpower training and employment programs provided under this part, including their effectiveness in achieving stated goals and their impact on other related programs. The Secretary may conduct research regarding, and demonstrations of, ways to improve the effectiveness of the manpower training and employment programs so provided and may also conduct demonstrations of improved training techniques for upgrading the skills of the working poor. The Secretary may, for these purposes, contract for independent evaluations of and research regarding such programs or individual projects under such programs, and establish a data collection, processing, and retrieval system.

"(2) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not exceeding $15,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary to carry out paragraph (1).

"(b) On or before September 1 following each fiscal year in which part D is effective with respect to any State—

"(1) the Secretary shall report to the Congress on the manpower training and employment programs provided under this part in such fiscal year, and

"(2) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall report to the Congress on the child care and supportive services provided under this part in such fiscal year."

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SERVICES FOR NEEDY FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN

SEC. 104. (a) Section 401 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601) is amended—

(1) by striking out "financial assistance and" in the first sentence; and

(2) by striking out "aid and" in the second sentence.

(b)(1) Subsection (a) of section 402 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 602) is amended—

(A) by striking out "aid and" in the matter preceding clause (1);

(B) by inserting, before "provide" at the beginning of clause (1), "except to the extent permitted by the Secretary,";

(C) by striking out clause (4);

(D)(i) by striking out "recipients and other persons" in clause (5)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof "persons", and

(ii) by striking out "providing services to applicants and recipients" in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "providing services under the plan";

(E) by striking out clauses (7) and (8);

(F) by striking out "aid to families with dependent children" in clause (9) and inserting in lieu thereof "the plan";

(G) by striking out clauses (10), (11), and (12);

(H)(i) by striking out "section 406(d)" in clause (14) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 405(c)",

(ii) by striking out "for each child and relative who receives aid to families with dependent children, and each appropriate individual (living in the same home as a relative and child receiving such aid whose needs are taken into account in making the determination under clause (7))" in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "for each member of a family receiving assistance to needy families with children, each appropriate individual (living in the same home as such family) whose needs would be taken into account in determining the need of any such member under the State plan (approved under this part) as in effect prior to the enactment of part D, and each individual who would have been eligible to receive aid to families with dependent children under such plan", and

(iii) by striking out "such child, relative, and individual" each place it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "such member or individual";

(I) by striking out clause (15) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(15)(A) provide for the development of a program, for appropriate members of such families and such other individuals, for preventing or reducing the incidence of births out of wedlock and otherwise strengthening family life, and for implementing such program by assuring that in all appropriate cases family planning services are offered to them, but acceptance of family planning services provided under the plan shall be voluntary on the part of such members and individuals and shall not be a prerequisite to eligibility for or the receipt of any other service under the plan; and (B) to the extent that services provided under this clause or clause (8) are furnished by the staff of the State agency or the local agency administering the State plan in each of the political subdivisions of the State, for the establishment of a single organizational unit in such State or local agency, as the case may be, responsible for the furnishing of such services;"

(J) by striking out "aid" in clause (16) and inserting in lieu thereof "assistance to needy families with children";

(K)(i) by striking out "aid to families with dependent children" in clause (17)(A)(i) and inserting in lieu thereof "assistance to needy families with children",

(ii) by striking out "aid" in clause (17)(A)(ii) and inserting in lieu thereof "assistance", and

(iii) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (i), and adding after clause (ii) the following new clause:

"(iii) in the case of any parent (of a child referred to in clause (ii)) receiving such assistance who has been deserted or abandoned by his or her spouse, to secure support for such parent from such spouse (or from any other person legally liable for such support), utilizing any reciprocal arrangements adopted with other States to obtain or enforce courts orders for support, and";

(L) by striking out "clause (17)(A)" in clause (18) and inserting in lieu thereof "clause (11)(A)";

(M) by striking out clause (19) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(19) provide for arrangements to assure that there will be made a non-Federal contribution to the cost of manpower services, training, and employment and opportunities provided for individuals registered pursuant to section 447, in cash or kind, equal to 10 per centum of such cost;";

(N) by striking out "aid to families with dependent children in the form of foster care in accordance with section 408" in clause (20) and inserting in lieu thereof "payments for foster care in accordance with section 406";

(O)(i) by striking out "of each parent of a dependent child or children with respect to whom aid is being provided under the State plan" in clause (21)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof "of each person who is the parent of a child or children with respect to whom assistance to needy families with children or foster care is being provided or is the spouse of the parent of such a child or children",

(ii) by striking out "such child or children" in clause (21)(A)(i) and inserting in lieu thereof "such child or children or such parent",

(iii) by striking out "such parent" each place it appears in clause (21)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof "such person", and

(iv) by striking out "section 410;" in clause (21)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 408; and";

(P)(i) by striking out "a parent" each place it appears in clause (22) and inserting in lieu thereof "a person",

(ii) by striking out "a child or children of such parent" each place it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "the spouse or a child or children of such person",

(iii) by striking out "against such parent" in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "against such person", and

(iv) by striking out "aid is being provided under the plan of such other State" each place it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "assistance to needy families with children or foster care payments are being provided in such other State"; and

(Q) by striking out "; and (23)" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(2) Clauses (5), (6), (9), (13), (14), (15), (16), (17), (18), (19), (20), (21), and (22) of section 402(a) of such Act, as amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection, are redesignated as clauses (4) through (16), respectively.

(c) Section 402(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), except that he shall not approve any plan which imposes, as a condition of eligibility for services under it, any residence requirement which denies services or foster care payments with respect to any individual residing in the State."

(d) Section 402 of such Act is further amended by striking out subsection (c).

(c)(1) Subsection (a) of section 403 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 603) is amended—

(A) by striking out "aid and services" and inserting in lieu thereof "services" in the matter preceding paragraph (1);

(B) by striking out paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as payments for foster care in accordance with section 406—

"(A) five-sixths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditures with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $18 multiplied by the number of children receiving such foster care in such month; plus

"(B) the Federal percentage of the amount by which such expenditures exceed

the maximum which may be counted under subparagraph (A), not counting so much of any expenditures with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $100 multiplied by the number of children receiving such foster care for such month;";

(C) by striking out paragraph (2);

(D) (i) by striking out "in the case of any State," in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) in paragraph (3),

(ii) by striking out "or relative who is receiving aid under the plan, or to any other individual (living in the same home as such relative and child) whose needs are taken into account in making the determination under clause (7) of such section" in clause (i) of subparagraph (A) of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "receiving foster care or any member of a family receiving assistance to needy families with children or to any other individual (living in the same home as such family) whose needs would be taken into account in determining the need of any such member under the State plan approved under this part as in effect prior to the enactment of part D",

(iii) by striking out "child or relative who is applying for aid to families with dependent children or" in clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "member of a family",

(iv) by striking out "likely to become an applicant for or recipient of such aid" in clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "likely to become eligible to receive such assistance", and

(v) by striking out "(14) and (15)" each place it appears in subparagraph (A) of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "(8) and (9)";

(E) by striking out all that follows "permitted" in the last sentence of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "by the Secretary; and";

(F) by striking out "in the case of any State," in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) in paragraph (5);

(G) by striking out "section 406(e)" each place it appears in paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 405(d)"; and

(H) by striking out the sentences following paragraph (5).

(2) Paragraphs (3) and (5) of section 403 (a) of such Act, as amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection, are redesignated as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

(f) Section 403(b) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "(B) records showing the number of dependent children in the State, and (C)" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "and (B)"; and

(2) by striking out "(A)" in paragraph (2), and by striking out ", and (B)" and all that follows in such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(g) Section 404 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 604) is amended—

(1) by striking out "(a) In the case of any State plan for aid and services" and inserting in lieu thereof "In the case of any State plan for services"; and

(2) by striking out subsection (b).

(h) Section 405 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 605) is repealed.

(i) Section 406 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 606) is redesignated as section 405, and as so redesignated is amended—

(1) by striking out subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) The term 'child' means a child as defined in section 445(b).

"(b) The term 'needy families with children' means families who are receiving benefits under part D and who would be eligible to receive aid to families with dependent children, under a State plan (approved under this part) as in effect prior to the enactment of part D, if the State plan had continued in effect and if it included assistance to dependent children of unemployed fathers pursuant to section 407 as it was in effect prior to such enactment; and 'assistance to needy families with children' means benefits under such part D, paid to such families.";

(2) by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively;

(3) (A) by striking out "living with any of the relatives specified in subsection (a) (1) in a place of residence maintained by one or more of such relatives as his or their own home" in paragraph (1) of subsection (d) as so redesignated and inserting in lieu thereof "a member of a family (as defined in section 445(a))", and

(B) by striking out "because such child or relative refused" and inserting in lieu thereof "because such child or another member of such family refused".

(j) Section 407 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 607) is repealed.

(k) Section 408 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 608) is redesignated as section 406, and as so redesignated is amended—

(1) by striking out everything (including the heading) which precedes paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"FOSTER CARE

"SEC. 406. For purposes of this part—

"(a) 'foster care' shall include only foster care which is provided in behalf of a child (1) who would, except for his removal from the home of a family as a result of a judicial determination to the effect that continuation therein would be contrary to his welfare, be a member of such family receiving assistance to needy families with children, (2) whose placement and care are the responsibility of (A) the State or local agency administering the State plan approved under section 402, or (B) any other public agency with whom the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such State plan has made an agreement which is still in effect and which includes provision for assuring development of a plan, satisfactory to such State agency, for such child as provided in paragraph (c) (1) and such other provisions as may be necessary to assure accomplishment of the objectives of the State plan approved under section 402, (3) who has been placed in a foster family home or child-care institution as a result of such determination, and (4) who (A) received assistance to needy families with children in or for the month in which court proceedings leading to such determination were initiated, or (B) would have received such assistance to needy families with children in or for such month if application had been made therefor, or (C) in the case of a child who had been a member of a family (as defined in section 445(a)) within six months prior to the month in which such proceedings were initiated, would have received such assistance in or for such month if in such month he had been a member of (and removed from the home of) such a family and application had been made therefor;

"(b) 'foster care' shall, however, include the care described in paragraph (a) only if it is provided—";

(2) (A) by striking out "'aid to families with dependent children'" in subsection (b) (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "foster care",

(B) by striking out "such foster care" in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "foster care", and

(C) by striking out the period at the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "; and";

(3) by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively;

(4) by striking out "paragraph (f) (2)" and "section 403(a) (3)" in subsection (c) (as so redesignated) and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (e) (2)" and "section 403 (a) (2)" respectively;

(5) by striking out "aid" in subsection (d) (as so redesignated) and inserting in lieu thereof "services";

(6) by striking out "relative specified in section 406(a)" in subsection (e) (1) (as so redesignated) and inserting in lieu thereof "family (as defined in section 445(a))"; and

(7) by striking out "522" and "part 3 of title V" in subsection (e) (2) (as so redesignated) and inserting in lieu thereof "422" and "part B of this title", respectively.

(l) (1) Section 409 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 609) is repealed.

(m) Section 410 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 610) is redesignated as section 407; and subsection (a) of such section (as so redesignated) is amended by striking out "section 402(a) (21)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 402(a) (15)".

(n) (1) Section 422(a) (1) (A) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 402(a) (15)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 402(a) (9)".

(2) Section 422(a) (1) (B) of such Act is amended by striking out "provided for dependent children" and inserting in lieu thereof "provided with respect to needy families with children".

(o) References in any law, regulation, State plan, or other document to any provision of part A of title IV of the Social Security Act which is redesignated by this section shall (from and after the effective date of the amendments made by this Act) be considered to be references to such provision as so redesignated.

CHANGES IN HEADINGS

SEC. 104. (a) The heading of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601, et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE IV—NATIONAL FAIR MINIMUM INCOME PLAN AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR AGED, BLIND, SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS, FOR COUPLES AND FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN, WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAMS, AND GRANTS TO STATES FOR FAMILY AND CHILD WELFARE SERVICES."

(b) The heading of part A of such title IV is amended to read as follows:

"PART A—SERVICES TO NEEDY FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN"

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

"REPEAL OF TITLES I, X, XIV, XVI, AND XIX AND OTHER INCONSISTENT PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

"SEC. 201. Titles I, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301, et seq., 120, et seq., 1351, et seq., 1381, et seq.) and such other provisions of such Act which are inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed.

ADDITIONAL DISREGARDING OF INCOME OF OASDI RECIPIENTS IN DETERMINING BENEFITS TO THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED PERSONS, COUPLES, AND FAMILIES

SEC. 202. Section 1007 of the Social Security Amendments of 1969 is amended by striking out "and before July 1970".

TRANSITION PROVISION RELATING TO OVERPAYMENTS AND UNDERPAYMENTS

SEC. 203. In the case of any State which has a State plan approved under title I, X, XIV, XVI or XIX of the Social Security Act as in effect prior to the enactment of this section, any overpayment or underpayment which the Secretary determined was made to such State under section 3, 1003, 1403, 1603, or 1903 of such Act with respect to a period before July 1, 1971, and with respect to which adjustment has not already been made under

subsection (b) of such section 3, 1003, 1403, 1603, or 1903, shall for purposes of parts A and B of title IV, as amended by this Act, be considered an overpayment or underpayment (as the case may be) under such parts as herein amended.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 228(D)

SEC. 204. Section 228(d)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "I, X, XIV, XVI or XIX," and by striking out "part A" and inserting in lieu thereof "receives payments with respect to such month pursuant to part D".

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE XI

SEC. 205. Title XI of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "I,", "X,", "XIV,", "XVI,", and "XIX," in section 1101(a)(1);

(2) by striking out "I,X,XIV,XVI and XIX" in section 1106(C)(1)(A);

(3) (A) by striking out "titles I,X,XIV, and XVI" in section 1108(a).

(B) by striking out "section 402(a)(19)" in section 1108(b) and inserting in lieu thereof "part A of title IV";

(4) by striking out the text of section 1109 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 1109. Any amount which is disregarded (or set aside for future needs) in determining eligibility for an amount of costs for services for any individual under a State plan approved under part A of title IV shall not be taken into consideration in determining the eligibility for and amount of aid or assistance for any other individual under any other part of said title."

(5) (A) by striking out "title I, X, XIV, and XVI of this Act, and" in section 1111, and

(B) by striking out "part A" in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "part D";

(6) (A) by striking out "title I, X, XIV, XVI, XIX of this Act" in the matter preceding clause (a) in section 1115.

(B) by striking out "of section 2, 402, 1002, 1402, 1602, or 1902," in clause (a) of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "of or pursuant to section 402," and

(C) by striking out "3, 403, 1003, 1403, 1603, or 1903," in clause (b) of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "403,";

(7) (A) by striking out "title I, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX of this Act," in subsections (a)(1), (b), and (d) of section 1116, and

(B) by striking out "4, 404, 1004, 1404, 1604, or 1904," in subsection (a)(3) of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "404,";

(8) by repealing section 1118;

(9) (A) by striking out "titles I, X, XIV, or XVI," in section 1119,

(B) by striking out "part A" in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "services under a State plan approved under part A," and

(C) by striking out "3(a), 403(a), 1003(a), 1403(a), or 1603(a)" in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "403(a)"; and

(10) by striking out section 1121.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE XVIII

SEC. 206. Title XVIII of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out section 1843.

TITLE III—GENERAL

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 301. The amendments and repeals made by this Act shall become effective, and section 9 of the Act of April 19, 1950 (25 U.S.C. 639), is repealed effective, on July 1, 1971; except that section 436 of the Social Security Act, as amended by this Act, shall be effective upon the enactment of this Act.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR PUERTO RICO, THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, AND GUAM

SEC. 302. Section 1108 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) (1) In applying the provisions of sections 442 (a), (b), (c), and (e), and 443(b)(2) and (6)—

"(1) With respect to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or Guam, the amounts to be used shall bear the same relation to the amounts specified in said sections as the per capita incomes of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, respectively, bear to the per capita income of that one of the fifty States which has the lowest per capital income; except that in no case may the amounts so used exceed such amounts specified and such amounts shall be rounded to the nearest dollar or fifty dollars, as the case may be.

"(2) (A) The amounts to be used under such sections in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam shall be promulgated by the Secretary between April 1 and June 30 of each year, on the basis of the average per capita income of each State and of the United States for the most recent calendar year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be effective for each fiscal year beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation.

"(B) The term 'United States', for purposes of subparagraph (A) only, means the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

"(3) If the amounts which would otherwise be promulgated for any fiscal year for any of the three States referred to in paragraph (1) would be lower than the amounts promulgated for such State for the immediately preceding period, the amounts for such fiscal year shall be increased to the extent of the difference; and the amounts so increased shall be the amounts promulgated for such year."

MEANING OF SECRETARY AND FISCAL YEAR

SEC. 303. As used in this Act and in the amendments made by this Act, the term "Secretary" means, unless the context otherwise requires, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the term "fiscal year" means a period beginning with any July and ending with the close of the following June 30.

YOUTH SPEAKS OUT

(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, the youth leaders of today are speaking out in moving words of their concerns, their fears, and their hopes. We need today to open our ears to what youth is saying. First, so they will feel that we are willing to listen, and second, so that we can evaluate what they say and that which we believe to be good, support and help them to achieve. One of the brilliant, young leaders of Florida is Michael Abrams, president of the Young Democrats Clubs of Florida. He spoke on March 9, 1971, before one of the valued forums of Florida, the Tiger Bay Club of Miami, and what he said I think we should hear and consider. I include, Mr. Speaker, the address of Michael Abrams before the Tiger Bay Club on March 9 in the RECORD following my remarks:

REMARKS BY MICHAEL ABRAMS

Gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for me to speak before Tiger Bay again. The last time I spoke here was two years ago when I was president of student government; and if I had known then what I know now about Tiger Bay, I probably would have been more nervous than I was at the time.

Two years ago I spoke about student unrest, and demonstrations over the war, the plight of the ghetto and the need for university reform. Now in 1971, although the killing in Viet Nam still goes on and the other problems still exist, student demonstrations are few and far between, and youth involvement in the political process has diminished considerably. Cynicism has replaced hope, and I contend this type of atmosphere is very dangerous for the country. It robs the country of youthful imagination and can very well lead us to a sterility of thought comparable to the silent generation of the 1950's. This cynicism of politics transcends all age groups. I think and hope this alienated feeling among youth is a temporary one that has arisen for several reasons:

1. The failure of the Youth Movement of 1968 to make any impact on the determination of the nominee at Chicago.

2. The duplicity of our actions in South East Asia.

3. The wholesale slaughter of students at such places as Kent State and Jackson State.

4. The intimidation of legitimate dissent by Spiro Agnew and the political right.

These are the obstacles we are trying to overcome in the Young Democrats. In this regard, we are receiving some help from the new members of the Cabinet. Secretary Stone and Attorney General Shevin's directives to register 18-year-olds have helped us overcome the obstinacies of many of the supervisors of elections in the State. Treasurer O'Malley is visiting the campuses of the State and making himself readily available to young people. This attitude shows young people that there is a willingness on the part of some of our officeholders to hear their views. We need more of our Democrats to bring government to the people.

On a more local level, the Young Democrats more than ever before have been issue-oriented and involved in some of the social problems of the State. As you probably know, we led the fight here in Dade County for the mobile homeowners to receive leases from the park owners. Employing a tactic of college students, we had the mobile homeowners picketing some of the parks and now they have been given leases where they weren't previously. In St. Peterburg, we raised over one thousand dollars worth of supplies for a medical clinic serving the black area. This type of activity has broadened our appeal immensely.

The Young Democrats also have some specific concerns that involve the legislative areas. We feel, as Ramsey Clark does, that certain laws that affect individual responsibility must be changed. For instance, we would favor a no-fault divorce law and legalized abortion. Abortion should be a matter between the doctor and a woman, and I don't believe any of us can make a moral judgment on it for somebody else.

We would also favor complete reform of the marijuana laws. Richard Rundell's Drug Research Foundation estimates that over 52,000 college students in Florida have tried marijuana and I dare say, a sizeable portion of our nonstudent population have also tried it. In addition, there is not any conclusive medical evidence that marijuana is harmful. It is just unrealistic to make usage of marijuana a felony. I think it's time to rid ourselves of our biases and face the truth about this matter.

We also agree with speaker Pettigrew that Florida should have a presidential preference primary in the early part of 1972. The fact that the legislature has not yet voted to put the corporate tax on the ballot before 1972, shows disregard on the part of some legislators of the mandate Governor Askew received in November.

There are three bills in the House that affect the treasurer's office. One calls for the Department of Insurance to be transferred to the Department of Business Regulation (FLEECE), the second would establish a six member insurance commission (Singleton), and the third transfers financial responsibility to the Department of Highway Safety

(Singleton and Gustafson). The young Democrats of Florida have publically come out against any division of the department and have stated that we favor no-fault insurance. Once again, we feel any contrary action would deny the mandate the treasurer received in November, and we think the best chance the public has for insurance reform is keeping the jurisdiction under an elected official who must be responsible to the people in order to stay in office.

Finally, I would like to spend a few moments on a subject that threatens all of us every day, and that is violence in our society. Sometimes, I think that we have accepted violence as a way of life in this country or at best, all we can do is scream about law and order. It seems to me there are three kinds of violence:

1. Physical violence: The violence one individual, or group, or nation physically imposes on another.

2. Institutional violence: The violence caused by the indifference of our institutions to the needs of the people and

3. Rhetorical violence: Violence caused by inflammatory rhetoric or derogatory labels.

I believe that institutional violence and rhetorical violence have been the direct cause of much of the physical violence in our society.

If we can deal with these two types of violence realistically, then the rate of violence in our society would diminish drastically.

Let's examine some forms of institutional violence today, for example, the plight of the migrant workers, the poor rural whites and the blacks in the urban ghettos are living proof that our institutions are not being responsive enough. After all, what can a man who goes to bed hungry and fears being bitten by rats in his sleep think? How long can he be expected to cheer the American flag? How long will he look to his own Nation with respect and love. And how long will it be before he is driven to commit an act of violence? The answer is not very long. It's really a question of priorities. For, as long as winning the war in Vietnam or going to the moon is more important than meeting the human needs of our people, the violence at home is going to continue to go on and on and on.

Now, about rhetorical violence. I think politicians are the most guilty party of this. In the 1970 elections we saw constant examples of politicians playing on the prejudices and fears of people—attacks on the youth, minority groups and the press. This type of leadership only adds to the divisiveness and hate in the country. We saw this continual negativism on the part of the Republicans here in Florida, to the point where they were even trying to pit north Floridians against south Floridians. It almost borders a form of insanity. We rejected it in Florida in 1970 and I hope the country rejects it in 1972.

Sometime or another, I suppose we are all guilty of using words that connotate division . . . words like red-neck, hippie, war monger, draft dodger, establishment, and drop-out. Even the word "hard hat" has become a symbol of political ideology.

It used to be political scientists talked about a political spectrum and could identify people ideologically by describing them as conservative, liberal, moderately conservative, middle-of-the-road, et cetera.

But these once merely descriptive terms have become inflammatory labels, now we tend to label people as ultraliberal or radiclib or ultra conservative.

More and more . . . we no longer have a respectable political spectrum . . . we are increasingly arriving at a polarization of inflammatory labels.

If we can all make an effort at being more tolerant, the hate will decrease and the violence with it. If we can do this and if our institutions become more responsive . . . then Carl Sandberg will be right when he said:

"I see America, not in the setting sun of a black night of despair ahead of us. I see America in the crimson light of a rising sun, fresh from the burning, creative hand of God. I see great days ahead, great days possible to men and women of will and vision."

CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

(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, a few days ago before the Democratic national policy committee, Mr. James F. Ahern, former police commissioner of New Haven, Conn., and one of the outstanding authorities on crime in the Nation, delivered a very able and comprehensive address on the problem of crime in the country. I commend Mr. Ahern's excellent address to my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, it appears following my comments in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF JAMES F. AHERN

Mr. Chairman, members of the Policy Council, I am pleased to have the opportunity to discuss the important issues of crime and criminal justice with you. Law and order and crime in the streets have been major partisan issues in the United States in recent years. Now, however, irrational public passion about crime appears to have decreased somewhat. This Committee's drawing on professionals in this area seems to reflect a more thoughtful effort to deal with the problems of crime than has been shown by other political groups in the past. With this new attitude, it should be possible to show the public that a patchwork of repression and pork barrel is not an effective solution to the problems of crime and the criminal justice system. Today also, a realistic possibility for the opposition party is to put forward affirmative alternatives sufficiently specific and cogent to demonstrate existing fuzzy thinking and political expediency.

The problem of crime as most people understand it actually incorporates three separate problems: street crime, drugs, and organized crime. As well as combining these different areas into one nebulous topic, much discussion of this field has also included campus unrest, civil disorders and the fair treatment of suspected offenders. The result becomes a confusing swirl of divergent though related issues. If the Democratic Party wants to put forward a platform that deals realistically with the problems of crime, it must analyze street crime, drugs and organized crime separately.

Street crime is a national issue because it affects the majority of Americans. Although the victims of this kind of crime are relatively few, the fear of it in both urban and suburban life is pervasive. Even though organized crime, white collar crime, and other criminal activity ultimately hurt people to a greater extent, it is direct physical and emotional involvement the average individual fears.

Violent street crimes are committed by a small proportion of the criminal population. Muggings, robberies and rapes are typically the offenses of alienated young men. Relatively few in number, and derived from the urban poor, these young men often have problems with unemployment, drugs and racial or ethnic discrimination. Without the support of a responsive educational system, or positive community or peer groups, city teenagers often fall into this antisocial pattern of crime. The inadequacies of the criminal justice system and the absence of successful rehabilitation forces these young people into recidivism and an ongoing career of street crime.

Besides dealing with the fear of potential victims and with the social and psychological problems of youthful offenders, a successful attack on street crime must include improved techniques of apprehension and deterrence. Existing measures have involved principally intensified patrol by uniformed police officers. However, this approach is largely ineffectual since protection is limited to the area in which the police officer is actually present and it remains easy for the offender to avoid the police. Occasional experiments with more sophisticated techniques have not been widely adopted.

The failure to promote new methods of apprehension is typical of present approaches to street crime. The principal federal effort in this area consists of channeling large dollar amounts to local police departments. However, the municipal police departments lack the expertise and initiative to make meaningful use of these new resources. Police chiefs have often found it easier to invest federal funds in helicopters and radio voice scramblers than in programs involving substantial changes in methods of operation. Washington has done little to reverse this trend.

In addition to this mostly wasted financial assistance to local police departments, the principal proposal from Washington to deal with street crime has been preventive detention. Many other observers have indicated the fundamental threat to civil liberties posed by this practice. I wish to add that it seems unlikely to do very much to decrease the occurence of street crime. A more adequate approach to the problem of crimes committed by persons awaiting trial would be to upgrade the efficiency and integrity of the criminal courts. The provision of speedy trials, as provided by our constitution, would have a far greater effect than would preventive detention.

No program will significantly alter the recidivist profile of street crime offenders until we have done something to halt the revolving door system of justice dispensed today in our courts. Until we can truly promise our citizens a fair trial we will continue to alienate and, ultimately, further criminalize them. I suggest that anyone who wishes to see first hand how inhumane and brutal our court system can be spend a day in any municipal court in the United States. Justice cannot be delivered at four cases a minute.

The changes required are very basic ones. The plea bargaining process must be removed from the back rooms of our courthouses and displayed to the public where they can observe its practice and insure that it is not only the well-connected that escape without punishment. Full-time prosecutors must be provided whose loyalty would be to the cause of justice rather than their private practice. Full-time defense attorneys must be provided those defendants who cannot afford private counsel. Courts must remain in session more often and for longer hours. And the selection process for judges and prosecutors must be removed from the political spoils system. Only with changes such as these will the court system begin to function in a manner that would restore respect for the courts and for the law in the citizens of our country.

Other proposals to cope with street crime must lessen in our citizens the fear of violent attack. One approach to this task stresses more effective city planning, such as im-

proved street lighting and the mixture of residential and commercial areas. Another approach would be to institute a program of compensation for victims of serious crime. Such a program would be particularly appropriate since so many of the people attacked on the streets are elderly or poor and cannot absorb the loss of property, medical costs or time away from work that so often results.

Any significant strategy for dealing with violent street crime must include the upgrading of our juvenile justice system. From their enlightened origins several decades ago, the juvenile courts and detention facilities have deteriorated to the point where they promote rather than combat juvenile delinquency. If the juvenile delinquent is to be helped, greatly augmented and coordinated services must be available. Full time psychiatrists and psychologists must be provided our juvenile courts. Social and medical agencies must be funded at a level that would permit them to expand both their staffs and the hours that they work. Police departments must be encouraged, and LEAA funding is one method to do so, to staff their youth divisions with case workers as well as police officers. Unless the police and juvenile court can offer the teenage offender meaningful alternatives to the street or reformatory, he is likely to continue and escalate his criminal career. I am convinced that unless we develop such alternatives, the frustrations facing much of our youth will continue to erupt into street crime.

A fourth component in a national program to cope with street crime must be the encouragement of new policies on the part of local police. Mere financial support, as provided under the Safe Streets Act of 1968, has proved inadequate. The Federal Government must take the initiative in fostering new ideas and promoting those programs which have proved successful in the more experimental police departments.

A major step in this direction would be the creation of a national institute of police standards. The institute would direct federally supported experimentation in law enforcement and draft and distribute a set of voluntary standards in such areas as police recruitment, training, operating procedures, organizational design, conduct and ethics. Such a professional organization is needed to provide leadership and guidance to the thousands of police departments in the country. Through the institute's leadership, great operational improvements could be accomplished.

One cannot discuss street crime without facing the problem of drug abuse that has came to permeate American life. Hundreds of thousands of Americans are now addicted to heroin. Literally millions more are affected by the crimes addicts commit.

Measured against the extent of the drug problem today, and the degree of public concern about it, Federal effects in the drug area have been grossly inadequate and disjointed. The one major Federal initiative in the drug area, Project Intercept, sought to halt the flow of a drug, marijuana, for which no harmful medical effects have yet been proved. And it sought to do so through extraordinary customs search procedures at the Mexican border. It is difficult to understand, with the serious heroin problem facing this Nation, why the Federal Government chose to concentrate its effects on marijuana.

Beyond Project Intercept, recent Federal efforts at combatting drug trafficking have been largely confined to legal gimmickery. No-knock searches, for example, constitute a serious erosion of civil liberties without any substantial benefit in obtaining evidence in drug cases. Many searches in drug cases have always been conducted without a warning knock or with only the most perfunctory one. The new law seems far more likely to invade our privacy than to further the fight against drugs. In much the same way, the stiffer penalties for drug selling recently enacted by Congress are unlikely to have much significance so long as drug dealers are rarely apprehended.

By contrast, Federal support for research and treatment in the drug area has always been limited. At a time when LEAA funds are often being squandered, money for medical programs concerned with drugs has remained very scarce.

In order to move beyond the present ineffectual Federal role in dealing with the drug crisis, I would suggest a four pronged attack on the problem.

First, all Federal activity in the narcotics area must be coordinated. At present, each Federal agency pursues its own frequently contradictory objectives from its own perspectives with communication often occurring only, if at all, at the Cabinet level. A single Federal agency should be created to asume responsibility for all the various drug programs now scattered throughout the Federal bureacracy. Only by this means could a coherent national policy on drugs be developed and implemented.

Second, the Federal Government should mount a massive basic medical research program into the causes, cure and rehabilitation of narcotics addicts. While a medical cure will not solve the problems that influenced the addict to retreat into a life of drugs, it will be a powerful tool in aiding the addict and in diminishing the societal harm he inflicts. If we were able to solve the polio problem in the 1950's, and if we can today talk about a major national effort to develop a cure for cancer, surely it is time to begin a similar campaign to develop a cure for narcotics addiction. The resources are available in the medical centers of this country, it is up to us to provide them with the funds necessary to use those resources.

Third, until a cure for narcotics addiction is found, the Federal Government must intensify its support of current rehabilitative efforts such as methadone maintenance, Synanon and Daytop Village. There is no excuse for forcing an addict to walk the streets, and steal to support his habit, because there is no space for him in a rehabilitation program.

Fourth, Federal law enforcement agencies must undertake an intensive effort to stop the flow of narcotics into this country. All the available evidence indicates that the illegal entry of heroin into this country is heavily concentrated in the port of New York. If Federal law enforcement agencies can find the manpower for project Intercept, or could overnight create an entire police force to prevent airline skyjackings, surely they should be able to assemble an adequate task force to saturate the port of New York.

The link between narcotics marketing and organized crime has long been clear. The importation and wholesale distribution of drugs is only one of many ways in which organized crime has penetrated the fabric of American life. Organized criminal groups also operate extensive vice networks and dominate many seemingly legitimate businesses and labor unions. And often they conduct their business with near impunity shielded by corrupt public officials and by public apathy.

As in other areas of the crime problem, recent Federal action has been based more on gimmicks than on substantial enforcement efforts. I speak, of course, of wiretapping. While wiretapping is an effective method of eroding our constitutional liberties and harassing political radicals, it has proved of little utility against organized crime. The knowledgeable organized criminal can easily avoid incriminating use of tapped telephones. Moreover, the extraordinary cost involved in monitoring telephone conversations diverts economic resources from the basic enforcement efforts against organized crime.

The most useful Federal effort against organized crime in recent years has been the task forces created by former Attorney General Ramsey Clark. The task forces represent a coordinated approach by a number of law enforcement agencies and have had some success in exposing and prosecuting leading organized criminal figures and their accomplices in high public office. The Federal Government must add to these strike forces State and local law enforcement agencies before they will be able to realize their potential in combatting organized crime.

The problem of organized crime cannot be separated from that of political and governmental corruption. The recently successful investigation in Newark, New Jersey is a good indication of how intimately connected are organized crime and politics. And Newark is unique in this country only because its corruption and organized criminal activity was publicly uncovered. I believe that the problem has become so serious that it is time to create a separate agency within the department of justice whose sole function would be the exposure and prosecution of this intertwined net of organized crime and corruption. When the citizens of this country lose faith in the honesty and integrity of their leaders, and the ability of their law enforcement agencies to halt overt criminal activity, the continued viability of our country faces a serious threat.

By focusing on the three key issues of street crime, drugs and organized crime, the Democratic party would be able to move beyond the appeal to fear and anger that has dominated political discussion of crime in recent years. In view of the critical need to begin to grapple with the real problems in this field, I hope the party will seize the opportunity.

A TIME CERTAIN

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the war in Southeast Asia has already exacted too heavy a toll of American lives. It has created conditions of national discord of great virulence, and it is costing billions of dollars that could be applied effectively to other and more humane purposes.

We have had some temporary declines in our casualty lists, but our total losses continue to mount and the determination that this war should not go on interminably must be expressed and the Congress must make its position clear.

The facts revealed in the Mylai case underscore the brutalizing effects of warfare. They should motivate all of us to work, not only to conclude this particular war, but also to make every effort to bring about international arms reduction and to reach accords which will limit the possibility of future wars.

I supported the position of the majority of the Democratic caucus, including the Dent amendment which strengthened the Bolling substitute. Although not mandating an immediate end

to the war or a cutting off of appropriations at this moment, nevertheless the caucus has agreed that the Congress should work toward a termination of the war within a specific period of time.

Its actual language is—

That the House of Representatives should work to end the United States military involvement in Indochina and to bring about the release of all prisoners during the 92nd Congress.

This does mark a change in public congressional positions on the war and I supported this action because I believe that it is incumbent upon Members of Congress to express the growing national revulsion against the war and the overwhelming desire of our people to have it terminated.

This revulsion was evidenced in a recent public opinion poll which I conducted in my district. In the priority ranking of national problems the war in Vietnam ranked second only to that of critical inflation and unemployment. Of 5,777 who responded, 1,716 identified the Vietnam conflict as the Nation's principal problem. Of 8,700 responses to the question: Do you favor immediate unilateral withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam?—4,352 said yes and 4,130 said no. Thus to this extreme statement of position there was an evenly divided answer representing a significant change in favor of withdrawal since my last poll.

I have supported this resolution after serious deliberation and in the knowledge that any reference to a specific date is highly controversial. However, there is no controversy over the fact that every American wants our servicemen returned and our prisoners of war released without delay and it is this objective to which the caucus has sought to give effect.

FRANK JAMES WAS QUIET AND STUDIOUS

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, one of our constituents, Elizabeth Rogers Jones, of Independence, Mo., is a long-time friend for whom I have the highest respect and great affection.

It has recently come to my attention that she is the winner of the Missouri Press Women's writing contest. It should be remembered that the Missouri Press Women are affiliated with the National Press Women, Inc.

In a recent letter from the contest chairman, Jane Byrd, Mrs. Jones was advised that she had placed second among the authors of feature stories in newspapers of 100,000 or more circulation. There will be a presentation of awards at the spring meeting of the Missouri Press Women in Columbia. For those of my colleagues who may not be fully advised, Columbia, Mo., is the home of the University of Missouri and the seat of its world famous University of Missouri School of Journalism.

Mrs. Jones deserves the warmest congratulations from her fellow members of the Missouri Press Women and the members of the National Federation of Press Women.

The winning feature story is centered around the life of Frank James, brother of the quick tempered Jesse James and one of the associates of the Youngers who were participants in a kind of guerrilla warfare which was waged in western Missouri during the years of the War Between the States. These guerrillas were pro-Confederate and famous or infamous, were known as Bushwackers.

Betty Jones, in my opinion, does a scholarly job of describing Frank James as a kind of bookworm who could recite from memory passages from Shakespeare. We must remember that this same man who carried books in his saddlebag. He was a man who had the capability at the same time to disrupt the enemy's communications and to capture Union supplies. This same Frank James, who could quote from Macbeth, was a man who served as one of Capt. Charles Quantrill's own guerrilla recruits. Every one of these men all under 25 years old were dead shots and mounted on splendid fast horses.

The winning feature story is so well written, so interesting, and so informative that when it came to my attention I thought it should be shared with my colleagues in the House and to become a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that it would be preserved in our archives.

It is my privilege to now read for the RECORD the winning feature story as it appeared in the Kansas City Times, a newspaper in Kansas City, Mo.

FRANK JAMES WAS QUIET AND STUDIOUS

(By Elizabeth R. Jones)

Baird Liggett of Blue Springs, 80 years old and active, remembers seeing Frank James, the Shakespeare-quoting bandit, at a picnic and reunion on the Judge S. L. Luttrell farm back in the 1890s when he was ten years old.

"The clearing had been cut between a grove of large oaks," he said, "and a platform built for the town fathers, leading citizens and Confederate veterans to sit on. They were waiting for the festivities to begin when Frank James slipped up on the platform and poured water into a glass for the speaker, a close friend of his. It was a hot day in August."

As Baird Liggett talked, these men, famous or infamous, rode across the pages of Eastern Jackson County history once again.

"I remember the day well," Liggett went on. "Frank James was a medium-sized, thin, handsome and slightly stooped man and well dressed. Being just a kid, I was afraid of him. He had a large head with a more prominent high forehead than most people. To me it seemed to slope back."

BOOK WORM

All his life Frank was quiet and studious, not quick-tempered like his brother Jesse. He had a scanty education but was a "book worm" and carried in his saddle bags his favorite books. No matter where he was, in a Rebel camp, a well-supplied, hidden Bushwhackers cave or in a pro-Southern friend's home he studied the classics and read Ingersoll.

Capt. Harrison Trowe, in his history, "Guerrilla Warfare in the Missouri and Kansas Border, 1861 to 1865," relates that Frank could recite by memory almost all of Shakespeare's "Richard the Second"—his favorite.

"You see how I know about the Jamses and the Bushwhackers," Liggett explained, my great uncles, James and John Little, were Bushwhackers and rode with the James boys, Cole Younger and Quantrill. They married my grandfather's sisters, the Liggett girls, and I learned from them the daring exploits of the pro-Confederate armed resistance to the Union troops stationed in Missouri, and Kansas Jayhawker's raids across the border.

Because of the strong feelings of Southern sympathizers against what they called the "hated abolitionist" in Kansas the entire state of Missouri was almost thrown into anarchy.

The border warfare began in earnest in 1861. Capt. Charles Quantrill and his young guerrilla recruits (all under 25) were dead shots and were mounted on splendid horses. They began to retaliate against the tactics of the Union Kansas leaders—Montgomery, Lane and Jennson—partly for protection and partly for revenge.

Frank James fought under the black flag of Quantrill and under the Rebel flag of Gen. Jo Shelby.

Some Bushwhackers were spies for the Confederacy. Others were farmers who fought for the South between planting and harvesting and protected and fed their comrades.

As an armed force, not more than 250 at a time, the Bushwhackers hid behind patches of hazel bushes, thick undergrowth and culverts along the roadsides where unsuspecting Union cavalrymen and marching soldiers traveled. They harassed and disrupted the enemies communications, looting and capturing Union supplies and then disappeared like vapor on their fast horses into the tall, heavy timber nearby.

At the beginning of the Civil War, Frank "joined up" with Gen. Sterling Price's Confederate army. He was 18 years old. The Jameses owned no slaves but were hotheaded Kentucky secessionists, especially Zerelda James Samuels, the James boys' mother.

In the battle of Wilson creek in South Missouri, Frank had his first encounter with the enemy. He was captured and brought back and imprisoned in the Liberty jail. Due to the pleading of his mother and promises from Frank never to take up arms again against the federal government, he was released. He had had enough of organized fighting. He didn't like it and soon afterward in 1862 joined Quantrill.

In June 1863, a squad of Union soldiers dismounted at the James' home at Kearney, Mo., and demanded that his stepfather, Dr. Reuben Samuels, tell them where Frank was hiding.

The doctor refused to give them the information they came for. In a rage they attempted to hang him. But his wife cut the rope just in time to save his life. As the Unionists were leaving the place, they came upon Jesse, 15, plowing corn. They dismounted again and began to question him about his older brother. Jesse gave them only contemptuous answers. The soldiers beat him with a rope until his back was a bloody mass of welts. That day Jesse made up his mind to join his brother Frank and fight with Quantrill.

JUST A COWARD

"Frank James had a score to finish with the federals, and so did Jimmy Little after his brother Johnny was killed by them," Liggett went on. "It chilled my blood to see Frank at close range. I guess I'm just a coward," he laughed. "My Bushwhacking rela-

tives used up all the bravery in the family. Grandpa Liggett came from Illinois and bought a 600-acre farm near here. He protected his brothers-in-law, partly out of fear and partly because he liked them, and after the war he got into politics and was elected county marshal.

"My Great-Uncle Jimmy said to me, 'Son, never tell about us as long as I live,' and I never did. He was so resentful over the death of Johnny that he killed easy after that. One day in a skirmish with the Union soldiers near Heifner railroad crossing, Uncle Jimmy shot a federal cavalryman off his horse. He called back to the Rebs who were following on fast horses, 'Shoot him again!' They thought the soldier was already dead and did not shoot. In the fury of the battle the soldier escaped and crawled to safety. Jimmy shouted, 'I'll never take another prisoner!' and he lived to prove it."

Liggett continued: "The code of the Bushwhackers was if their enemy was killed in battle his possessions belonged to them, and they expected the same treatment.

"One day a band of Bushwhackers and Jimmy Little came upon a lone federal cavalryman watering his horse in the middle of the creek. 'Let him alone, Jimmy,' his companions said, 'we want to ask him some questions and find out where the feds are hiding.' But the only question Little asked was 'How much do you want for your horse?'

"The federalist shouted, 'You'll have to take him over my dead body!' The reply made Jimmy mad and he shot the soldier right above the ear, with one shot. Lifeless, he toppled into the shallow water.

"After the war, Jimmy Little went to Kentucky and his family never heard from him again.

"Jim Hopkin's—another Bushwhacker in these parts—aunt told me many times this story," Liggett said. "The woods were full of Bushwhackers and many were farmers. Hopkins' little daughter, Nancy, about 12 years old was walking home along the road near East Fork creek one day when she recognized Frank and Jesse James riding their magnificent horses toward her. Panic-stricken, she tried to escape unnoticed by cautiously working her way up the side of the bank. The two riders, seeing her, stopped their horses, Jesse asked, "Who is the little girl?' Frank replied, 'Why, that's Nancy, Jim Hopkins' little girl.' Then Jesse said, 'Little girl, come down and don't be afraid of us. This road belongs to you as well as anyone else.'

Liggett bent over in his chair and laughed and rubbed his forehead in a familiar gesture. Ruth, his wife, for over 50 years, sat nearby and smiled at him, listening attentively.

"I tell you if you can't laugh at things, life isn't worth livin'," he said.

Mrs. Liggett smiled in agreement. Both look unusually young for their age and have a delightful sense of humor.

COLE YOUNGER

"I also saw Cole Younger, on Maple avenue in Independence when I was 12 years old," Liggett said. "He and Frank were good friends but not with Jesse."

At the Northfield, Minn., bank robbery, 1876, by the Younger-James band, all the bandits were killed or captured except Frank and Jesse.

A quarrel ensued between Cole and Jesse when he wanted Cole to leave his brother Bob who was badly wounded. Cole refused and he and his brothers were captured and Cole served 25 years in the state penitentiary.

"Cole as well as Frank during Bushwhacking days had their horses trained to take their rider into battle from a walk to a full run with both reins held in his teeth, a gun in each hand, cocked and ready to fire. It was a 2-gun business to be a Bushwhacker. It was also an unwritten Bushwhacker law to respect each other's guns," Liggett emphasized.

The bank robbery at Northfield, Minn., spelled doom for the Jameses and Youngers.

Frank was tired of running and wanted a peaceful life with his beloved wife, Annie, and son, Robert.

After Jesse was murdered by Bob Ford, 1882, Frank was afraid he would be ambushed for the $10,000 reward hanging over his head.

Frank James surrendered to Gov. Thomas Crittenden in Jefferson City on October 5, 1883. He presented his two six-shooters to the governor and said, "You're the first man to touch my guns. My life is in your hands."

Frank was acquitted on February 21, 1885.

In September, 1897, he went to the battlefield at Centralia, Mo., to pay homage to his dead comrades. A reporter from the Herald newspaper was there asking him questions about his Bushwhacking days. He quoted from Macbeth, "Never shake thy gory locks at me; thou canst say I did it."

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED: COMMUNITY ATTITUDES

(Mr. ALBERT, at the request of Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, was granted permission to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, each year the Governors Committee on Employment of the Handicapped of the State of Oklahoma sponsors an "Ability Counts" essay contest in which high school juniors and seniors are invited to submit essays on employment of the handicapped. This year, I am very proud to report, the winner of the State contest is Miss Sydnee Thompson, a 17-year-old high school senior from my hometown of McAlester, Okla. She has written an outstanding essay on community attitudes in our hometown of McAlester. Her teacher, Miss Mabel Aston, her principal, Dr. Finas Sandlin, and all our fellow townspeople are extremely proud of Sydnee.

Under the unanimous consent request, I include at this point in the RECORD her winning essay titled "Employment of the Handicapped: Community Attitudes."

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED: COMMUNITY ATTITUDES

(By Miss Sydree Thompson)

"Happiness does not come from doing easy work, but from the after-glow of satisfaction that comes after the achievement of a difficult task which has demanded our best."[1] These are the words of a local citizen, Chairman of the Mayor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, a man whose efforts I could not appreciate until I had learned what an excellent job he and others like him are doing.

McAlester has always been home. I assumed I knew my city rather well. This study, however, has re-educated me as to the value of my community. I am proud to have learned about he exceptional spirit and attitude here. I have found outstanding examples of the American dream—that opportunity to make of one's self just as much as his capabilities allow. I also discovered that Oklahoma ranks third in jobs filled by handicapped workers. Many communities contribute in making this achievement possible, but McAlester can take pride in its part in accomplishing this high standard.

The core of McAlester's efforts to aid the handicapped worker is the Mayor's Committee, organized in January, 1968. The objective of this committee is to increase employment of the handicapped, in order to make them useful, tax-paying instead of tax-consuming, citizens. I found that they have, indeed, achieved their goal.

In January, 1969, the Naval Ammunition Depot, active in hiring the handicapped, and full of success stories such as that of Robert Burris, a blind computer programmer, was presented the *first* Disabled American Veterans National Employer's Award. In March, 1969, the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped presented eight awards state-wide. McAlester, the first city to receive more than one award, received three.

Both local newspapers have received awards for support involving employment of the handicapped. Both radio stations and the Cable TV Company have helped with announcements and posters.

Other firms active in employment of handicapped include: First National Bank, McHoma Lodge, Krebs Concrete Service, McAlester News-Capital, Day & Night Grocery, Ward's Service Stations, Oklahoma State Penitentiary, and the County Health Department.

Pittsburg County has a disabled veteran serving as a deputy sheriff and another as an employee of the Department of Public Safety. Our Court Clerk, disabled in World War II, has been in office since 1951. Despite his handicap, the citizens of Pittsburg County have given him their vote of confidence every two years since that time. He has truly proved that "Ability Counts"!

Other helping hands include the Work Incentive Program, Vocational Rehabilitation Office, and State Employment Office. I found these to be especially dedicated in placing the handicapped in positions where they can help others and themselves. These services are not unique to McAlester; they can be found all across Oklahoma. What is unique is the *extra* time and attention given here. In 1969, our Mayor nominated the Manager of the local Employment Service for the Employer of the Year Award. He emphasized that in placing the handicapped, the Manager conducts campaigns by personally and tirelessly conferring with employers in their behalf. Four handicapped veterans serve on the staff of our Employment Service. Last year, three hundred and ninety-two veterans obtained employment. In the words of our local DAV Commander, ***"They go out of their way to help."***[2]

My discovery of our attitude toward the handicapped has caused me to re-assess my community *and* myself. I have seen the value of contributing to the rehabilitation of a human being. The enthusiasm I have found everywhere has sparked my personal ambition. In learning of the things being done, new doors seem to have opened as to what can be done.

What truly makes a person "handicapped" is placing him in a particular niche and saying, "This is all you can do; stay here." Too often, if there are limits, *we* place them.

To quote our Chairman again, "These handicapped citizens and others who may be disabled in any way do not want sympathy; they do not want to be made objects of pity and charity. Their role in life, like ours, is to be useful."[3] These quotes, at the beginning and conclusion of this report, excellently summarize the attitudes of my community toward employment of the handicapped. I

can take pride in my city's efforts to help these men and women attain a more useful and rewarding life. All that they ask is a chance, and I am proud to say that in *McAlester, Oklahoma,* they are being given that chance!

FOOTNOTES

[1] Quote from a letter addressed to a prospective member of the Mayor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, written by Earl R. Dunn, Chairman.

[2] Quote from a statement made by Harold Gray, local Commander of the DAV.

[3] Quote from a letter addressed to the author, Sydnee Thompson, written by Earl R. Dunn, Chairman, Mayor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

1. Mr. Bob Baggett, Station KTMC, McAlester, Oklahoma.
2. Mr. Jack Dale, Court Clerk, McAlester, Oklahoma.
3. Mr. Al Dickens, Manager, Employment Service, McAlester, Oklahoma.
4. Mr. Earl R. Dunn, Chairman, Mayor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, McAlester, Oklahoma.
5. Mr. Harold Gray, Commander, DAV, McAlester, Oklahoma.
6. Handicapped veterans of McAlester, Oklahoma, including: Mr. Joe Palmer, Mr. J. C. Harvey, Mr. Tom Ford, Mr. Dan Tedrick, Mr. David Gardner, Mr. Bill Votaw, Mr. Joe Tannehill, Mr. Ed Whitney, Mr. Bob Lake, and Mr. Wayne Holloway.
7. McAlester Cable TV Company.
8. Mayor Harry W. Owens, McAlester, Oklahoma.
9. Mr. Francis Stipe, Editor, *McAlester Democrat.*
10. Mr. Fred Turner, Editor, *McAlester News-Capital.*
11. Vocational Rehabilitation Office, Mr. Clyde Petete, Manager, McAlester, Oklahoma.
12. WIN Program, Mr. Lloyd W. Burris, Director, McAlester, Oklahoma.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PRICE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today through April 9, on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. ARENDS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and balance of week, on account of death in family.

Mr. RANDALL, for April 1 and 2, on account of official business in home district.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. WAGGONNER), for today from 12 noon until 2 p.m. Wednesday, March 31, on account of official business.

Mr. GETTYS (at the request of Mr. STEPHENS), for today, on account of personal illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. GONZALEZ for 15 minutes today.

Mr. RANDALL, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama for 5 minutes today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio for 5 minutes today.

Mr. FINDLEY for 5 minutes today.

Mr. HAGAN for 10 minutes today.

Mr. BELL of California for 20 minutes today.

Mr. ZWACH for 1 hour May 3.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FUQUA for 30 minutes today.

Mr. FLOOD for 20 minutes today.

Mr. FLYNT for 10 minutes today.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia for 15 minutes today.

Mr. GRIFFIN for 10 minutes today.

Mr. MCFALL for 15 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PRICE of Illinois, to extend his remarks today on the Selective Service Act amendments, and to include a table.

Mr. GRAY, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MCMILLAN.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. GOLDWATER to revise and extend remarks made in Committee of the Whole to follow Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. PUCINSKI, and to include a table during general debate today on H.R. 6531.

Mr. RANDALL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL to revise and extend remarks in Committee of the Whole on H.R. 6531 prior to a recorded teller vote on the Whalen amendment.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in three instances.

Mr. BLACKBURN in two instances.

Mr. NELSEN in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. FREY in two instances.

Mr. SHOUP.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. ZION in two instances.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. SCHMITZ in three instances.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. HUNT in two instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. BOW in two instances.

Mr. SKUBITZ in two instances.

Mr. KEMP in two instances.

Mr. SANDMAN.

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

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.

Mr. DRINAN.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. CARNEY in two instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. FOLEY.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. DULSKI in six instances.

Mr. MANN in 10 instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. ALEXANDER in five instances.

Mr. REES.

Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.

Mr. ABBITT.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. KARTH in two instances.

Mr. BRASCO.

Mr. GALLAGHER in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania in three instances.

Mr. HATHAWAY in two instances.

Mr. ROBERTS in two instances.

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. SATTERFIELD in two instances.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5432. An act to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 1, 1971, at 11 o'clock a.m.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES DURING 1970 AS REQUIRED BY THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED BY PUBLIC LAW 86-472 AND BY PUBLIC LAW 86-628

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86-472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86-628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds.

The required reports for travel during 1970 are submitted herewith:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 127, 1ST SESS., 91ST CONG., BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation[1]: Foreign currency	Transportation[1]: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Poage, W. R.:												
Upper Volta	CFA franc	11/6	11/7	1	13,800	50.00	5,312	19.31			5,312	19.31
Niger	CFA franc	11/7	11/7	1	13,800	50.00	3,000	10.91			3,000	10.91
Chad	CFA franc	11/7	11/8	1	13,800	50.00	11,000	40.00			11,000	40.00
Central African Republic	CFA franc	11/8	11/9	1	13,800	50.00	9,464	34.17			9,464	34.17
Uganda	Schilling	11/9	11/11	2	700	100.00	400	57.14			400	57.14
Malawi	Pound	11/11	11/11	1	20.8	50.00	1.2.3	2.85			1.2.3	2.85
Mauritius	Rupee	11/11	11/12	1	276	50.00	44.28	8.01			44.28	8.01
South Africa	Ran	11/13	11/17	5	178.57	250.00	90	126.00			90	126.00
Congo	Zair	11/17	11/18	1	24.5	50.00	22.85	46.68			22.85	46.68
Liberia	Dollar	11/18	11/19	1	50.00	50.00	20.00	20.00			20.00	20.00
Mauritania	Franc	11/19	11/19	1	13,800	50.00	3,943	14.28			3,943	14.28
Surinam	Guilder	11/20	11/21	1	92	50.00	64.35	35.00			64.35	35.00
Total						850.00		414.35				414.35
Abernethy, Thos. G.:												
Upper Volta	CFA franc	11/6	11/7	1	13,800	50.00	5,312	19.31			5,312	19.31
Niger	CFA franc	11/7	11/7	1	13,800	50.00	3,000	10.91			3,000	10.91
Chad	CFA franc	11/7	11/8	1	13,800	50.00	11,000	40.00			11,000	40.00
Central African Republic	CFA franc	11/8	11/9	1	13,800	50.00	9,464	34.17			9,464	34.17
Uganda	Schilling	11/9	11/11	2	700	100.00	400	57.14			400	57.14
Malawi	Pound	11/11	11/11	1	20.8	50.00	1.2.3	2.85			1.2.3	2.85
Mauritius	Rupee	11/11	11/12	1	276	50.00	44.28	8.01			44.28	8.01
South Africa	Ran	11/13	11/17	5	178.57	250.00	90	126.00			90	126.00
Congo	Zair	11/17	11/18	1	24.5	50.00	22.85	46.68			22.85	46.68
Liberia	Dollar	11/18	11/19	1	50.00	50.00	20.00	20.00			20.00	20.00
Mauritania	Franc	11/19	11/19	1	13,800	50.00	3,943	14.28			3,943	14.28
Surinam	Guilder	11/20	11/21	1	92	50.00	64.35	35.00			64.35	35.00
Total						850.00		414.35				414.35
de la Garza, Eligio:												
Upper Volta	CFA franc	11/6	11/7	1	13,800	50.00	5,312	19.31			5,312	19.31
Niger	CFA franc	11/7	11/7	1	13,800	50.00	3,000	10.91			3,000	10.91
Chad	CFA franc	11/7	11/8	1	13,800	50.00	11,000	40.00			11,000	40.00
Central African Republic	CFA franc	11/8	11/9	1	13,800	50.00	9,464	34.17			9,464	34.17
Uganda	Schilling	11/9	11/11	2	700	100.00	400	57.14			400	57.14
Malawi	Pound	11/11	11/11	1	20.8	50.00	1.2.3	2.85			1.2.3	2.85
Mauritius	Rupee	11/11	11/12	1	276	50.00	44.28	8.01			44.28	8.01
South Africa	Ran	11/13	11/17	5	178.57	250.00	90	126.00			90	126.00
Congo	Zair	11/17	11/18	1	24.5	50.00	22.85	46.68			22.85	46.68
Liberia	Dollar	11/18	11/19	1	50.00	50.00	20.00	20.00			20.00	20.00
Mauritania	Franc	11/19	11/19	1	13,800	50.00	3,943	14.28			3,943	14.28
Surinam	Guilder	11/20	11/21	1	92	50.00	64.35	35.00			64.35	35.00
Total						850.00		414.35				414.35
Goodling, George:												
Upper Volta	CFA franc	11/6	11/7	1	13,800	50.00	5,312	19.31			5,312	19.31
Niger	CFA franc	11/7	11/7	1	13,800	50.00	3,000	10.91			3,000	10.91
Chad	CFA franc	11/7	11/8	1	13,800	50.00	11,000	40.00			11,000	40.00
Central African Republic	CFA franc	11/8	11/9	1	13,800	50.00	9,464	34.17			9,464	34.17
Uganda	Schilling	11/9	11/11	2	700	100.00	400	57.14			400	57.14
Malawi	Pound	11/11	11/11	1	20.8	50.00	1.2.3	2.85			1.2.3	2.85
Mauritius	Rupee	11/11	11/12	1	276	50.00	44.28	8.01			44.28	8.01
South Africa	Ran	11/13	11/17	5	178.57	250.00	90	126.00			90	126.00
Congo	Zair	11/17	11/18	1	24.5	50.00	22.85	46.68			22.85	46.68
Liberia	Dollar	11/18	11/19	1	50.00	50.00	20.00	20.00			20.00	20.00
Mauritania	Franc	11/19	11/19	1	13,800	50.00	3,943	14.28			3,943	14.28
Surinam	Guilder	11/20	11/21	1	92	50.00	64.35	35.00			64.35	35.00
Total						850.00		414.35				414.35
Mayne, Wiley:												
Upper Volta	CFA franc	11/6	11/7	1	13,800	50.00	5,312	19.31			5,312	19.31
Niger	CFA franc	11/7	11/7	1	13,800	50.00	3,000	10.91			3,000	10.91
Chad	CFA franc	11/7	11/8	1	13,800	50.00	11,000	40.00			11,000	40.00
Central African Republic	CFA franc	11/8	11/9	1	13,800	50.00	9,464	34.17			9,464	34.17
Uganda	Schilling	11/9	11/11	2	700	100.00	400	57.14			400	57.14
Malawi	Pound	11/11	11/11	1	20.8	50.00	1.2.3	2.85			1.2.3	2.85
Mauritius	Rupee	11/11	11/12	1	276	50.00	44.28	8.01			44.28	8.01
Malagasy Republic	CFA franc	11/12	11/15	3	414	150.00	414	150.00		[2] 126.60		276.60
Mozambique	Escudo	11/15	11/16	1	14.62	50.00	14.62	50.00		[2] 24.60		74.60
South Africa	Ran	11/16	11/17	1	35.7	50.00	18	25.20			18	25.20
Congo	Zair	11/17	11/18	1	24.5	50.00	22.85	46.68			22.85	46.68
Liberia	Dollar	11/18	11/19	1	50.00	50.00	20.00	20.00			20.00	20.00
Mauritania	CFA franc	11/19	11/19	1	13,800	50.00	3,943	14.28			3,943	14.28
Surinam	Guilder	11/20	11/21	1	92	50.00	64.35	35.00			64.35	35.00
Total						850.00		513.35		151.20		664.55

See footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 127, 1ST SESS., 91ST CONG., BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation[1]: Foreign currency	Transportation[1]: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Knebel, John:												
Upper Volta	CFA franc	11/6	11/7	1	13,800	50.00	5,312	19.31			5,312	19.31
Niger	CFA franc	11/7	11/7	1	13,800	50.00	3,000	10.91			3,000	10.91
Chad	CFA franc	11/7	11/8	1	13,800	50.00	11,000	40.00			11,000	40.00
Central African Republic	CFA franc	11/8	11/9	1	13,800	50.00	9,464	34.17			9,464	34.17
Uganda	Schilling	11/9	11/11	2	700	100.00	400	57.14			400	57.14
Malawi	Pound	11/11	11/11	1	20.8	50.00	1.2.3	2.85			1.2.3	2.85
Mauritius	Rupees	11/11	11/12	1	276	50.00	44.28	8.01			44.28	8.01
South Africa	Ran	11/13	11/17	5	178.57	250.00	90	126.00			90	126.00
Congo	Zair	11/17	11/18	1	24.5	50.00	22.85	46.68			22.85	46.68
Liberia	Dollar	11/18	11/19	1	50.00	50.00	20.00	20.00			20.00	20.00
Mauritania	CFA franc	11/19	11/19	1	13,800	50.00	3,943	14.28			3,943	14.28
Surinam	Guilder	11/20	11/21	1	92	50.00	64.35	35.00			64.35	35.00
Total						850.00		414.35				414.35
Blake, Chas. E.:												
Upper Volta	CFA franc	11/6	11/7	1	13,800	50.00	5,312	19.31			5,312	19.31
Niger	CFA franc	11/7	11/7	1	13,800	50.00	3,000	10.91			3,000	10.91
Chad	CFA franc	11/7	11/8	1	13,800	50.00	11,000	40.00			11,000	40.00
Central African Republic	CFA franc	11/8	11/9	1	13,800	50.00	9,464	34.17			9,464	34.17
Uganda	Schilling	11/9	11/11	2	700	100.00	400	57.14			400	57.14
Malawi	Pound	11/11	11/11	1	20.8	50.00	1.2.3	2.85			1.2.3	2.85
Mauritius	Rupee	11/11	11/12	1	276	50.00	44.28	8.01			44.28	8.01
South Africa	Ran	11/13	11/17	5	178.57	250.00	90	126.00			90	126.00
Congo	Zair	11/17	11/18	1	24.5	50.00	22.85	46.68			22.85	46.68
Liberia	Dollar	11/18	11/19	1	50.00	50.00	20.00	20.00			20.00	20.00
Mauritania	CFA franc	11/19	11/19	1	13,800	50.00	3,943	14.28			3,943	14.38
Surinam	Guilder	11/20	11/21	1	92	50.00	64.35	35.00			64.35	35.00
Total						850.00		414.35				414.35
McKneally, M.:												
Hong Kong	HK dollar	1/2	1/3	1	274.00	50.00	109.00	19.99	101.55	16.74	110.55	36.73
Japan	Yen	1/4	1/6	3	54,000	150.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
India	Rupee	1/7	1/7	1	375	50.00	184.00	24.21			184.00	24.21
Lebanon	Pound	1/8	1/9	2	325	100.00	325	100.00			325	100.00
France	Franc	1/10	1/13	3	834	150.00	834	150.00			834	150.00
Total						500.00		[3] 444.20		16.74		[3] 460.94
Grand total, Committee on Agriculture, 1970								3,443.65		167.94		3,611.59

[1] Transportation provided by Military Airlift Command, USAF.
[2] Ticket receipt attached.
[3] Reflects $50 refunded by Congressman McKneally by check to U.S. Treasury.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, FOR TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
MASTER COMPILATION												
Agriculture Subcommittee	Dollar							429.00		1,280.80		1,709.80
Defense Subcommittee	Dollar							2,158.95		9,954.55		12,113.50
Foreign Operations Subcommittee	Dollar							1,311.00		4,684.88		5,995.88
Independent Offices-HUD Subcommittee.	Dollar							336.00		589.00		925.00
State, Justice, Commerce and Judiciary Subcommittee.	Dollar							842.00		1,376.60		2,218.60
Transportation Subcommittee	Dollar											
Surveys and investigations staff	Dollar							12,201.00		23,374.40		35,575.40
Total								17,277.95		41,260.23		58,538.18

GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Odin Langen:												
United States	Dollar	4/26	4/28	2½		35.00		87.50				87.50
Australia	Dollar	4/29	5/5	6½		31.00		201.50				201.50
United States	Dollar	5/5	5/9	4		35.00		140.00				140.00
Transportation	Dollar									1,280.80		1,280.80
Total								429.00		1,280.80		1,709.80

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John O. Marsh, Jr.:												
Vietnam	Dollar	1/4	1/12	9								(1)
Laos	Dollar	1/12	1/13	1								(1)
Vietnam	Dollar	1/13	1/15	2								(1)
Hon. John J. Rhodes:												
Vietnam	Dollar	3/26	4/2	8				58.96				58.96
Thailand	Dollar	4/3	4/4	2				28.26				28.26
Japan	Dollar	4/5	4/6	2				88.23				88.23
Transportation	Dollar									1,882.50		1,882.50
Subtotal								175.45		1,882.50		2,057.95
Hon. Joseph P. Addabbo:												
Germany	Dollar	8/22	8/24	3		30.00		90.00				90.00
Belgium	Dollar	8/25	8/25	1		34.00		34.00				34.00
United Kingdom	Dollar	8/26	8/28	3		36.00		108.00				108.00
Transportation	Dollar									[2]820.00		820.00
Subtotal								232.00		820.00		1,052.00
Mr. Austin G. Smith:												
United States	Dollar	8/21	8/21	½		35.00		17.50				17.50
Germany	Dollar	8/22	8/24	3		30.00		90.00				90.00
Belgium	Dollar	8/25	8/25	1		34.00		34.00				34.00
United Kingdom	Dollar	8/26	8/28	3		36.00		108.00				108.00
United States	Dollar	8/29	8/30	2		35.00		70.00				70.00
Transportation	Dollar									[2]870.00		870.00
Subtotal								319.50		870.00		1,189.50
Hon. William E. Minshall:												
United States	Dollar	9/1	9/1	1		35.00		35.00				35.00
Korea	Dollar	9/3	9/5	3		28.00		84.00				84.00
United States	Dollar	9/6	9/6	1		35.00		35.00				35.00
Transportation	Dollar									1,587.20		1,587.20
Subtotal								154.00		1,587.20		1,741.20
Mr. Robert B. Foster:												
United States	Dollar	10/24	10/26	3				105.00				105.00
Thailand	Dollar	10/28	10/31	3¾				67.50				67.50
South Vietnam	Dollar	10/31	11/5	5				130.00				130.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	11/5	11/8	3				78.00				78.00
Okinawa	Dollar	11/8	11/9	1¼				12.50				12.50
Japan	Dollar	11/9	11/11	2				42.00				42.00
United States	Dollar	11/11	11/11	1				35.00				35.00
Transportation	Dollar									1,898.15		1,898.15
Subtotal								470.00		1,898.15		2,368.15
Mr. Gary C. Michalak:												
United States	Dollar	10/24	10/26	3				105.00				105.00
Thailand	Dollar	10/28	10/31	3¾				67.50				67.50
South Vietnam	Dollar	10/31	11/5	5				130.00				130.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	11/5	11/8	3				78.00				78.00
Okinawa	Dollar	11/8	11/9	1¼				12.50				12.50
Japan	Dollar	11/9	11/11	2				42.00				42.00
United States	Dollar	11/11	11/11	1				35.00				35.00
Transportation	Dollar									1,898.15		1,898.15
Subtotal								470.00		1,898.15		2,368.15
Hon. Joseph P. Addabbo:												
Italy	Dollar	11/5	11/12	8		31.00		248.00				248.00
Germany	Dollar	11/13	11/15	3		30.00		90.00				90.00
Transportation	Dollar									998.55		998.55
Subtotal								338.00		998.55		1,336.55
Total								2,158.95		9,954.55		12,113.50

[1] No per diem claimed; Government transportation provided via Military Airlift Command aircraft.

[2] Transportation partially furnished by Government-owned aircraft and vehicles.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Otto E. Passman:												
United States	Dollar	10/22	10/26	2		35.00		70.00				70.00
Switzerland	Dollar	10/27	11/1	6		34.00		204.00				204.00
Thailand	Dollar	11/2	11/4	2		28.00		56.00				56.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	11/4	11/9	6		36.00		216.00				216.00
Taiwan	Dollar	11/9	11/11	2		32.00		64.00				64.00
Korea	Dollar	11/11	11/12	1		28.00		28.00				28.00
United States	Dollar	11/13		1		35.00		35.00				35.00
Transportation	Dollar									2,479.03		2,479.03
Subtotal								673.00		2,479.03		3,152.03

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transnportation [1]: Foreign currency	Transnportation [1]: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mr. Donald E. Richbourg:												
United States	Dollar		10/26	1		35.00		35.00				35.00
Switzerland	Dollar	10/27	11/1	6		34.00		204.00				204.00
Thailand	Dollar	11/2	11/4	2		28.00		56.00				56.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	11/4	11/9	6		36.00		216.00				216.00
Taiwan	Dollar	11/9	11/11	2		32.00		64.00				64.00
Korea	Dollar	11/11	11/12	1		28.00		28.00				28.00
United States	Dollar	11/13		1		35.00		35.00				35.00
Transportation	Dollar									2,205.85		2,205.85
Subtotal								638.00		2,205.85		2,843.85
Total								1,311.00		4,684.88		5,995.88

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES—HUD

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation [1]: Foreign currency	Transportation [1]: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Joseph M. McDade:												
France	Dollar	11/6	11/9	3		38.00		114.00				114.00
Austria	Dollar	11/9	11/14	5		30.00		150.00				150.00
England	Dollar	11/14	11/16	2		36.00		72.00				72.00
Transportation	Dollar									589.00		589.00
Total								336.00		589.00		925.00

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Frank T. Bow:												
Germany	Dollar	6/19	6/22	4		30.00		120.00				120.00
Switzerland	Dollar	6/22	6/26	4		30.00		120.00				120.00
Transportation	Dollar									860.60		860.60
Subtotal								240.00		860.60		1,100.60
Hon. John J. Rooney:												
Jamaica	Dollar	11/7	11/11	5		33.00		165.00				165.00
Puerto Rico	Dollar	11/12	11/15	4		34.00		136.00				136.00
Transportation	Dollar									258.00		258.00
Subtotal								301.00		258.00		559.00
Mr. Jay B. Howe:												
Jamaica	Dollar	11/7	11/11	5		33.00		165.00				165.00
Puerto Rico	Dollar	11/12	11/15	4		34.00		136.00				136.00
Transportation	Dollar									258.00		258.00
Subtotal								301.00		258.00		559.00
Total								842.00		1,376.60		2,218.60

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Tota days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Sidney R. Yates:												
France	Dollar	2/5	2/9	4								(1)
Israel	Dollar	2/9	2/15	7								(1)
Total												(1)

[1] No per diem or transportation expenses claimed; Congressman traveled at own expense.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS STAFF

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Cornelius R. Anderson:												
Japan	Dollar	5/14	5/25	10		31.00		310.00		54.00		364.00
Korea	Dollar	5/25	5/26	1		28.00		28.00				28.00
Japan	Dollar	5/26	5/27	1		31.00		31.00				31.00
Okinawa	Dollar	5/27	5/29	2		26.00		52.00				52.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	5/29	6/1	3		30.00		90.00				90.00
Thailand	Dollar	6/1	6/3	2		28.00		56.00				56.00
Philippines	Dollar	6/3	6/7	4		30.00		120.00				120.00
Round trip transportation	Dollar									2,047.70		2,047.70
Germany	Dollar	9/12	9/28	16		30.00		480.00				480.00
England	Dollar	9/28	10/3	5		36.00		180.00		26.40		206.40
Round trip transportation	Dollar									889.00		889.00
Subtotal								1,347.00		3,017.10		4,364.10
Andrew P. Bosko:												
Germany	Dollar	1/3	1/17	14¼		30.00		427.50				427.50
Belgium	Dollar	1/17	1/21	3¾		32.00		120.00				120.00
England	Dollar	1/21	1/25	3		33.00		99.00				99.00
				1¼		30.00		37.50				37.50
Round-trip transportation	Dollar									934.00		934.00
Subtotal								684.00		934.00		1,618.00
Donald A. Brummitt:												
Germany	Dollar	1/3	1/17	14¼		30.00		427.50		19.50		447.00
Belgium	Dollar	1/17	1/21	3¾		32.00		120.00				120.00
England	Dollar	1/21	1/25	4¼		33.00		140.25				140.25
Round trip transportation	Dollar									882.00		882.00
Subtotal								687.75		901.50		1,589.25
Paul K. Funkhouser:												
Japan	Dollar	5/14	5/25	10		31.00		310.00		54.00		364.00
Korea	Dollar	5/25	5/26	1		28.00		28.00				28.00
Japan	Dollar	5/26	5/27	1		31.00		31.00				31.00
Okinawa	Dollar	5/27	5/29	2		26.00		52.00				52.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	5/29	6/1	3		30.00		90.00				90.00
Thailand	Dollar	6/1	6/3	2		28.00		56.00				56.00
Philippines	Dollar	6/3	6/7	4		30.00		120.00				120.00
Round trip transportation	Dollar									2,047.70		2,047.70
Germany	Dollar	9/12	9/28	16		30.00		480.00				480.00
England	Dollar	9/28	10/3	5		36.00		180.00		26.40		206.40
Round trip transportation	Dollar									889.00		889.00
Subtotal								1,347.00		3,017.10		4,364.10
John G. Goedtel:												
Japan	Dollar	5/14	5/25	10		31.00		310.00				310.00
Korea	Dollar	5/25	5/26	1		28.00		28.00				28.00
Japan	Dollar	5/26	5/27	1		31.00		31.00				31.00
Okinawa	Dollar	5/27	5/29	2		26.00		52.00				52.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	5/29	6/1	3		30.00		90.00				90.00
Thailand	Dollar	6/1	6/3	2		28.00		56.00				56.00
Philippines	Dollar	6/3	6/7	4		30.00		120.00				120.00
Round trip transportation	Dollar									2,047.70		2,047.70
Germany	Dollar	9/12	9/28	16		30.00		480.00				480.00
England	Dollar	9/28	10/3	5		36.00		180.00				180.00
Round trip transportation	Dollar									889.00		889.00
Subtotal								1,347.00		2,936.70		4,283.70
Leroy R. Kirkpatrick:												
Germany	Dollar	1/3	1/17	14¼		30.00		427.50		19.50		447.00
Belgium	Dollar	1/17	1/21	3¾		32.00		120.00				120.00
England	Dollar	1/21	1/25	4¼		33.00		140.25				140.25
Round trip transportation	Dollar									882.00		882.00
Subtotal								687.75		901.50		1,589.25
E. Huyett Magee:												
Germany	Dollar	1/3	1/17	14¼		30.00		427.50				427.50
Belgium	Dollar	1/17	1/21	3¾		32.00		120.00				120.00
England	Dollar	1/21	1/25	3		33.00		99.00				99.00
England	Dollar			1¼		30.00		37.50				37.50
Round trip transportation	Dollar									973.00		973.00
Subtotal								684.00		973.00		1,657.00
Joseph E. Michalski:												
Japan	Dollar	5/14	5/25	10		31.00		310.00		54.00		364.00
Korea	Dollar	5/25	5/26	1		28.00		28.00				28.00
Japan	Dollar	5/26	5/27	1		31.00		31.00				31.00
Okinawa	Dollar	5/27	5/29	2		26.00		52.00				52.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	5/29	6/1	3		30.00		90.00				90.00
Thailand	Dollar	6/1	6/3	2		28.00		56.00				56.00
Philippines	Dollar	6/3	6/7	4		30.00		120.00				120.00
Round trip transportation	Dollar									2,047.70		2,047.70
Germany	Dollar	9/12	9/28	16		30.00		480.0				480.00
England	Dollar	9/28	10/3	5		36.00		180.00		26.40		206.40
Round trip transportation	Dollar									889.00		889.00
Subtotal								1,347.00		3,017.10		4,364.10

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation [1]: Foreign currency	Transportation [1]: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Paul J. Mohr:												
Germany	Dollar	1/3	1/17	14½		30.00		427.50		19.50		447.00
Belgium	Dollar	1/17	1/21	3¾		32.00		120.00				120.00
England	Dollar	1/21	1/25	4¼		33.00		140.25				140.25
Round trip transportation	Dollar									882.00		882.00
Japan	Dollar	5/14	5/25	10		31.00		310.00				310.00
Korea	Dollar	5/25	5/26	1		28.00		28.00				28.00
Japan	Dollar	5/26	5/27	1		31.00		31.00				31.00
Okinawa	Dollar	5/27	5/29	2		26.00		52.00				52.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	5/29	6/1	3		30.00		90.00				90.00
Thailand	Dollar	6/1	6/1	2		28.00		56.00				56.00
Philippines	Dollar	6/3	6/7	4		30.00		120.00				120.00
Round trip transportation	Dollar									2,047.70		2,047.70
Germany	Dollar	9/12	9/28	16		30.00		480.00				480.00
England	Dollar	9/28	10/3	5		36.00		180.00				180.00
Round trip transportation	Dollar									889.00		889.00
Subtotal								2,034.75		3,838.20		5,872.95
John A. Taylor:												
Germany	Dollar	1/3	1/17	14½		30.00		427.50		19.50		447.00
Belgium	Dollar	1/17	1/21	3¾		32.00		120.00				120.00
England	Dollar	1/21	1/25	4¼		33.00		140.25				140.25
Round-trip transportation	Dollar									882.00		882.00
Subtotal								687.75		901.50		1,589.25
H. Branch Wood:												
Japan	Dollar	5/14	5/25	10		31.00		310.00				310.00
Korea	Dollar	5/25	5/26	1		28.00		28.00				28.00
Japan	Dollar	5/26	5/27	1		31.00		31.00				31.00
Okinawa	Dollar	5/27	5/29	2		26.00		52.00				52.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	5/29	6/1	3		30.00		90.00				90.00
Thailand	Dollar	6/1	6/3	2		28.00		56.00				56.00
Philippines	Dollar	6/3	6/7	4		30.00		120.00				120.00
Round trip transportation	Dollar									2,047.70		2,047.70
Germany	Dollar	9/12	9/28	16		30.00		480.00				480.00
England	Dollar	9/28	10/3	5		36.00		180.00				180.00
Round trip transportation	Dollar									889.00		889.00
Subtotal								1,347.00		2,936.70		4,283.70
Grand total								12,201.00		23,374.40		35,575.40

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 105, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name o currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
MASTER COMPILATION												
Subcommittee on Supplemental Service Benefits								1,167.68		7,708.00		8,875.68
Subcommittee to Western Europe and Middle East								2,119.54		4,194.00		6,313.54
Subcommittee to Western Europe								2,266.00		1,856.80		4,122.80
Subcommittee on My Lai Incident								3,814.68		11,000.70		14,815.38
Subcommittee on Antisubmarine Warfare								1,353.03		11,639.95		12,992.98
Subcommittee to Western Europe								2,247.60		7,825.11		10,072.71
Full Committee								918.21		1,401.00		2,319.21
Grand total								13,886.74		45,625.56		59,512.30

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	24,684.07
Appropriated funds:	
Government department:	
Air Force	24,134.23
Navy	10,694.00
Total	59,512.30

F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

Mar. 15 1971

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 105, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., SUBCOMMITTEE ON SUPPLEMENTAL SERVICE BENEFITS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. James A. Byrne:												
Thailand	Baht	1/13	1/14	2	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00			2,082.50	100.00
Vietnam	Piaster	1/15	1/17	3	5,900	50.00	13,500	114.40			13,500	114.40
Hong Kong	HK dollar	1/18	1/19	2	302.50	50.00	516.00	85.45			516.00	85.45
Transportation (commercial aircraft).	D. mark								6,940.94	1,880.94	6,940.94	1,880.94
Subtotal								299.85		1,880.94		2,180.79
Hon. Charles W. Wilson:												
Thailand	Baht	1/13	1/15	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
Vietnam	Piaster	1/16	1/16	1	5,900	50.00	5,900	50.00			5,900	50.00
Hong Kong	HK dollar	1/17	1/19	3	302.50	50.00	907.50	150.00			907.50	150.00
Transportation (commercial aircraft).	N. guilder								7,097.07	1,998.07	7,097.07	1,998.07
Subtotal								350.00		1,998.07		2,348.07
Hon. William G. Bray:												
Thailand	Baht	1/13	1/14	2	1,041.25	50.00	1,280.88	61.51			1,280.88	61.51
Vietnam	Piaster	1/15	1/17	3	5,900	50.00	8,640	73.22			8,640	73.22
Hong Kong	HK dollar	1/18	1/19	2	302.50	50.00	377.50	62.35			377.50	62.35
Transportation (commercial aircraft).	N. guilder								7,066.40	1,961.80	7,066.40	1,961.80
Subtotal								197.08		1,961.80		2,158.88
Mr. John J. Ford:												
Thailand	Baht	1/13	1/14	2	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00			2,082.50	100.00
Vietnam	Piaster	1/15	1/17	3	5,900	50.00	14,250	120.75			14,250	120.75
Hong Kong	HK dollar	1/18	1/19	2	302.50	50.00	605.00	100.00			605.00	100.00
Transportation (commercial aircraft).	D. mark								6,889.95	1,867.19	6,889.95	1,867.19
Subtotal								320.75		1,867.19		2,187.94
Total								1,167.68		7,708.00		8,875.68

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollars equivalent)	8,875.68

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 105, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., SUBCOMMITTEE ON WESTERN EUROPE AND MIDDLE EAST, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Bill Nichols:												
Spain	Peseta	1/3	1/5	3	3,480	50.00	10,215	146.76			10,215	146.76
Italy	Lira	1/5	1/7	2	31,450	50.00	56,540	89.89			56,540	89.89
Turkey	Lira	1/7	1/10	2	450	50.00	900	100.00			900	100.00
Iran	Rial	1/10	1/13	3	3,812	50.00	11,437	150.00			11,437	150.00
Transportation:												
(Military aircraft)	U.S. dollar									803.00		803.00
(Commercial aircraft)	U.S. dollar									421.00		421.00
Subtotal								486.65		1,224.00		1,710.65
Hon. Robert H. Mollohan:												
Spain	Peseta	1/3	1/5	3	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00			10,440	150.00
Italy	Lira	1/5	1/7	2	31,450	50.00	28,600	45.47			28,600	45.47
Turkey	Lira	1/7	1/10	2	450	50.00	900	100.00			900	100.00
Iran	Rial	1/10	1/13	3	3,812	50.00	11,437	150.00			11,437	150.00
Spain	Peseta	1/13	1/17	4	3,480	50.00	10,327	148.38			10,327	148.38
Transportation (military aircraft).	U.S. dollar									873.00		873.00
Subtotal								593.85		873.00		1,466.85
Hon. W. C. Daniel:												
Spain	Peseta	1/3	1/5	3	3,480	50.00	8,644	124.20			8,644	124.20
Italy	Lira	1/5	1/7	2	31,450	50.00	28,336	45.05			28,336	45.05
Turkey	Lira	1/7	1/10	2	450	50.00	900	100.00			900	100.00
Iran	Rial	1/10	1/13	3	3,812	50.00	11,437	150.00			11,437	150.00
Transportation:												
(Miltary aircraft)	U.S. dollar									803.00		803.00
(Commercial aircraft)	U.S. dollar									421.00		421.00
Subtotal								419.25		1,224.00		1,643.25
Mr. William H. Cook:												
Spain	Peseta	1/3	1/5	2	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00			10,440	150.00
Italy	Lira	1/5	1/7	2	31,450	50.00	62,900	100.00			62,900	100.00
Turkey	Lira	1/7	1/10	2	450	50.00	900	100.00			900	100.00
Iran	Rial	1/10	1/13	3	3,812	50.00	11,437	150.00			11,437	150.00
Spain	Peseta	1/13	1/17	4	3,480	50.00	8,337	119.79			8,337	119.79
Transportation (military aircraft).	U.S. dollar									873.00		873.00
Subtotal								619.79		873.00		1,492.79
Total								2,119.54		4,194.00		6,313.54

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,119.54
Appropriated funds:	
Government department: Air Force	4,194.00
Total	6,313.54

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 105, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., SUBCOMMITTEE ON WESTERN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Philip J. Philbin:												
Germany	D. mark	3/30	4/3	5	184	50.00	918	250.00			918	250.00
Italy	Lira	4/3	4/4	1	31,450	50.00	31,450	50.00			31,450	50.00
Spain	Peseta	4/4	4/7	3	3,490	50.00	10,470	150.00			10,470	150.00
England	B. pound	4/7	4/11	4	20.15.5	50.00	82.19.0	200.00	7.0.0	16.80	89.19.0	216.80
Transportation (military aircraft).	U.S. dollar									460.00		460.00
Subtotal								650.00		476.80		1,126.80
Hon. G. Elliott Hagan:												
Germany	D. mark	3/30	4/3	5	184	50.00	918	250.00			918	250.00
Italy	Lira	4/3	4/4	1	31,450	50.00	31,450	50.00			31,450	50.00
Spain	Peseta	4/4	4/7	3	3,490	50.00	10,470	150.00			10,470	150.00
England	B. pound	4/7	4/11	4	20.15.5	50.00	47.19.0	116.00			47.19.0	116.00
Transportation (military aircraft).	U.S. dollar									460.00		460.00
Subtotal								566.00		460.00		1,026.00
Hon. Charles W. Whalen:												
Germany	D. mark	3/30	4/3	5	184	50.00	918	250.00			918	250.00
Italy	Lira	4/3	4/4	1	31,450	50.00	31,450	50.00			31,450	50.00
Spain	Peseta	4/5	4/5	1	3,490	50.00	3,490	50.00			3,490	50.00
England	B. pound	4/5	4/6	1	20.15.5	50.00	20.15.5	50.00			20.15.5	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft).	U.S. dollar									460.00		460.00
Subtotal								400.00		460.00		860.00
Mr. Ralph Marshall:												
Germany	D. mark	3/30	4/3	5	184	50.00	918	250.00			918	250.00
Italy	Lira	4/3	4/4	1	31,450	50.00	31,450	50.00			31,450	50.00
Spain	Peseta	4/4	4/7	3	3,490	50.00	10,470	150.00			10,470	150.00
England	B. pound	4/7	4/11	4	20.15.5	50.00	82.19.0	200.00			82.19.0	200.00
Transportation (military aircraft).	U.S. dollar									460.00		460.00
Subtotal								650.00		460.00		1,110.00
Total								2,266.00		1,856.80		4,122.80

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,282.80
Appropriated funds:	
Government department—Air Force	1,840.00
Total	4,122.80

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 105, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES (MY LAI INCIDENT SUBCOMMITTEE), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Tota days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Samuel S. Stratton:												
Vietnam	Piaster	5/11	5/14	3	5,900	50.00	15,020	127.28			15,020	127.28
Taiwan	NT dollar	5/14	5/15	1	2,000	50.00	1,550	38.75			1,550	38.75
Hong Kong	HK dollar	5/15	5/18	3	301.50	50.00	900.20	149.28	[1] 1,021.50	[1] 168.90	1,921.70	318.18
Japan	Yen	5/18	5/20	2	18,000	50.00	28,698	79.71	[1] 127,133	[1] 353.16	155,831	432.87
Transportation (military transportation from United States and return).	U.S. dollar									1,140.88		1,140.88
Subtotal								395.02		1,662.94		2,057.96
Hon. Charles S. Gubser:												
Vietnam	Piaster	5/11	5/14	3	5,900	50.00	17,000	144.06			17,000	144.06
Taiwan	NT dollar	5/14	5/15	1	2,000	50.00	2,000	50.00			2,000	50.00
Hong Kong	HK dollar	5/15	5/18	3	301.50	50.00	904.50	150.00			904.50	150.00
Japan	Yen	5/18	5/20	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Transportation (Military transportation from United States and return)	U.S. dollar									1,140.88		1,140.88
Subtotal								444.06		1,140.88		1,584.94
Hon. William Dickinson:												
Vietnam	Piaster	5/11	5/14	3	5,900	50.00	17,400	147.46			17,400	147.46
Taiwan	NT dollar	5/14	5/15	1	2,000	50.00	2,000	50.00			2,000	50.00
Hong Kong	HK dollar	5/15	5/18	3	301.50	50.00	904.50	150.00			904.50	150.00
Japan	Yen	5/18	5/20	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Transportation (military transportation from United States and return).	U.S. dollar									1,140.88		1,140.88
Subtotal								447.46		1,140.88		1,588.34

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 105, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES (MY LAI INCIDENT SUBCOMMITTEE), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation[1]: Foreign currency	Transportation[1]: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Charles A. Halleck:												
Vietnam	Piaster	5/11	5/14	3	5,900	50.00	17,000	144.06			17,000	144.08
Taiwan	NT dollar	5/14	5/15	1	2,000	50.00	2,000	50.00			2,000	50.06
Hong Kong	HK dollar	5/15	5/18	3	301.50	50.00	904.50	150.00			904.50	150.00
Japan	Yen	5/18	5/20	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Transportation (military transportation from United States and return).	U.S. dollar									1,140.88		1,140.80
Subtotal								444.06		1,140.88		1,584.94
Rear Adm. Allan S. Chrisman:												
Vietnam	Piaster	5/11	5/14	3	5,900	50.00	17,470	148.06			17,470	148.06
Taiwan	NT dollar	5/14	5/15	1	2,000	50.00	1,750	43.75			1,750	43.75
Hong Kong	HK dollar	5/15	5/18	3	301.50	50.00	904.50	150.00			904.50	150.00
Japan	Yen	5/18	5/20	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Transportation (military transportation from United States and return).	U.S. dollar									1,140.88		1,140.88
Subtotal								441.81		1,140.88		1,582.69
Mr. Frank Slatinshek:												
Vietnam	Piaster	5/11	5/14	3	5,900	50.00	17,380	147.29			17,380	147.29
Taiwan	NT dollar	5/14	5/15	1	2,000	50.00	2,000	50.00			2,000	50.00
Hong Kong	HK dollar	5/15	5/18	3	301.50	50.00	904.50	150.00			904.50	150.00
Japan	Yen	5/18	5/18	0								
Transportation:												
(Military transportation from United States (1-way).	U.S. dollar									558.80		558.80
(Commercial transportation Tokyo to Washington, D.C.)	Yen								285,408	792.80	285,408	792.80
Subtotal								347.29		1,351.60		1,698.89
Mr. John Reddan:												
Vietnam	Piaster	5/11	5/14	3	5,900	50.00	17,485	148.27			17,485	148.27
Taiwan	NT dollar	5/14	5/15	1	2,000	50.00	1,700	42.50			1,700	42.50
Hong Kong	HK dollar	5/15	5/18	3	301.50	50.00	904.50	150.00			904.50	150.00
Japan	Yen	5/18	5/20	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Transportation (military transportation from United States and return).	U.S. Dollar									1,140.88		1,140.88
Subtotal								440.77		1,140.88		1,581.65
Mr. John F. Lally:												
Vietnam	Piaster	5/11	5/14	3	5,900	50.00	17,000	144.06			17,000	144.06
Taiwan	NT dollar	5/14	5/15	1	2,000	50.00	1,940	48.50			1,940	48.50
Hong Kong	HK dollar	5/15	5/18	3	301.50	50.00	904.50	150.00			904.50	150.00
Japan	Yen	5/18	5/20	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Transportation (military transportation from United States and return).	U.S. dollar									1,140.88		1,140.88
Subtotal								442.56		1,140.88		1,583.44
Mr. Raymond Lushin:												
Vietnam	Piaster	5/11	5/14	3	5,900	50.00	13,580	115.08			13,580	115.08
Taiwan	NT dollar	5/14	5/15	1	2,000	50.00	1,863	46.57			1,863	46.57
Hong Kong	HK dollar	5/15	5/18	3	301.50	50.00	904.50	150.00			904.50	150.00
Japan	Yen	5/18	5/20	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Transportation (military transportation from United States and return).	U.S. dollar									1,140.88		1,140.88
Subtotal								411.65		1,140.88		1,552.53
Total								3,814.68		11,000.70		14,815.38

[1] Cost of local transportation for entire group charged to Mr. Stratton as acting chairman of subcommittee.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	5,129.54
Appropriated funds:	
Government department:	9,685.84
Total	14,815.38

SAMUEL S. STRATTON,

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 105, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date		Total days	Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Samuel S. Stratton:												
Italy	Lira	9/1	9/2	1	31,450	50.00	9,850	15.65			9,850	15.65
Israel	I. pound	9/2	9/4	2	175	50.00	290	82.85	108.60	31.09	398.60	113.94
Great Britain	B. pound	9/4	9/5	1	20.17.0	50.00	20.17.0	50.00			20.17.0	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar									1,422.00		1,422.00
Subtotal								148.50		1,453.09		1,601.59
Hon. Robert L. Leggett:												
Italy	Lira	9/1	9/2	1	31,450	50.00	28,450	45.25			28,450	45.25
Israel	I. pound	9/2	9/4	2	175	50.00	350	100.00	108.60	31.09	458.60	131.09
Great Britain	B. pound	9/4	9/5	1	20.17.0	50.00	20.17.0	50.00			20.17.0	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar									1,422.00		1,422.00
Subtotal								195.25		1,453.09		1,648.34
Hon. Floyd V. Hicks:												
Italy	Lira	9/1	9/2	1	31,450	50.00	10,950	17.40			10,950	17.40
Israel	I. pound	9/2	9/4	2	175	50.00	260	74.25	108.60	31.09	368.60	105.34
Great Britain	B. pound	9/4	9/5	1	20.17.0	50.00	20.17.0	50.00			20.17.0	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar									1,422.00		1,422.00
Subtotal								141.65		1,453.09		1,594.74
Hon. Bob Wilson:												
Israel	I. pound	9/2	9/4	2	175	50.00	240	68.57	108.60	31.09	348.60	99.66
Great Britain	B. pound	9/4	9/10	7	20.17.0	50.00	104.3.4	250.00			104.3.4	250.00
Transportation (commercial aircraft)	D. mark								5,218.57	1,437.23	5,218.57	1,437.23
Subtotal								318.57		1,468.32		1,786.89
Hon. Robert T. Stafford:												
Italy	Lira	9/1	9/2	1	31,450	50.00	9,920	15.80			9,920	15.80
Israel	I. pound	9/2	9/4	2	175	50.00	247	70.55	108.60	31.09	355.60	101.64
Great Britain	B. pound	9/4	9/5	1	20.17.0	50.00	20.17.0	50.00			20.17.0	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar									1,422.00		1,422.00
Subtotal								136.35		1,453.09		1,589.44
Hon. G. William Whitehurst:												
Italy	Lira	9/1	9/2	1	31,450	50.00	11,450	18.20			11,450	18.20
Israel	I. pound	9/2	9/4	2	175	50.00	185	52.85	108.60	31.09	293.60	83.94
Great Britain	B. pound	9/4	9/5	1	20.17.0	50.00	20.17.0	50.00			20.17.0	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar									1,422.00		1,422.00
Subtotal								121.05		1,453.09		1,574.14
Rear Adm. Allan S. Chrisman, U.S. Navy, retired:												
Italy	Lira	9/1	9/2	1	31,450	50.00	21,650	34.36			21,650	34.36
Israel	I. pound	9/2	9,4	2	175	50.00	185	52.85	108.60	31.09	293.60	83.74
Great Britain	B. pound	9/4	9/5	1	20.17.0	50.00	20.17.0	50.00			20.17.0	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar									1,422.00		1,422.00
Subtotal								137.21		1,453.09		1,590.30
Mr. George Norris:												
Italy	Lira	9/1	9/2	1	31,450	50.00	5,850	9.30			5,850	9.30
Israel	I. pound	9/2	9/4	2	175	50.00	330	95.15	108.60	31.09	438.60	126.24
Great Britain	B. pound	9/4	9/5	1	20.17.0	50.00	20.17.0	50.00			20.17.0	50.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar									1,422.00		1,422.00
Subtotal								154.45		1,453.09		1,607.54
Total								1,353.03		11,639.95		12,992.98

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	3,038.98
Appropriated funds:	
Government department:	
Navy	9,954.00
Total	12,992.98

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 105, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., SUBCOMMITTEE TO WESTERN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Charles H. Wilson:												
Ireland	I. pound	9/4	9/7	3	20.17.0	50.00	62.12.70	150.00			62.12.70	150.00
England	B. pound	9/7	9/11	5	20.17.0	50.00	104.3.4	250.00			104.3.4	250.00
Spain	Peseta	9/11	9/13	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960	100.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar									1,690.63		1,690.63
Subtotal								500.00		1,690.63		2,190.63
Hon. Richard C. White:												
Ireland	I. pound	9/4	9/7	3	20.17.0	50.00	62.12.70	150.00			62.12.70	150.00
England	B. pound	9/7	9/11	5	20.17.0	50.00	104.3.4	250.00			104.3.4	250.00
Spain	Peseta	9/11	9/13	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960	100.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar									1,690.63		1,690.63
Subtotal								500.00		1,690.63		2,190.63
Hon. W. C. Daniel:												
Ireland	I. pound	9/4	9/7	3	20.17.0	50.00	61.12.70	147.60			61.12.70	147.60
England	B. pound	9/7	9/8	1	20.17.0	50.00	20.17.0	50.00	17.0.0	41.65	37.1.0	91.65
Franc	Franc	9/8	9/9	1	276	50.00	276	50.00	166	30.07	442	80.07
England [1]	B. pound	9/10	9/10	1								
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar									990.87		990.87
Subtotal								247.60		1,062.59		1,310.19
Mr. Earl Morgan:												
Ireland	I. pound	9/4	9/7	3	20.17.0	50.00	62.12.70	150.00			62.12.70	150.00
England	B. pound	9/7	9/11	5	20.17.0	50.00	104.3.4	250.00			104.3.4	250.00
Spain	Peseta	9/11	9/13	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960	100.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar									1,690.63		1,690.63
Subtotal								500.00		1,690.63		2,190.63
Mr. James F. Shumate:												
Ireland	I. pound	9/4	9/7	3	20.17.0	50.00	62.12.70	150.00			62.12.70	150.00
England	B. pound	9/7	9/11	5	20.17.0	50.00	104.3.4	250.00			104.3.4	250.00
Spain	Peseta	9/11	9/13	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960	100.00
Transportation (military aircraft)	U.S. dollar									1,690.63		1,690.63
Subtotal								500.00		1,690.63		2,190.63
Grand total								2,247.60		7,825.11		10,072.7

[1] No counterpart drawn.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,319.32
Appropriated funds:	
Government department:	
Air Force	7,753.39
Total	10,072.71

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 105, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. L. Mendel Rivers:												
England	B. pound	9/7	9/11	5	20.17.0	50.00	104.3.4	250.00			104.3.4	250.00
Transportation (private aircraft)												
Subtotal								250.00				250.00
Hon. Samuel S. Stratton:												
Ireland	I. pounds	1/24	1/26	2	20.16.2	50.00	31.09.0	67.01			31.09.0	67.01
England [1]	B. pound	1/26	1/27	2	20.16.2	50.00	39.22.4	92.00			39.22.4	92.00
England [1]	B. pound	1/27	2/6	9								
Germany	D. mark	2/6	2/9	4	184	50.00	128	34.65			128	34.65
Transportation:												
Commercial aircraft	U.S. dollar									244.00		244.00
Military aircraft	U.S. dollar									496.00		496.00
Subtotal								193.66		740.00		933.66

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 105, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation[1]: Foreign currency	Transportation[1]: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John R. Blandford:												
Spain	Peseta	12/12	12/15	3	3,480.00	50.00	6,440.00	92.55			6,440.00	92.55
Portugal	Escudo	12/15	12/17	3	1,427.00	50.00	3,760.80	132.00			3,760.80	132.00
Italy[1]	Lira	12/17	12/18	1								
Germany	D. mark	12/19	1/4/71	17	181.50	50.00	907.50	250.00			907.50	250.00
Transportation (military aircraft).	U.S. dollar									661.00		661.00
Subtotal								474.55		661.00		1,135.55
Grand total								918.21		1,401.00		2,319.21

[1] No counterpart drawn.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	918.21
Appropriated funds:	
Government Department:	
Navy	740.00
Air Force	661.00
Total	2,319.21

EDWARD F. HÉBERT,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

Mar. 15, 1971.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 152, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Thomas L. Ashley:												
Japan	Yen	4/4	4/6	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Korea	Won	4/7	4/11	5	15,275	50.00	76,375	250.00			76,375	250.00
Japan	Yen	4/12	4/13	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
							[1] 12,000	[1] 48.13				
Hon. Garry Brown:												
Uruguay	Peso	4/17	4/23	7	12,462	50.00	75,237	301.87			75,237	301.87
Brazil	Cruzeiro	4/24	4/26	3	223.00	50.00	669.00	150.00			669.00	150.00
Denmark	D. krone	9/21	9/25	5	375.00	50.00	1,875	250.00	4,317.50	575.82	6,192.50	825.82
Germany	D. mark								3,304.98	910.21	3,304.98	910.21
Mr. Orman S. Fink:												
Japan	Yen	4/4	4/6	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
							[1] 15,250	[1] 50.20				
Korea	Won	4/7	4/10	4	15,275	50.00	61,125	199.80			66,125	199.80
Japan	Yen	4/11	4/13	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Belgium	B. franc	9/17	9/20	4	250	50.00	10,000	200.00	3,600	72.26	13,600	272.26
							[1] 375	[1] 50.00				
Denmark	D. krone	9/21	9/25	5	375	50.00	1,875	250.00			1,875	250.00
							[1] 3,480	[1] 50.00				
Spain	Peseta	9/26	9/27	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960	100.00
Mr. Benet Gellman:												
United Kingdom	B. pound	9/17	9/20	4	20.16.8	50.00	83.6.8	200.00			83.6.8	200.00
							[1] 490	[1] 65.35				
Denmark	D. krone	9/21	9/26	5	375.00	50.00	1,760	234.65			1,760	234.65
Germany	D. mark								2,137.44	588.66	2,137.44	588.66
							[1] 3,300	[1] 13.24				
Hon. Tom Gettys:												
Uruguay	Peso	4/17	4/23	7	12,462.42	50.00	83,937	336.76			83,937	336.76
Brazil	Cruzeiro	4/24	4/26	3	223.00	50.00	669.00	150.00			669.00	150.00
Hon. Seymour Halpern:												
Japan	Yen	4/4	4/6	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Korea	Won	4/7	4/11	5	15,275	50.00	76,375	250.00			76,375	250.00
Japan	Yen	4/12	4/13	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Hon. Richard T. Hanna:												
Japan	Yen	4/5	4/6	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00	25,506	70.85	61,506	170.85
Korea	Won	4/7	4/10	4	15,275	50.00	61,100	200.00	273,278	899.45	61,000	1,099.45
Japan	Yen	4/11	4/13	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Hon. Albert W. Johnson:												
Japan	Yen	4/4	4/6	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Korea	Won	4/7	4/11	5	15,275	50.00	76,375	250.00			76,375	250.00
Japan	Yen	4/12	4/13	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Denmark	Krone	9/19	9/24	6	375	50.00	2,250	300.00	4,730	630.83	6,980	930.83
Spain	Peseta	9/25	9/27	3	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00			10,440	150.00
Germany	Deutsche mark								1,625.04	447.55	1,625.04	447.55
Hon. Chester L. Mize:												
Denmark	Deutsche krone	9/19	9/24	6	375	50.00	2,250	300.00	5,060	674.85	7,310	974.85
Germany	Deutsche mark								3,239.10	892.07	3,239.10	892.07

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 152, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Paul Nelson:												
Japan	Yen	4/4	4/6	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Korea	Won	4/7	4/11	5	15,275	50.00	76,375	250.00			76,375	250.00
Japan	Yen	4/12	4/14	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Belgium	B. franc	9/17	9/20	4	2,500	50.00	10,000	200.00			10,000	200.00
							[1] 750	[1] 100.00				
Denmark	D. krone	9/21	9/24	4	375	50.00	1,500	200.00			1,500	200.00
Spain	Peseta	9/25	9/27	3	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00			10,440	150.00
							[1] 11,650	[1] 46.73				
Graham T. Northup:												
Uruguay	Peso	4/17	4/23	7	12,462	50.00	75,587	303.27			75,587	303.27
Brazil	Cruzeiro	4/24	4/26	3	223	50.00	669.00	150.00			669.00	150.00
Hon. Wright Patman:												
Belgium	B. franc	9/17	9/20	4	2,500	50.00	10,000	200.00			10,000	200.00
							[2] 750	[2] 100.00				
Denmark	D. krone	9/21	9/24	4	375	50.00	1,500	200.00	[3] 4,152.50	[3] 553.81	4,152.50	753.81
Spain	Peseta	9/25	9/27	3	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00			10,440	150.00
Hon. J. William Stanton:												
Uruguay	Peso	4/17	4/23	7	12,462	50.00	87,237	350.00			87,237	350.00
							[1] 40.00	[1] 9.15				
Brazil	Cruzeiro	4/24	4/26	3	223	50.00	629.00	140.85			629.00	140.85
Hon. Robert G. Stephens, Jr.:												
Uruguay	Peso	4/17	4/23	7	12,462	50.00	87,237	350.00			87,237	350.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	4/24	4/26	3	223	50.00	669	150.00			669	150.00
Hon. William B. Widnall:												
Belgium	B. franc	9/17	9/20	4	2,500	50.00	10,000	200.00			10,000	200.00
Denmark	D. krone	9/21	9/25	5	375	50.00	1,875	250.00	4,592.50	612.50	6,467.50	862.50
Spain	Peseta	9/26	9/27	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960	100.00
Hon. Benjamin B. Blackburn:												
Nicaragua	Córdoba	1/25	1/30	6	350	50.00	2,100	300.00			2,100	300.00
Guatemala	Quetzal	1/31	2/3	4	50	50.00	200	200.00	300	300.00	500	500.00
Japan	Yen	4/4	4/6	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Korea	Won	4/7	4/11	5	15,275	50.00	76,375	250.00			76,375	250.00
Japan	Yen	4/12	4/13	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Germany	D. mark				184.00	50.00			1,230.80	333.92	1,230.80	333.92

[1] Refund.
[2] Refund ($7.68 to Embassy; $92.32 to State Department).
[3] Local transportation used by group attending meeting for which I signed as dean of the group.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	18,279.98

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mar. 18, 1971.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 347 AND H. RES. 572 OF 1ST SESS. AND H. RES. 1033 OF 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR (FULL COMMITTEE), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John H. Dent:												
Switzerland	S. franc	6/18	6/24	7	215.50	50.00	1,508.50	350.00	1,497	346.69	3,005.50	696.69
Denmark	Kroner	6/25	6/26	2	375	50.00	750	100.00	94.15	12.54	844.15	112.54
United Kingdom	Pound	6/27	6/28	2	20.56.1	50.00	41.12.3	100.00			41.12.3	100.00
Germany [2]	Deutsche mark								3,367.20	925.31	3,367.20	[1] 925.31
Hon. Dominick V. Daniels:												
Switzerland	S. franc	6/18	6/23	6	215.50	50.00	1,508.50	350.00			1,508.50	[3] 350.00
Total								300.00				
Germany [2]	Marks								3,228.12	887.09	3,228.12	887.09
Denmark	Krone	6/24	6/25	2	375	50.00	750	100.00			750	[4] 100.00
Total								0				
United Kingdom	Pound	6/25	6/26	2	20.9.4	50.00	41.12.3	100.00			41.12.3	[4] 100.00
Total								0				
Hon. William H. Ayres:												
Switzerland	Swiss francs	6/4	6/9	6	215.50	50.00	1,293	300.00			1,293.00	300.00
Local transportation									1,920.00	446.72	1,920.00	446.72
Germany [2]	Marks								3,228.12	887.09	3,228.12	887.09
Hon. John M. Ashbrook:												
Switzerland	S. francs	6/1	6/15	14	215.50	50.00	3,018.75	700.00	3,168.00	737.09	6,186.75	1,437.09
Germany [2]	Marks								3,228.12	887.09	3,228.12	887.09
Hon. John N. Erlenborn:												
Switzerland	S. francs	6/13	6/23	10	215.50	50.00	2,155	500.00			2,155	500.00
Local transportation									2,189.60	507.09	2,189.60	507.09
Germany [5]	Marks								3,531.90	970.57	3,531.90	970.57
Denmark	Krone	6/23	6/25	2	325	50.00	750	100.00			750	100.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	6/26	6/29	3	20.9.4	50.00	62.8.3	150.00			62.8.3	150.00
Local transportation									4.13.6	11.22	4.13.6	11.22

[1] $50 (U.S. dollars) refunded.
[2] Round trip air fare.
[3] $50 of per diem amount returned by personal check.
[4] $100 of per diem amount returned by personal check.
[5] Round trip fare.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$9,168.50

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 572, 1ST SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR (SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John Brademas:												
Israel	Pounds	1/14	1/25	12	175	50.00	2,100	600.00	[1] 7,092.84	[1] 2,026.58	9,192.84	2,626.53
Netherlands [2]	Florin								3,142.65	872.47	3,142.65	872.47
Hon. James H. Scheuer:												
Israel	Pounds	1/13	1/23	10	175	50.00	1,750	500.00			1,750.00	500.00
Netherlands [2]	Florin								3,199.23	887.98	3,199.23	887.98
Hon. Lloyd Meeds:												
Israel	Pounds	1/10	1/25	15	175	50.00	2,100	600.00			2,100.00	600.00
Netherlands [2]	Florin								2,587.85	718.44	2,587.85	718.44
Hon. Orval Hansen:												
Israel	Pounds	1/12	1/20	9	175	50.00	1,575	450.00			1,575.00	450.00
Netherlands [2]	Florin								3,660.95	1,016.37	3,660.95	1,016.37
Charles W. Radcliffe:												
Israel	Pounds	1/13	1/25	13	175	50.00	2,275	650.00			2,275.00	650.00
Netherlands [2]	Florin								3,124.40	867.41	3,124.40	867.41
Jack G. Duncan:												
Israel	Pounds	1/13	1/25	13	175	50.00	2,275	650.00			2,275.00	650.00
Germany [2]	Marks											
Netherlands	Florin								3,191.52	864.91	3,191.52	864.91
Jack Schuster:												
Israel	Pounds	1/13	1/27	15	175	50.00	2,625	750.00			2,625.00	750.00
Netherlands [2]	Florin								2,387.10	662.72	2,387.10	662.72
Robert Andringa:												
Israel	Pound	1/13	1/25	13	175	50.00	2,275	650.00			2,275.00	650.00
Germany	Mark								3,191.52	864.91	3,191.52	864.91

[1] Includes local transportation for all members on trip.

[2] Round trip air fare.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$13,631.74

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 572, 1ST SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR (GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation [1]: Foreign currency	Transportation [1]: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Augustus F. Hawkins:												
Philippines	Peso	1/8	1/10	3	196	50.00	587.80	150.00	[1] 60.13	[1] 15.34	647.93	165.34
Thailand	Baht	1/10	1/14	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollars	1/14	1/18	4	302.50	50.00	1,210	200.00	[1] 75.05	[1] 12.37	1,285.05	212.37
Taiwan	Dollars	1/18	1/19	1					[1] 429.44	[1] 10.74	429.44	10.74
Japan	Yen	1/19	1/24	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00	[1] 69,127	[1] 192.02	177,127	492.02
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Marks								6,889.95	1,867.20	6,889.95	1,867.20
Sweden	Kroner	8/15	8/18	4	258.75	50.00	1,035	200.00	[1] 619.58	[1] 119.68	1,654.58	319.68
Denmark	Kroner	8/18	8/23	5	375	50.00	1,875	250.00	[1] 400.38	53.42	2,275.38	303.42
Denmark (air fare)	Kroner								139.20	18.56	139.20	18.56
Norway	Kroner	8/23	8/25	2	356.62	50.00	713.25	100.00	2,385	334.13	3,098.25	434.13
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Marks								3,547.27	976.94	3,547.27	976.94
Panama Canal Zone	Dollar	11/5	11/7	2								
Costa Rica	Colon	11/7	11/10	3	331	50.00	1,655	250.00	[1] 1,131.08	[1] 170.86	2,786.08	420.86
Costa Rica	Colon	11/7	11/10	3							[2] 779.25	[2] 117.71
Costa Rica	Colon	11/7	11/10	3			(460.67)	(69.59)			(460.67)	(69.59)
Mexico	Peso	11/10	11/14	5	624.50	50.00	3,122.50	250.00	[1] 1,850	[1] 148.12	4,972.50	398.12
Mexico	Peso	11/10	11/14	5							[1] 138.00	[2] 11,052
Phillip Burton:												
Philippines	Peso	1/8	1/11	4	196	50.00	783.80	200.00	[1] 60.13	[1] 15.34	843.93	215.34
Thailand	Baht	1/11	1/14	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1/14	1/18	4	302.50	50.00	1,210	200.00	[1] 75.05	12.37	1,285.05	212.37
Taiwan	Dollar	1/18	1/19	1					[1] 429.44	10.74	429.44	10.74
Japan	Yen	1/19	1/24	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00	[1] 69,127	[1] 192.02	1,771.27	492.02
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Marks								6,390.36	1,731.80	6,390.36	1,731.80
Sweden	Kroner	8/15	8/18	4	258.75	50.00	1,035	200.00	[1] 619.58	[1] 119.68	1,654.58	319.68
Demark	Kroner	8/18	8/23	5	375	50.00	1,875	250.00	[1] 400.37	[1] 53.39	2,275.37	303.39
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Marks								3,547.27	976.94	3,547.27	976.94
William Clay:												
Philippines	Peso	1/8	1/10	3	196	50.00	587.80	150.00	[1] 60.13	[1] 15.34	647.93	165.34
Thailand	Baht	1/10	1/14	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1/14	1/18	4	302.50	50.00	1,210	200.00	[1] 75.05	[1] 12.37	1,285.05	212.37
Taiwan	Dollar	1/18	1/19	1					[1] 429.44	[1] 10.74	429.44	10.74
Japan	Yen	1/19	1/24	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00	[1] 69,127	[1] 192.02	177,127	492.02
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Marks								6,889.95	1,867.20	6,889.95	1,867.20
Panama Canal Zone	Dollar	11/5	11/7	2								
Costa Rica	Colón	11/7	11/10	3	331	50.00	1,655	250.00	[1] 1,131.08	[1] 170.86	2,786.08	420.86
Costa Rica	Colón	11/7	11/10	3	331	50.00	(460.67)	(69.59)			(460.67)	(69.59)
Mexico	Peso	11/10	11/14	5	624.50	50.00	3,122.50	250.00	[1] 1,850	[1] 148.12	4,972.50	398.12
Louis Stokes:												
Panama Canal Zone	Dollar	11/5	11/7	2								
Costa Rica	Colón	11/7	11/10	3	331	50.00	1,655	250.00	[1] 1,131.08	[1] 170.86	2,786.08	420.86
Costa Rica	Colón	11/7	11/10	3			(460.67)	(69.59)			(460.67)	(69.59)
Mexico	Peso	11/10	11/14	5	624.50	50.00	3,122.50	250.00	[1] 1,850	[1] 148.12	4,972.50	398.12
William D. Ford:												
Philippines	Peso	1/8	1/11	4	196	50.00	783.80	200.00	[1] 60.13	[1] 15.34	647.93	215.34
Thailand	Baht	1/11	1/14	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
Taiwan	Dollar	1/14	1/16	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	1/16	1/17	1								
Korea	Won	1/17	1/19	2	15,165	50.00	30,330	100.00			30,330	100.00
Japan	Yen	1/19	1/21	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00	[1] 3,690	[1] 10.25	57,690	160.25
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Deutsche Mark								7,124.19	1,930.67	7,124.19	1,930.67

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 572, 1ST SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR (GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date		Total days	Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Depar-ture		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John N. Erlenborn:												
Philippines	Peso	1/8	1/10	3	196	50.00	587.80	150.00	[1] 60.13	[1] 15.34	647.93	165.34
Thailand	Baht	1/10	1/14	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1/14	1/18	4	302.50	50.00	1,210	200.00	75.05	12.37	1,285.05	212.37
Taiwan	Dollar	1/18	1/19	1					[1] 429.44	[1] 10.74	429.44	10.74
Japan	Yen	1/19	1/24	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00	[1] 69,127	[1] 192.02	177,127	492.02
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Marks								6,889.95	1,867.20	6,889.95	1,867.20
Panama Canal Zone	Dollar	11/5	11/7	2								
Costa Rica	Colon	11/7	11/10	3	331	50.00	1,655	250.00	[1] 1,131.08	170.86	2,786.08	420.86
Costa Rica	Colon						(460.67)	(69.59)			(460.67)	(69.59)
Mexico	Peso	11/10	11/14	5	624.50	50.00	3,122.50	250.00	[1] 1,850	[1] 148.12	4,972.50	398.12
William Scherle:												
Panama Canal Zone	Dollar	11/5	11/7	2								
Costa Rica	Colón	11/7	11/10	3	331	50.00	1,655	250.00	[1] 1,131.08	[1] 170.86	2,786.08	420.86
Costa Rica	Colón						(460.67)	(69.59)			(460.67)	(69.59)
Mexico	Peso	11/10	11/14	5	624.50	50.00	3,122.50	250.00	[1] 1,850	[1] 148.12	4,972.50	398.12
Marvin Esch:												
Philippines	Peso	1/8	1/10	3	196	50.00	783.80	200.00	[1] 60.13	[1] 15.34	843.93	215.34
Philippines	Peso						(201)	(51.28)			(201.00)	(51.28)
Thailand	Baht	1/10	1/13	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
Vietnam	Piaster	1/13	1/15	2								
Hong Kong	Dollar	1/15	1/18	3	302.50	50.00	907.50	150.00	[1] 75.05	[1] 12.37	982.55	162.37
Taiwan	Dollar	1/18	1/19	1					[1] 429.44	[1] 10.74	429.44	10.74
Japan	Yen	1/19	1/24	6	18,000	50.00	144,000	400.00	[1] 69,127	[1] 192.02	213,127	592.02
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Mark								6,889.95	1,867.20	6,889.95	1,867.20
Panama Canal Zone	Dollar	11/5	11/7	2								
Costa Rica	Colón	11/7	11/10	3	331	50.00	1,655	250.00	[1] 1,131.08	[1] 170.86	2,786.08	420.86
Costa Rica	Colón						(460.67)	(69.59)			(460.67)	(69.59)
Mexico	Peso	11/10	11/14	5	624.50	50.00	3,122.50	250.00	[1] 1,850	[1] 148.12	4,972.50	398.12
Adrienne Fields:												
Philippines	Peso	1/8	1/10	3	196	50.00	587.80	150.00	[1] 60.13	[1] 15.34	647.93	165.34
Thailand	Baht	1/10	1/14	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1/14	1/18	4	302.50	50.00	1,210	200.00	[1] 75.05	[1] 12.37	1,285.05	212.37
Taiwan	Dollar	1/18	1/19	1					[1] 429.44	[1] 10.74	429.44	10.74
Japan	Yen	1/19	1/24	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00	[1] 69,127	[1] 192.02	177,127	492.02
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Marks								6,889.95	1,867.20	6,889.95	1,867.20
Sweden	Kroner	8/15	8/18	4	258.75	50.00	1,035	200.00	[1] 619.58	[1] 119.68	1,654.58	319.68
Denmark	Kroner	8/18	8/23	5	375	50.00	1,875	250.00	[1] 400.37	[1] 53.39	2,275.37	303.39
Norway	Kroner	8/23	8/25	2	356.62	50.00	713.25	100.00	[1] 330	[1] 46.23	1,043.25	146.23
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Mark								3,806.04	1,048.20	3,806.04	1,048.20
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Mark									(71.26)		(71.26)
Mary McAndrew:												
Panama Canal Zone	Dollar	11/5	11/7	2								
Costa Rica	Colon	11/7	11/10	3	331	50.00	1,655	250.00	1,131.08	170.86	2,786.08	420.86
Costa Rica	Colon						(460.67)	(69.59)			(460.67)	(69.59)
Mexico	Peso	11/10	11/14	5	624.50	50.00	3,122.50	250.00	[1] 1,850	[1] 148.12	4,972.50	398.12
Michael Bernstein:												
Philippines	Peso	1/8	1/10	3	196	50.00	587.80	150.00	60.13	15.34	647.93	165.34
Thailand	Baht	1/10	1/14	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1/14	1/18	4	302.50	50.00	1,210	200.00	[1] 75.05	[1] 12.37	1,285.05	212.37
Taiwan	Dollar	1/18	1/19	1					[1] 429.44	[1] 10.74	429.44	10.74
Japan	Yen	1/19	1/24	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00	69,127	192.02	177,127	492.02
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Mark								6,889.95	1,867.20	6,889.95	1,867.20
Denmark	Kroner	8/18	8/23	5	375	50.00	1,875	250.00	[1] 400.37	[1] 53.39	2,275.37	303.39
Norway	Kroner	8/23	8/25	2	356.62	50.00	713.25	100.00	[1] 330	46.23	1,043.25	146.23
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Mark								3,239.10	892.07	3,239.10	892.07
Martin LaVor:												
Philippines	Peso	1/8	1/10	3	196	50.00	587.80	150.00	[1] 60.13	[1] 15.34	647.93	165.34
Thailand	Baht	1/10	1/14	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1/14	1/18	4	302.50	50.00	1,210	200.00	[1] 75.05	[1] 12.37	1,285.05	212.37
Taiwan	Dollar	1/18	1/19	1					[1] 429.44	[1] 10.74	429.44	10.74
Japan	Yen	1/19	1/24	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300,000	[1] 69,127	[1] 192.02	177,127	492.02
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Mark								6,889.95	1,867.20	6,889.95	1,867.20
Panama Canal Zone	Dollar	11/5	11/7	2								
Costa Rica	Colones	11/7	11/10	3	331	50.00	1,655	250.00	[1] 1,131.08	[1] 170.86	2,786.08	420.86
Costa Rica	Colones						(460.67)	(69.59)			(460.67)	(69.59)
Mexico	Peso	11/10	11/14	5	624.50	50.00	3,122.50	250.00	[1] 1,850	[1] 148.12	4,972.50	398.12
Ernest Mannino:												
Philippines	Peso	1/8	1/11	4	196	50.00	783.80	200.00	[1] 60.13	[1] 15.34	647.93	215.34
Thailand	Baht	1/11	1/14	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
Taiwan	Dollar	1/14	1/16	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	1/16	1/17	1								
Korea	Won	1/17	1/19	2	15,165	50.00	30,330	100.00			30,330	100.00
Japan	Yen	1/19	1/21	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00	[1] 3,690	[1] 10.25	57,690	160.25
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Mark								6,889.95	1,867.20	6,889.95	1,867.20
Ronald A. Downing:												
Philippines	Peso	1/8	1/11	4	196	50.00	783.80	200.00	[1] 60.13	[1] 15.34	647.93	215.34
Thailand	Baht	1/11	1/14	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
Taiwan	Dollar	1/14	1/16	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	1/16	1/17	1								
Korea	Won	1/17	1/19	2	15,165	50.00	30,330	100.00			30,330	100.00
Japan	Yen	1/19	1/21	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00	[1] 3,690	[1] 10.25	57,690	160.25
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Mark								6,889.95	1,867.20	6,889.95	1,867.20
John O. Amos:												
Philippines	Peso	1/8	1/10	3	196	50.00	587.80	150.00	[1] 60.13	[1] 15.34	647.93	165.34
Thailand	Baht	1/10	1/14	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1/14	1/18	4	302.50	50.00	1,210	200.00	[1] 75.05	[1] 12.37	1,285.05	212.37
Taiwan	Dollar	1/18	1/19	1					[1] 429.44	[1] 10.74	429.44	10.74
Japan	Yen	1/19	1/24	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00	[1] 69,127	[1] 192.02	177,127	492.02
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Marks								6,889.95	1,867.20	6,889.95	1,867.20
David J. Smith:												
Philippines	Peso	1/8	1/11	4	196	50.00	783.80	200.00	[1] 60.13	[1] 15.34	647.93	215.34
Thailand	Baht	1/11	1/14	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
Taiwan	Dollar	1/14	1/16	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Okinawa	Dollar	1/16	1/17	1								
Korea	Won	1/17	1/19	2	15,165	50.00	30,330	100.00			30,330	100.00
Japan	Yen	1/19	1/21	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00	[1] 3,690	[1] 10.25	57,690	160.25
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Deutsche mark								6,889.95	1,867.20	6,889.95	1,867.20

See footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 572, 1ST SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR (GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR), HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert E. Vagley:												
Philippines	Peso	1/8	1/11	4	196	50.00	783.80	200.00	[1] 60.13	[1] 15.34	647.93	215.34
Thailand	Baht	1/11	1/14	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	1/14	1/18	4	302.50	50.00	1,210	200.00	[1] 75.05	[1] 12.37	1,285.05	212.37
Taiwan	Dollar	1/18	1/19	1					[1] 429.44	[1] 10.74	429.44	10.74
Japan	Yen	1/19	1/24	6	18,000	50.00	108,000	300.00	[1] 69,127	[1] 192.02	177,127	492.02
Germany (round-trip air fare)	Deutsche mark								6,889.95	1,867.20	6,889.95	1,867.20
Panama Canal Zone	Dollar	11/5	11/7	1								
Costa Rica	Colon	11/7	11/10	3	331	50.00	1,655	250.00	[1] 1,131.08	170.86	2,786.08	420.86
Costa Rica	Colon						(460.67)	(69.59)			(460.67)	(69.59)
Mexico	Peso	11/10	11/14	5	624.50	50.00	3,122.50	250.00	[1] 1,850	[1] 148.12	4,972.50	398.12

[1] Pro rata share of local transportation.

[2] Miscellaneous expenses incurred by subcommittee, but charged to Congressman Hawkins, as acting chairman, for bookkeeping purposes.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$53,388.59
Total	76,188.83

CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

Mar. 19, 1971.

REPORT OF EXPENDTITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 143, 2d SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. E. Ross Adair: Mexico	Peso	11/27	12/3	6	624.5	50.00	3,747	300.00			3,747	300.00
Melvin O. Benson:												
Egypt, United Arab Republic	Egyptian pound	1/15	1/18	3	27,777	50.00	83.33	150.00			83.33	150.00
Lebanon	Lebanese pound	1/18	1/20	2	163	50.00	326	100.00	27	8.28	353	108.28
Greece	Drachma	1/20	1/23	3	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00
Israel	Israeli pound	1/23	1/28	5	175	50.00	875	250.00	166.20	47.50	1,041.20	297.50
Rome	Lire	1/28	1,30	2	31,350	50.00	62,700	100.00			62,700	100.00
Transportation	Egyptian pound								645.310	1,161.47	645.310	1,161.47
France	Franc	3/29	3/30	1	277	50.00	277	50.00			277	50.00
Morocco	F. franc	3/30	3/31	1	277	50.00	277	50.00			277	50.00
Guinea	F. franc	3/31	4/3	3	277	50.00	831	150.00			831	150.00
Guinea	G. franc								2,503	10.15	2,503	10.15
Sierra Leone	F. franc	4/3	4/4	1	277	50.00	277	50.00			277	50.00
Ivory Coast	F. franc	4/4	4/6	2	277	50.00	554	100.00			554	100.00
Mali	F. franc	4/6	4/8	2	277	50.00	554	100.00			554	100.00
Upper Volta	F. franc	4/8	4/9	1	277	50.00	277	50.00			277	50.00
Niger	F. franc	4/9	4/11	2	277	50.00	554	100.00			554	100.00
Cameroon	F. franc	4/11	4/14	3	277	50.00	831	150.00			831	150.00
Cameroon	C. franc								49,450	178.52	49,450	178.52
Chad	F. franc	4/14	4/15	1	277	50.00	277	50.00			277	50.00
Congo	F. franc	4/15	4/18	3	277	50.00	831	150.00			831	150.00
Burundi	F. franc	4/18	4/19	1	277	50.00	277	50.00			277	50.00
Rwanda	F. franc	4/19	4/21	2	277	50.00	554	100.00			554	100.00
Rwanda	R. franc								10,300	103.50	10,300	103.50
Uganda	F. franc	4/21	4/23	2	277	50.00	554	100.00			554	100.00
United Kingdom	Pound	4/23	4/27	5	20.14.9	50.00	103.12.6	250.00			103.12.6	250.00
Transportation	N. Ghana cedis								2,516.54	2,467.20	2,516.54	2,467.20
Bahrain	B.dinar	8/30	9/1	2	23.750	50.00	47.5	100.00			47.5	100.00
Saudi Arabia	S. rial	9/1	9/4	3	225.50	50.00	675	150.00			675	150.00
Egypt	E. pound	9/4	9/6	2	27.777	50.00	55.55	100.00			55.55	100.00
Lebanon	L. pound	9/6	9/8	2	183	50.00	326	100.00	58	17.82	384	117.82
Israel	L. pound	9/8	9/11	3	175	50.00	525	150.00	174.6	49.91	699.65	199.91
France	Franc	9/11	9/12	2	276	50.00	552	100.00			552	100.00
Transportation	Israeli pound								5,763.10	1,646.60	5,763.10	1,646.60
John J. Brady, Jr.:												
Belgium	Franc	1/12	1/14	3	250	50.00	7,500	150.00	898	17.91	8,398	167.91
West Germany	Deutsche mark	1/14	1/17	3	185	50.00	555	150.00			555	150.00
Italy	Lire	1/17	1/20	3	31,350	50.00	94,050	150.00			94,050	150.00
Greece	Drachma	1/20	1/23	3	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00
France	Franc	1/23	1/25	2	277.7	50.00	555.5	100.00			555.5	100.00
England	Pound	1/25	1/29	4	20.14.9	50.00	82.19.0	200.00			82.19.0	200.00
Transportation	Dutch florin								4,354.45	1,208.90	4,354.45	1,208.90
Belgium	Franc	5/3	5/5	2	2,500	50.00	5,000	100.00			5,000	100.00
West Germany	Deutsche mark	5/5	5/14	9	181.5	50.00	1,633.50	450.00			1,633.50	450.00
Italy	Lire	5/14	5/19	5	31,450	50.00	157,250	250.00			157,250	250.00
Spain	Peseta	5/19	5/21	2	3,490	50.00	6,980	100.00			6,980	100.00
England	Pound	5/21	5/24		20.14.9	50.00	82.19.0	200.00			82.19.0	200.00
Transportation	Dutch florin								3,073.30	848.04	3,073.30	848.04
Hon. William S. Broomfield:												
England	Pound	7/2	7/5	4	20.16.9	50.00	83.7.0	200.00	75.6.6	180.77	158.13.6	380.77
Switzerland	Franc	7/6	7/11	6	215.5	50.00	1,293	300.00	1,364	315.89	2,657	615.89
France	Franc	7/12	7/14	3	286	50.00	828	150.00	1,377.44	249.54	2,205.44	399.54
Transportation	Deutsche mark								2,320.44	637.66	2,320.44	637.66
Hon. John Buchanan:												
Egypt	E. pound	9/3	9/6	3	27.77	50.00	53,330	96.00			53,330	96.00
Lebanon	L. pound	9/6	9/8	2	163	50.00	326	100.00			326	100.00
Israel	I. pound	9/8	9/11	3	175	50.00	525	150.00	174.6	49.90	699.6	199.90
France	Franc	9/11	9/12	2	276	50.00	552	100.00			552	100.00
Transportation	Israeli pound								5,047.84	1,442.24	5,047.84	1,442.24

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 143, 2d SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date		Total days	Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. J. Herbert Burke:												
Japan	Yen	1/9	1/12	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Hong Kong	H.K. dollar	1/12	1/14	3	302.50	50.00	907.50	150.00			907.50	150.00
Taiwan	Yuan	1/15	1/17	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Philippines	Peso	1/17	1/19	3	195.95	50.00	587.85	150.00			587.85	150.00
India	Rupee	1/20	1/23	4	380	50.00	1,520	200.00	6.0	.79	1,526	200.79
Pakistan	Rupee	1/24	1/27	4	240	50.00	960	200.00	66.75	13.91	1,026.75	213.91
United Kingdom	Pound	1/28	1/31	3	20.15.8	50.00	62.7.0	150.00	17.17.9	42.93	80.4.9	192.93
Transportation	Deutsche mark								8,134.71	2,204.56	8,134.71	2,204.56
Harry C. Cromer:												
Hong Kong	H.K. dollar	3/23	3/25	3	301.50	50.00	904.50	150.00			904.50	150.00
Vietnam	Piaster	3/25	4/10	16	5,900.0	50.00	45,500	385.50			45,500	385.50
Transportation	Deutsche mark								6,820.41	1,849.85	6,820.41	1,849.85
Peru	Soles	8/6	8/14	9	2,169	50.00	21,690	500.00	5,400	124.48	27,090	624.48
Panama	Soles	8/14	8/15	1								
Transportation	Deutsche mark								2,719.38	748.93	2,719.38	748.93
Italy	Lire	10/29	11/3	5	31,250	50.00	156,250	250.00			156,250	250.00
Switzerland	Franc	11/3	11/6	4	216.25	50.00	865	200.00			865	200.00
Austria	Schilling	11/6	11/11	4	1,287.50	50.00	5,150	200.00	1,298.70	50.47	6,448.70	250.47
France	Franc	11/11	11/14	4	276	50.00	1,104	200.00	375.36	68.04	1,479.36	268.04
Transportation	Deutsche mark								3,640.13	1,002.51	3,640.13	1,002.51
Hon. John C. Culver:												
Venezuela	Bolivar	2/2	2/7	6	224.25	50.00	1,345.50	300.00	49.35	11.00	1,394.85	311.00
Trinidad	TT dollar	2/7	2/10	3	100	50.00	300	150.00	25.40	12.71	325.40	162.71
Barbados	EC dollar	2/10	2/16	6	99.7	50.00	598.20	300.00			598.20	300.00
Transportation	Deutsche mark								1,588.44	430.47	1,588.44	430.47
Switzerland	Franc	4/17	4/20	3	214.5	50.00	644.45	150.00			644.45	150.00
France	Franc	4/20	4/22	3	276.5	50.00	829.50	150.00			829.50	150.00
Transportation	Deutsche mark								3,228.12	875.54	3,228.12	875.54
Marian Czarnecki:												
Brazil	Cruzeiros	1/13	1/17	4	216	50.00	864.0	200.00			864	200.00
Transportation	Du. florin								3,036.80	843.09	3,036.80	843.09
Venezuela	Bolivar	2/2	2/8	7	224.25	50.00	1,504.75	335.51			1,504.75	335.51
Transportation	Deutsche mark								1,588.44	430.47	1,588.44	430.47
United Kingdom	Pound	4/13	4/14	1	20.14.7	50.00	20.14.7	50.00	3.0.0	7.20	23.14.7	57.20
Switzerland	Franc	4/14	4/21	8	215	50.00	1,720.0	400.00	270	62.82	1,990	462.82
Transportation	Deutsche mark								3,228.12	875.54	3,228.12	875.54
Peru	Soles	8/6	8/15	10	2,169	50.00	21,690	500.00	5,400	124.48	27,090	624.48
Transportation	Deutsche mark								2,719.38	748.93	2,719.38	748.93
Italy	Lire	10/29	11/3	5	31,250	50.00	156,250	250.00			156,250	250.00
Switzerland	Franc	11/3	11/6	4	216.25	50.00	865.0	200.00			865	200.00
Austria	Shilling	11/6	11/11	4	1,287.50	50.00	5,150.0	200.00	1,298.70	50.47	6,448.70	250.47
France	Franc	11/11	11/14	4	276	50.00	1,104.0	200.00			1,104	200.00
Transportation	Deutsche mark								3,640.12	1,002.51	3,640.12	1,002.51
Hon. Edward J. Derwinski:												
Egypt, United Arab Republic	E. pound	1/15	1/18	3	27,777	50.00	83,330	150.00			83,330	150.00
Lebanon	L. pound	1/18	1/20	2	163	50.00	326	100.00	27	8.28	353	108.28
Greece	Drachma	1/20	1/23	3	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00	662	22.07	5,162	172.07
Israel	I. pound	1/23	1/25	2	175	50.00	350	100.00	166.20	47.48	516.20	147.48
Transportation	Egyptian pound								645,308	1,161.46	645,308	1,161.46
Hon. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.:												
France	F. franc	3/29	3/30	1	277	50.00	277	50.00			277	50.00
Morocco	F. franc	3/30	3/31	1	277	50.00	277	50.00			277	50.00
Guinea	F. franc	3/31	4/3	3	277	50.00	831	150.00			831	150.00
Guinea	G. franc								2,503	10.15	2,503	10.15
Sierra Leone	F. franc	4/3	4/4	1	277	50.00	277	50.00			277	50.00
Ivory Coast	F. franc	4/4	4/6	2	277	50.00	554	100.00			554	100.00
Mali	F. franc	4/6	4/8	2	277	50.00	554	100.00			554	100.00
Upper Volta	F. franc	4/8	4/9	1	277	50.00	277	50.00			277	50.00
Niger	F. franc	4/9	4/11	2	277	50.00	554	100.00			554	100.00
Cameroon	F. franc	4/11	4/14	3	277	50.00	831	150.00			831	150.00
Cameroon	C. franc								49,450	178.52	49,450	178.52
Chad	F. franc	4/14	4/15	1	277	50.00	277	50.00			277	50.00
Congo (K)	C. zaires	4/15	4/17	2	25	50.00	50	100.00	31.50	63.00	81.50	163.00
Congo (K)	F. franc	4/17	4/18	1	277	50.00	277	50.00			277	50.00
Burundi	F. franc	4/18	4/19	1	277	50.00	277	50.00			277	50.00
Burundi	Bu. franc								48,195	557.75	48,195	557.75
Rwanda	F. franc	4/19	4/21	2	277	50.00	554	100.00			554	100.00
Rwanda	Rw. franc								10,300	103.50	10,300	103.50
Uganda	F. franc	4/21	4/23	2	277	50.00	208	37.75			208	37.75
Uganda	U. shilling				354.45	50.00	63.90	9.59			63.90	9.59
Kenya	K. shilling	4/23	4/24	1	354	50.00	184	26.17			184	26.17
Germany	Deutsche mark	4/24	4/26	3	183	50.00	549	150.00			549	150.00
Transportation	Deutsche mark								2,524.39	2,474.89	2,524.39	2,474.89
Hon. Leonard Farbstein:												
Belgium	B. franc	1/12	1/14	2	2,500	50.00	5,000	100.00	898	17.91	5,898	117.91
Germany	Deutsche mark	1/14	1/17	3	181.5	50.00	544.5	150.00			544.5	150.00
Italy	Lire	1/17	1/20	3	31,350	50.00	94,050	150.00	71,150	113.12	165,200	263.12
Greece	Drachma	1/20	1/23	3	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00
France	Franc	1/23	1/25	2	277.7	50.00	555.5	100.00			555.5	100.00
United Kingdom	Pound	1/25	1/27	3	20.14.9	50.00	62.12.0	150.00	50.4.6	120.53	112.16.6	270.53
Transportation	Du. florin								4,266.85	1,184.58	4,266.85	1,184.58
Hon. Dante B. Fascell:												
Brazil	New cruzeiro	1/13	1/17	4	216	50.00	864	200.00			864	200.00
Transportation	Dutch florin								3,036.80	843.09	3,036.80	843.09
Switzerland	Franc	4/17	4/21	5	215	50.00	1,075	250.00	402.50	93.65	1,476.95	343.65
Transportation	Deutsche mark								3,228.12	875.54	3,228.12	875.54
Mexico	Peso	11/29	12/5						4,025	322.26	4,025	322.26
Transportation	Deutsche mark								940.17	259.00	940.17	259.00
Hon. Paul Findley:												
Peru	Soles	1/11	1/13	2	2,160	50.00	4,320	100.00			4,320	100.00
Colombia	Peso	1/13	1/15	3	893	50.00	2,679	150.00			2,679	150.00
Transportation	Dutch florin								2,701	749.86	2,701	749.86
Germany	Deutsche mark	2/5	2/8	3	184	50.00	552	150.00			552	150.00
France	Franc	2/8	2/9	2	277	50.00	554	100.00			554	100.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATE FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 143, 2d SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Depar-ture	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. L. H. Fountain:												
Bahrain	B. dinar	8/30	9/1	2	23.750	50.00	47.500	100.00			47,500	100.00
Saudi Arabia	S. riyal	9/1	9/4	3	225	50.00	675	150.00			675	150.00
Egypt, United Arab Republic	E. pound	9/4	9/6	2	27.777	50.00	55.55	100.00	19.800	35.64	75.28	135.64
Lebanon	L. pound	9/6	9/8	2	183	50.00	326	100.00	58	17.80	384	117.80
Israel	I. pound	9/8	9/11	3	175	50.00	525	150.00	174.6	49.90	699.65	199.90
France	Franc	9/11	9/12	2	276	50.00	552	100.00			552	100.00
Transportation	Israeli pound								5,763.10	1,646.60	5,763.10	1,646.60
Hon. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen:												
Egypt, United Arab Republic	E. pound	1/15	1/18	3	27.777	50.00	83.330	150.00	13.250	23.85	96.580	173.85
Lebanon	L. pound	1/18	1/20	2	163	50.00	326	100.00	27	8.28	353	108.28
Greece	Drachma	1/20	1/23	3	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00
Israel	I. pound	1/23	1/28	5	175	50.00	875	250.00	166.20	47.48	1,041.20	297.48
Italy	Lire	1/28	2/1	4	31,350	50.00	125,400	200.00			125,400	200.00
Spain	Peseta	2/1	2/3	2	3,495	50.00	6,990	100.00			6,990	100.00
Transportation	E. pound								645.310	1,161.47	645.310	1,161.47
Mexico	Peso	11/29	12/4	4	624.50	50.00	2,498	200.00	2,625	210.17	5,123	410.17
Transportation	Deutsche mark								1,196.82	329.52	1,196.82	329.52
Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher:												
Hong Kong	H.K. dollar	1/7	1/9	2	302.7	50.00	2,119	350.00	69.90	11.52	2,188	361.52
Hong Kong	H.K. dollar	1/11	1/16	5								
Vietnam	Piastre	1/9	1/11	2	5,900	50.00	11,800	100.00			11,800	100.00
Philippines	Peso	1/16	1/18	3	195.95	50.00	587.85	150.00			587.85	150.00
Switzerland	Franc	1/19	1/24	6	215.5	50.00	1,293	300.00	444.30	102.87	1,737.30	402.87
Transportation	Deutsche mark								8,352.82	2,262.22	8,352.82	2,262.22
Japan	Yen	7/20	7/21	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Korea	Won	7/21	7/31	10	15,550	50.00	46,650	150.00			46,650	150.00
Transportation	Deutsche mark								6,208.82	1,706.19	6,208.82	1,706.19
Spain	Peseta	11/6	11/7	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960	100.00
United Kingdom	Pound	11/8	11/20	13	20.16.7	50.00	270.16.6	650.00			270.16.6	650.00
Transportation	Deutsche mark								3,151.26	867.64	3,151.26	867.64
Peter B. Johnson:												
Vietnam	Piaster	2/11	2/17	7	5,900	50.00	31,038.7	263.04			31,038.7	263.04
Israel	Pound	2/18	2/20	3	175	50.00	487.03	139.15			487.03	139.15
France	Franc	2/20	2/24	4	277	50.00	845	152.53			845	152.53
Transportation	Dutch florin								7,493.08	2,080.25	7,493.08	2,080.25
Hon. Abraham Kazen, Jr.:												
Mexico	Peso	11/27	12/4	8	624.50	50.00	1,496	120.00	4,075.00	326.26	5,571	446.26
Transportation	Deutsche mark								656.30	180.80	656.30	180.80
Hon. Sherman P. Lloyd:												
Egypt, U.A.R.	E. pound	1/15	1/18	3	27.777	50.00	72.86	131.28			72.86	131.28
Lebanon	L. pound	1/18	1/20	2	163	50.00	326	100.00	27	8.28	353	108.28
Greece	Drachma	1/20	1/23	3	1,500	50.00	4,500	150.00			4,500	150.00
Israel	I. pound	1/23	1/28	5	175	50.00	875	250.00	166.20	47.48	1,041.20	297.48
Italy	Lire	1/28	2/1	4	31,350	50.00	125,400	200.00			125,400	200.00
Transportation	Egyptian pound								645.307	1,161.46	645.307	1,161.46
Hon. William S. Mailliard:												
Bermuda	B. pound	2/20	2/24	5	50.00	50.00	250.00	250.00			250	250.00
Transportation	U.S. dollar									182.00		182.00
Germany	D-mark	4/20	4/21	1	183.00	50.00	183.00	50.00			183.00	50.00
France	Franc	4/21	4/22	2	276.50	50.00	553.00	100.00			553.00	100.00
Transportation	D-mark								3,850.60	1,044.37	3,850.60	1,044.37
Mexico	Peso	11/27	12/4	6	624.5	50.00	3,747.00	300.00	3,300	264.21	7,047	564.21
Hon. F. Bradford Morse:												
Vietnam	Piaster	2/11	2/17	7	5,900	50.00	28,169	238.72			28,169	238.72
Israel	Pound	2/18	2/20	3	175.0	50.00	455	130.00	247	70.57	702.0	200.57
France	Franc	2/20	2/24	4	277.0	50.00	914.1	165.00			914.1	165.00
Transportation	Du.florin								7,493.09	2,080.26	7,493.09	2,080.26
Franklin J. Schupp:												
Japan	Yen	1/9	1/12	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Hong Kong	H.K. dollar	1/12	1/14	3	302.50	50.00	907.50	150.00			907.50	150.00
Taiwan	Yuan	1/15	1/17	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Philippines	Peso	1/17	1/19	3	195.90	50.00	587.85	150.00			587.85	150.00
India	Rupee	1/20	1/23	4	380	50.00	1,520	200.00	6.00	.79	1,526.00	200.79
Pakistan	Rupee	1/24	1/27	4	240	50.00	960	200.00	76.75	15.99	1,036.75	215.99
United Kingdom	Pound	1/28	1/31	3	20.15.8	50.00	62.7.0	150.00	17.17.10	42.93	80.4.10	192.93
Transportation	D-mark								8148.64	2208.31	8,148.64	2,208.31
John H. Sullivan:												
Brazil	N. cruzeiros	1/8	1/10	3	216	50.00	594	137.50			594	137.50
Peru	Soles	1/10	1/13	3	2160	50.00	6,480	150.00			6,480	150.00
Colombia	Peso	1/13	1/15	2	893	50.00	1786	100.00			1786	100.00
Panama	U.S. Dollars	1/15	1/18	3		28.00		14.40				14.40
Transportation	D-mark								3218.78	872.30	3,218.78	872.30
Japan	Yen	10/20	10/22	3	18,000	50.00						
Japan	Yen	10/24	10/26	2	18,000	50.00	90,000	250.00	22,776	63.27	112,776	313.27
Korea	Won	10/22	10/24	2	15,638.5	50.00	31,277	100.00			31,277	100.00
Taiwan	NT Dollars	10/28	10/31	4	2,000	50.00	8,000	200.00			8,000	200.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	10/31	11/4	3	19,050	50.00	57,150	150.00			57,150	150.00
Thailand	Baht	11/4	11/8	4	1041.25	50.00	4,165	200.00			4,165	200.00
Philippines	Peso	11/8	11/10	2	324	50.00	648	100.00			648	100.00
Transportation	D-mark								7,790.68	2,145.60	7,790.68	2,145.60
Hon. Vernon W. Thomson:												
Bermuda	B. pound	2/20	2/24	5	50.00	50.00	250.00	250.00			250.00	250.00
Transportation	U.S. Dollars									182.00		182.00
Hon. J. Irving Whalley:												
New Zealand	NZ $	1/1	1/9	8	44.29	50.00	354.32	400.00			354.32	400.00
Transportation	D-mark								6,132.33	1,661.88	6,132.33	1,661.88
Vietnam	Piaster	3/28	4/2	5	5,900	50.00	26,900	227.97			26,900	227.97
Thailand	Baht	4/2	4/4	2	1,041.25	50.00	1,662.50	79.83			1,662.50	79.83
Japan	Yen	4/5	4/8	4	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00	45,030	125.08	117,030	325.08
Transportation	D-mark								6,889.95	1,868.71	6,889.95	1,868.71

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Lester L. Wolff:												
Japan	Yen	1/9	1/12	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00	23,690	65.81	77,690	215.81
Hong Kong	H.K. $	1/12	1/14	3	302.50	50.00	907.50	150.00	46.70	7.69	954.20	157.69
Philippines	Peso	1/15	1/19	5	195.95	50.00	979.75	250.00			979.75	250.00
India	Rupee	1/20	1/23	4	380.0	50.00	1,520	200.00	12.00	1.58	1,532	201.58
Pakistan	Rupee	1/24	1/29	6	240	50.00	1,440	300.00	116.75	24.32	1,556.75	324.32
Iran	Real	1/30	1/31	2	3,812.5	50.00	7,625.0	100.00			7,624.0	100.00
United Kingdom	Pound	2/1	2/2	2	20.15.9	50.00	41.10.6	100.00	17.17.9	42.93	59.8.3	142.93
Transportation	D-mark								8,162.17	2,211.98	8,162.17	2,211.98
Korea	Won	12/12	12/15	3	15,738.55	50.00	31,477	100.00			31,477	100.00
Taiwan	NT $	12/15	12/17	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Thailand	Baht	12/17	12/18	2	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00			2,082.50	100.00
Vietnam	Piaster	12/18	12/19	1	13,750	50.00	13,750	50.00			13,750	50.00
Hong Kong	H.K. Dollar	12/20	12/22	2	303.0	50.00	606.0	100.00	42.95	7.04	648.95	107.04
Japan	Yen	12/22	12/23	2	18,000	50.00	36,000	100.00			36,000	100.00
Transportation	Deutsche Mark								7,260.88	1,962.40	7,260.88	1,962.40
Hon. Clement J. Zablocki:												
Brazil	N. Cruzeiro	1/8	1/10	3	216	50.00	594	137.50	419.25	98.42	1,013.25	235.92
Peru	Soles	1/10	1/13	3	2,160	50.00	6,480	150.00	1,800	41.67	8,280	191.67
Colombia	Peso	1/13	1/15	2	893	50.00	1,786	100.00			1,786	100.00
Panama	U.S. Dollar	1/15	1/18	3		28.00		14.40				14.40
Transportation	Deutsche Mark								3,218.79	872.30	3,218.79	872.30
Hon. James G. Fulton:												
Brazil	N. Cruzeiro	1/9	1/10	2	216	50.00	378	86.80			378	86.80
Peru	Soles	1/10	1/13	3	2,160	50.00	6,480	150.00			6,480	150.00
Colombia	Peso	1/13	1/15	2	893	50.00	1,786	100.00			1,786	100.00
Transportation	Du. florin								3,131.70	869.43	3,131.70	869.43
Total							29,028.64			62,749.66		91,778.30

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. Dollar equivalent)	$91,385.50
Appropriated funds:	
H. Res. 883	28.80
Government Department:	
Defense	364.00
Total	91,778.30

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 752, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S currency
MASTER RECAPITULATION												
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. John A. Blatnik, chairman								400.00		1,035.96		1,435.96
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. John E. Moss, chairman								10,250.00		18,220.07		28,270.07
Special Studies Subcommittee, Hon. John S. Monagan, chairman								500.00		753.00		1,253.00
Total								11,150.00		20,009.03		30,959.03

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 752, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE, HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK, CHAIRMAN												
Hon. John A. Blatnik: Yugoslavia	Dinar	5/6	5/14	8	625.00	50.00	5,000.00	400.00			5,000.00	400.00
Round trip air transportation furnished by Department of State.									3,819.58	1,035.96	3,819.58	1,035.96
Subtotal								400.00		1,035.96		1,435.96
Total								400.00		1,035.96		1,435.96
FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE, HON. JOHN E. MOSS, CHAIRMAN												
Hon. John E. Moss:												
Hong Kong	Dollar	2/12	2/15	2	302.00	50.00	604.00	100.00	561.65	92.56	1,165.65	192.56
Vietnam	Piaster	2/15	2/18	3	5,900.00	50.00	17,700.00	150.00			17,700.00	150.00
Singapore	Dollar	2/18	2/19	1	150.00	50.00	150.00	50.00	101.50	33.50	251.50	83.50
Indonesia	Rupiah	2/19	2/24	6	19,250.00	50.00	15,500.00	300.00	38,950.00	101.17	44,450.00	401.17
Thailand	Baht	2/21	2/27	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165.00	200.00			4,165.00	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	2/27	3/2	3	302.00	50.00	906.00	150.00			906.00	150.00
Taipei	Dollar	3/2	3/4	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Round trip air transportation furnished by Department of State.										2,061.60		2,061.60
Subtotal								1,050.00		2,288.83		3,338.83

See footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES 143, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Depar-ture	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Vincent J. Augliere:												
Japan	Yen	2/9	2/12	4	180.00	50.00	72,000.00	200.00			72,000.00	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	2/12	2/15	2	302.00	50.00	604.00	100.00	34.00	5.60	638.00	105.60
Vietnam	Piaster	2/15	2/18	3	5,900.00	50.00	17,700.00	150.00			17,700.00	150.00
Singapore	Dollar	2/18	2/19	1	150.00	50.00	150.00	50.00			150.00	50.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	2/19	2/24	5	19,250.00	50.00	962.50	250.00			115,500.00	250.00
Thailand	Baht	2/24	2/27	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165.00	200.00			4,165.00	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	2/27	3/2	3	302.00	50.00	906.00	150.00			906.00	150.00
Taipei	Dollar	3/2	3/4	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00		17.48	4,000.00	117.48
Round trip air transportation furnished by Department of State										2,061.60		2,061.60
Accra, Ghana	Ghanian cedi	11/3	11/6	3	1.02	50.00	153.00	150.00			153.00	150.00
Nigeria	Pound	11/6	11/8	2	17.57.5½	50.00	35.15.3	100.00			35.15.3	100.00
Kinshasa, Congo	Zair	11/8	11/11	3	0.4897	50.00	73.50.0	150.00			73.50.0	150.00
Kenya	Shilling	11/11	11/21	11	356	50.00	3,921.50	550.00			3,921.50	550.00
Italy	Lira	11/21	11/24	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Round trip air transportation furnished by Department of State, U.S. dollar refund, Washington, D.C. ($50.00) [1]										1,796.40		1,796.40
Subtotal								2,300.00		3,881.08		6,181.08
Norman G. Cornish:												
Ghana	Cedi	11/3	11/6	3	1.02	50.00	153.00	150.00			153.00	150.00
Nigeria	Pound	11/6	11/8	2	17.57.5½	50.00	35.15.3	100.00			35.15.3	100.00
Kinshasha, Congo	Zair	11/8	11/11	3	0.4897	50.00	73.50.0	150.00			73.50.0	150.00
Kenya	Shilling	11/11	11/13	2	356	50.00	713.00	100.00			713.00	100.00
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	E. dollar	11/13	11/16	3	124.06250	50.00	372.19	150.00			372.19	150.00
Kenya	Shilling	11/16	11/20	4	356	50.00	1,426	200.00			1,426	200.00
Kenya	Shilling	11/20	11/21	1	356	50.00	356	50.00			356	50.00
Italy	Lira	11/21	11/24	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Round trip air transportation furnished by Department of State.										1,796.40		1,796.40
Subtotal								1,050.00		1,796.40		2,846.40
Jack Matteson:												
Japan	Yen	2/9	2/12	4	18,000.00	50.00	72,000.00	200.00			72,000.00	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	2/12	2/15	2	302.00	50.00	604.00	100.00	34.00	5.60	638.00	105.60
Vietnam	Piaster	2/15	2/18	3	5,900.00	50.00	17,700.00	150.00			17,700.00	150.00
Singapore	Dollar	2/18	2/19	1	150.00	50.00	150.00	50.00			150.00	100.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	2/19	2/24	6	19,250.00	50.00	115,500.00	300.00			115,500.00	300.00
Thailand	Baht	2/24	2/27	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165.00	200.00			4,165.00	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	2/27	3/2	3	302.00	50.00	906.00	150.00			906.00	150.00
Taipei	Dollar	3/2	3/4	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00			4,000.00	100.00
Round trip air transportation furnished by Department of State, U.S. dollar refund, Washington, D.C. ($50.00). [1]										2,061.60		2,061.60
Subtotal								1,250.00		2,067.00		3,317.20
James L. Nelligan:												
Japan	Yen	2/9	2/12	4	18,000.00	50.00	72,000.00	200.00			72,000.00	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	2/12	2/15	2	302.00	50.00	604.00	100.00	34.00	5.60	634.00	105.60
Vietnam	Piaster	2/15	2/18	3	5,900.00	50.00	17,700.00	150.00			17,700.00	150.00
Singapore	Dollar	2/18	2/19	1	150.00	50.00	150.00	50.00			150.00	50.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	2/19	2/24	6	19,250.00	50.00	115,500.00	300.00			115,500.00	300.00
Thailand	Baht	2/24	2/27	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165.00	200.00			4,165.00	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	2/27	3/2	3	302.00	50.00	906.00	150.00			906.00	150.00
Taipei	Dollar	3/2	3/4	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00	11.02	3.04	4,011.02	103.04
Round trip air transportation furnished by Department of State, U.S. dollar refund, Washington, D.C. ($50.00). [1]										2,061.60		2,061.60
Subtotal								1,250.00		2,070.24		3,320.24
William L. Brannon, Jr.:												
Hong Kong	Dollar	2/12	2/15	2	302.00	50.00	604.00	100.00	34.00	5.60	638.00	105.60
Vietnam	Piaster	2/15	2/18	3	5,900.00	50.00	17,700.00	150.00			17,700.00	150.00
Singapore	Dollar	2/18	2/19	1	150.00	50.00	150.00	50.00			150.00	50.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	2/19	2/24	6	19,250.00	50.00	115,500.00	300.00			115,500.00	300.00
Thailand	Baht	2/24	2/27	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165.00	200.00			4,165.00	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	2/27	3/2	3	302.00	50.00	906.00	150.00			906.00	150.00
Taipei	Yuan	3/2	3/4	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00		117.30	4,000.00	217.30
Round trip air transportation furnished by Department of State.										2,061.60		2,061.60
Subtotal								1,050.00		2,184.50		3,234.50
Dale E. Moser:												
Ghana	Cedi	11/3	11/6	3	1.02	50.00	153.00	150.00			153.00	150.00
Nigeria	Pound	11/6	11/8	2	17.57.5½	50.00	35.15.3	100.00			35.15.3	100.00
Congo	Zair	11/8	11/11	3	0.4897	50.00	73.50.1	150.00			73.50.0	150.00
Kenya	Shilling	11/11	11/13	2	356	50.00	713	100.00			713	100.00
Ethiopia	E. dollar	11/13	11/16	3	124.06250	50.00	372.19	150.00			372.19	150.00
Kenya	Shilling	11/16	11/21	5	356	50.00	1,782	250.00			1,782	250.00
Italy	Lira	11/21	11/24	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Round trip air transportation by Department of State										1,796.40		1,796.40
Subtotal								1,050.00		1,796.40		2,846.40

See footnotes at end of table.

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Wendell H. Thiers:												
Japan	Yen	2/9	2/12	4	18,000.00	50.00	72,000.00	200.00			72,000.00	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	2/12	2/15	2	302.00	50.00	604.00	100.00	34.00	5.60	608.00	105.60
Vietnam	Piaster	2/15	2/18	3	5,900.00	50.00	17,700.00	150.00			17,700.00	150.00
Singapore	Dollar	2/18	2/19	1	150.00	50.00	150.00	50.00			150.00	50.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	2/19	2/24	6	19,250.00	50.00	115,500.00	300.00			115,500.00	300.00
Thailand	Baht	2/24	2/27	4	1,041.25	50.00	4,165.00	200.00			4,165.00	200.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	2/27	3/2	3	302.00	50.00	906.00	150.00			906.00	150.00
Taipei	Dollar	3/2	3/4	2	2,000.00	50.00	4,000.00	100.00		68.22	4,000.00	168.22
Round trip air transportation furnished by Department of State, U.S. dollar refund, Washington, D.C. (50.00).[1]										2,061.60		2,061.60
Subtotal								1,250.00		2,135.42		3,385.42
Total								10,250.00		18,220.07		28,470.07
Less amount refunded												200.00
Total												28,270.07

SPECIAL STUDIES SUBCOMMITTEE, HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN, CHAIRMAN

Charles P. Witter:												
Great Britain	Pound	11/13	11/26	10	20.16.08	50.00	208.06.06	500.00			208.06.06	500.00
Round trip air transportation furnished by Department of State.										753.00		753.00
Subtotal								500.00		753.00		1,253.00

[1] Amount refunded.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$30,959.03

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Feb. 18, 1971.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Lucien N. Nedzi:												
Netherlands	Guilders								668.50	185.85	668.50	185.85
Sweden	S. Krona	10/8	10/9	2	259	50.00	518	100.00			518.00	100.00
Total								100.00		185.85		285.85

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$285.85

WAYNE L. HAYS,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration.

Mar. 17, 1971.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 21, 1ST SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John N. Camp:												
New Zealand to Antarctica	NZ dollars	1/1	1/10	8	44.29	50.00	354.32	400.00			354.32	400.00
	Netherlands guilder.								6,115.57	1,697.83	6,115.57	1,697.83
Hon. James G. O'Hara:												
New Zealand to Antarctica	NZ dollars	1/1	1/10	8	44.29	50.00	354.32	400.00			354.32	400.00
	Netherlands guilder.								5,904.60	1,639.26	5,904.60	1,639.26
	Deutsche Mark								200.93	54.60	200.93	54.60
Hon. John S. Wold:												
New Zealand to Antarctica	NZ dollars	1/1	1/10	8	44.29	50.00	354.32	400.00			354.32	400.00
	Netherlands guilder.								5,939.28	1,648.88	5,939.28	1,648.88
	Deutsche Mark								530.33	144.90	530.33	144.90
Hon. Manuel J. Lujan:												
Venezuela	Bolivar	2/3	2/6	3	223.50	50.00	670.50	149.50			670.50	149.50
	Deutsche mark								1,884.90	510.76	1,884.90	510.76

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 21, 1ST SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Ed Edmondson:												
United Kingdom	Pound	11/6	11/14	8	20.18.00	50.00	166.13.2	400.00	6.0.0	14.33	171.13.2	414.33
Switzerland	Franc	11/14	11/17	3	215.50	50.00	646.50	150.00	580.00	134.92	1,226.50	284.92
	Deutsche mark								3,788.10	1,043.27	3,788.10	1,043.27
Hon. James A. McClure:												
New Zealand to Antarctica	Pound	1/1	1/10	8	44.29	50.00	354.32	400.00			354.32	400.00
Netherlands	Guilder								6,115.58	1,697.83	6,115.58	1,697.83
United Kingdom	Pound	11/11	11/15	4	20.18.00	50.00	83.6.9	200.00	71.12.6	171.11	154.9.3	371.11
Switzerland	Franc	11/15	11/21	6	215.50	50.00	1,293.00	300.00	1,082.58	251.82	2,375.58	551.82
	Deutsche mark								2,804.29	772.32	2,804.29	772.32
Hon. Joe Skubitz:												
United Kingdom	Pound	11/8	11/11	4	20.18.0	50.00	83.6.6	200.00	31.10.1	75.26	114.16.7	275.26
France	Franc	11/11	11/14	3	276	50.00	828	150.00	186.10	38.74	1,014.10	188.74
Switzerland	Franc	11/14	11/21	7	215.50	50.00	1,508.50	350.00	1,082.58	251.82	2,591.08	601.82
Spain	Peseta	11/21	11/23	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960	100.00
Portugal	Escudo	11/23	11/26	3	1,427.3	50.00	4,281.40	150.00			4,281.40	150.00
	Deutsche mark								3,568.50	982.79	3,568.50	982.79
Hon. James Kee:												
New Zealand to Antarctica	Pound New Zealand (dollar).	12/10	12/18	4	44.29	50.00	177.84	200.00			177.84	200.0
William L. Shafer:												
United Kingdom	Pound	11/8	11/11	4	20.18.0	50.00	83.6.6	200.00	32.17.7	78.74	116.14.1	278.74
France	Franc	11/11	11/14	3	276	50.00	828.00	150.00	186.10	38.74	1,014.10	188.74
Switzerland	S Franc	11/14	11/21	7	215.50	50.00	1,508.50	350.00	1,082.58	251.82	2,591.08	601.82
Spain	Peseta	11/21	11/23	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960	100.00
Portugal	Escudo	11/23	11/26	3	1,427.13	50.00	4,281.40	150.00			4,281.40	150.00
	Deutsche Mark								3,246.13	894.00	3,246.13	894.00
Lewis A. Sigler:												
New Zealand to Antarctica	NZ Dollar	1/1	1/10	8	44.29	50.00	354.32	400.00			354.32	400.00
	Deutsche Mark								6,132.33	1,661.88	6,132.33	1,661.88
Lee McElvain:												
New Zealand to Antarctica	NZ Dollar	12/10	12/18	4	44.29	50.00	177.84	200.00			177.84	200.00
Total								5,499.50		14,055.62		19,555.12

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$19,555.12

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mar. 19, 1971.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 116, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation[1]: Foreign currency	Transportation[1]: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Brock Adams:												
Japan	Yen	11/11	11/15	5	18,000	50.00	90,000	250.00	51,608	143.36	141,608	393.36
Transportation	Deutsche mark								5,094.46	1,403.05	5,094.46	1,403.05
Subtotal							190,000	250.00		1,546.41		1,796.41
Less refund								19.44			7,000	19.44
Total								230.56				1,776.97
William P. Adams:												
Japan	Yen	11/11	11/15	5	18,000	50.00	90,000	250.00	12,100	33.61	102,100	283.61
Transportation	Deutsche mark								5,635.22	1,551.97	5,635.22	1,551.97
Subtotal								250.00		1,585.58		1,835.58
Less refund								19.44				19.44
Total								230.56				1,816,14
James Harvey:												
Uruguay	Peso	4/18	4/24	7	12,462	50.00	87,237	350.00			87,237	350.00
Less refund								−48.13			12,000	−48.13
Brazil	Cruzeiro	4/25	4/26	2	223	50.00	446	100.00			446	100.00
Total								401.87				401.87
Donald Brotzman:												
United Kingdom	Pound	3/27	3/31	5		50.00	103.15	250.00			103.15	250.00
France	S franc	4/1	4/3	3	277	50.00	831	150.00			831	150.00
Switzerland	S franc	4/4	4/5	2	215.50	50.00	431	100.00	396.20	92.18	827	192.18
Transportation	Deutsche mark								1,961.76	532.07	1,961.76	532.07
Subtotal								500.00		624.25		1,124.25
James Hastings:												
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar	6/26	6/28	2	301	50.00	602	100.00			602	100.00
Vietnam	Piastre	6/28	7/2	4	5,900	50.00	23,600	200.00			23,600	200.00
Cambodia	Riel	7/2	7/3	1	2,744	50.00	2,744	50.00			2,744	50.00
Thailand	Baht	7/3	7/4	2	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00			2,082.50	100.00
Australia	A dollar	7/5	7/7	3	44.33	50.00	133.95	150.00			133.95	150.00
Transportation	Deutsche mark								7,175.06	1,971.71	7,175.06	1,971.71
Subtotal								600.00		1,971.71		2,571.71

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Torbert Macdonald:												
Haiti	Gourde	3/27	4/5	10	250	50.00	2,500	500.00			2,500	500.00
Transportation	Deutsche mark								1,229.76	333.54	1,229.76	333.54
Haiti	Gourde	11/6	11/13	7	250	50.00	1,750	350.00			1,750	350.00
Dominican Republic	Peso	11/13	11/20	7	50	50.00	350	350.00			350	350.00
Transportation	Deutsche mark								1,587.67	437.25	1,587.67	437.25
Subtotal								1,200.00		770.79		1,970.79
Ray Blanton:												
Japan	Yen	3/21	3/22	1	18,000	50.00	18,000	50.00	6,660	18.50	24,660	68.50
Thailand	Baht	3/22	3/24	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
Vietnam	Piastre	3/25	3/27	3	5,900	50.00	17,700	150.00			17,700	150.00
Transportation	Deutsche mark								6,889.95	1,868.71	6,889.95	1,868.71
Subtotal								350.00		1,887.21		2,237.21
William L. Springer:												
France	Franc	11/11	11/12	1	276	50.00	191	35.12	Refund	(14.88)	191	35.12
Switzerland	S Franc	11/12	11/13	2	215.50	50.00	431	100.00	550	127.94	981	227.94
Transportation	Deutsche mark									885.00	3,214	885.00
Subtotal								135.12		1,012.94		1,148.06
Peter N. Kyros:												
Japan	Yen	3/21	3/22	1	18,000	50.00	18,000	50.00	6,660	18.50	24,660	68.50
Thailand	Baht	2/22	3/24	3	1,041.25	50.00	3,123.75	150.00			3,123.75	150.00
Vietnam	Piastre	3/25	3/27	3	5,900	50.00	17,700	150.00			17,700	150.00
Transportation	Deutsche mark								6,889.95	1,868.71	6,889.95	1,868.71
Subtotal								350.00		1,887.21		2,237.21
W. S. Stuckey:												
Mexico	Peso	1/3	1/7	5	624.50	50.00	3,122.50	250.00			3,122.50	250.00
Venezuela		1/8	1/10	2		50.00						
Brazil	Cruzeiro	1/10	1/17	7	216	50.00	1,512	350.00			1,512	350.00
Trinidad	TT dollar	1/17	1/18	1	50	50.00	100	50.00	17.50	8.76	117.50	58.76
Transportation	Deutsche mark								3,811.52	1,032.93	3,811.52	1,032.93
Subtotal								650.00		1,041.69		1,691.69
Fletcher Thompson:												
Mexico	Peso	1/2	1/7	6	624.50	50.00	3,747	300.00			3,747	300.00
Venezuela		1/8	1/10	2		50.00						
Brazil	Cruzeiro	1/10	1/17	7	216	50.00	1,512	350.00			1,512	350.00
Trinidad	TT dollar	1/17	1/18	1	50	50.00	100	50.00			100	50.00
Transportation	Deutsche mark								2,777.02	752.58		752.58
Subtotal								700.00		752.58		1,452.58
Michael Taylor:												
Mexico	Peso	1/3	1/7	5	624.50	50.00	3,122.50	250.00			3,122.50	250.00
Venezuela	Bolivar	1/8	1/10	2		50.00	448.50	100.00			448.50	100.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	1/10	1/17	7	216	50.00	1,512	350.00			1,512	350.00
Trinidad	TT dollar	1/17	1/18	1	50	50.00	100	50.00			100	50.00
Transportation									3,811.52	1,032.93	3,811.52	1,032.93
Subtotal								750.00		1,032.93		1,782.93
Total								6,098.11		14,113.30		20,211.41

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$20,211.41

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mar. 19, 1971.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 93, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Donald G. Benn:												
Spain	Peseta	11/16	11/21	6	3,480	50.00	20,880	300.00	6,486	93.19	27,366	393.19
Switzerland	S. franc	11/21	11/28	7	215.50	50.00	1,508.50	350.00			1,508.50	350.00
Ireland	Pound	11/30	12/3	3	20.17.10	50.00	62.13.6	150.00			62.13.6	150.00
United Kingdom	B. pound	11/28	11/30	2	20.15.8	50.00	41.13.4	100.00			41.13.4	100.00
Germany	D. mark								1,072.00	268.00	1,072.00	268.00
Total								900.00		361.19		1,261.19
Hon. Emanuel Celler:		8/17	8/23									
Japan	Yen	8/28	8/30	10	18,000	50.00	180,000	500.00	73,299	203.61	253,299	703.61
Hong Kong, B.C.C.	HK dollar	8/24	8/27	4	302.50	50.00	1,210	200.00	55.20	9.13	1,265.20	209.13
Germany	D. mark								7,302.68	1,825.67	7,302.68	1,825.67
Total								700.00		2,038.41		2,738.41

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 93, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date		Total days	Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Frances F. Christy:		8/17	8/23									
Japan	Yen	8/28	8/30	10	18,000	50.00	180,000	500.00	73,299	203.61	253,299	703.61
Hong Kong	HK dollars	8/24	8/27	4	302.50	50.00	1,210	200.00			1,210	200.00
Germany	D. mark								7,302.68	1,825.67	7,302.68	1,825.67
Total								700.00		2,029.28		2,729.28
Garner J. Cline:												
France	Franc	5/30	6/3	5	276	50.00	1,380	250.00	383.13	69.40	1,763.13	319.40
Switzerland	S. franc	5/25	5/29	5	215.39	50.00	1,077.50	250.00	67.00	15.59	1,144.50	265.59
Germany	D. mark								3,606.56	978.18	3,606.56	978.18
Total								500.00		1,063.17		1,563.17
Garner J. Cline:												
Peru	Sol	11/5	11/9	4	2,169	50.00	8,676	200.00	2,761.70	63.66	11,437.70	263.66
Chile	Escudo	11/9	11/11	2	716.50	50.00	1,433	100.00			1,433	100.00
Argentina	Peso	11/11	11/14	3	200	50.00	600	150.00			600	150.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	11/14	11/18	4	239	50.00	956	200.00			956	200.00
Switzerland	S. franc	11/18	11/26	9	215.39	50.00	1,938.50	450.00	196.75	45.77	2,135.25	495.77
France	Franc	11/30	12/2	2	276	50.00	552	100.00	296.80	54.16	848	154.16
Italy	Lira	11/26	11/30	4	31,150	50.00	124,600	200.00			124,600	200.00
Denmark	Krone	12/2	12/5	3	375	50.00	1,125	150.00	263.62	35.16	1,388.62	185.16
Germany	D. mark								6,100.12	1,680.01	6,100.12	1,680.01
Total								1,550.00		1,878.76		3,428.76
Hon. R. Lawrence Coughlin:												
Israel	Pound	11/10	11/12	2	175	50.00	350	100.00			350	100.00
Germany									889.38	244.94	889.38	244.94
Total								100.00		244.94		344.94
Hon. David W. Dennis:												
Switzerland	S. Franc	11/22	11/28	6	215.50	50.00	646.50	150.00	1,944	452.20	2,590.50	602.20
Ireland	Pound	11/30	12/3	4	20.17.10	50.00	62.13.6	150.00			62.13.6	150.00
Germany	D. mark								1,972.74	543.16	1,972.74	543.16
Total								300.00		995.36		1,295.36
Bess E. Dick:												
Japan	Yen	8/17	8/23	10	18,000	50.00	180,000	500.00	73,299	203.61	253,299	703.61
Hong Kong	HK dollar	8/24	8/27	4	302.50	50.00	1,210	200.00			1,210	200.00
Germany	D. mark								7,302.68	1,825.67	7,302.68	1,825.67
Total								700.00		2,029.28		2,729.28
Hon. Don Edwards:												
France	Franc	5/22	5/24	3	276	50.00	828	150.00			828	150.00
Switzerland	S. franc	5/25	5/26	2	215.50	50.00	431	100.00	398.35	92.68	829.35	192.68
United Kingdom	Pound	5/27	5/31	5	20.15.0	50.00	103.15.0	250.00	6.3.4	14.80	109.18.4	264.80
Germany	D. mark								3,228.12	887.09	2,228.12	887.09
Total								500.00		994.57		1,494.57
Hon. Edwin W. Edwards:												
Hong Kong, B.C.C	HK dollar	11/4	11/9	5	303	50.00	1,515.00	250.00			1,515	250.00
Thailand	Baht	11/2	11/4	2	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00			2,082.50	100.00
Switzerland	S. franc	10/27	11/1	6	215	50.00	1,287.50	300.00			1,287.50	300.00
Korea	Won	11/11	11/12	1	15,674	50.00	15,674	50.00			15,674	50.00
Taiwan	NT dollar	11/9	11/11	2	2,225	50.00	4,450	100.00			4,450	100.00
Germany	D. mark								7,525.59	2,072.32	7,524.59	2,072.32
Total								800.00		2,072.32		2,872.32
Hon. Joshua Eilberg:												
Peru	Sol	11/5	11/9	4	2,169	50.00	8,676	200.00	3,461.70	79.80	12,137.70	279.80
Chile	Excudo	11/9	11/11	2	716.50	50.00	1,433	100.00			1,433	100.00
Argentina	Peso	11/11	11/14	3	200	50.00	600	150.00			600	150.00
Brazil	Cruzeiro	11/14	11/17	3	239	50.00	717	150.00			717	150.00
Germany									3,464.92	954.26	3,464.92	954.26
Total								600.00		1,034.06		1,634.06
Hon. Michael A. Feighan:												
Netherlands	Guilder	9/25	10/3	9	179.50	50.00	1,615.50	450.00			1,615.50	450.00
Belgium	Franc	10/3	10/6	3	2,500	50.00	7,500	150.00			7,500	150.00
Total								600.00				600.00
Hon. Walter Flowers:												
Greece	Drachma	4/1	4/6	5	1,500	50.00	7,500	250.00			7,500	250.00
United Kingdom	B. pound	3/26	4/1	7	20.15.0	50.00	145.5.0	350.00	34.5.6	82.56	179.10.6	432.56
Germany	D. mark								3,049.94	827.21	3,049.94	827.21
Total								600.00		909.77		1,509.77
Hon. Walter Flowers:												
Australia	Australian dollar.	7/5	7/7	2	44.37	50.00	9.30	100.00			89.30	100.00
Cambodia	Riel	7/3	7/3	1	2,744	50.00	2,744	50.00			2,744	50.00
Hong Kong, B.C.C	HK dollar	6/26	6/28	2	301	50.00	602	100.00			602	100.00
Thailand	Baht	7/2	7/4	2	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00			2,082.50	100.00
Vietnam	Piaster	6/28	7/2	4	5,900	50.00	23,600.00	200.00			23,600.00	200.00
Germany	D. mark								7,267.84	1,997.26	77,267.84	1,997.26
Total								550.00		1,997.26		2,547.26

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Clark MacGregor												
Germany	D. mark	5/21	5/26	5		50.00	907.50	250.00	3,370.86	914.26	4,278.36	1,164.26
France	Franc	5/28	5/30	2	276	50.00	552	100.00			552	100.00
Switzerland	S. Franc	5/26	5/28	3	215.50	50.00	646.50	150.00	659	153.32	1,305.50	303.32
Total								500.00		1,067.58		1,567.58
Hon. James R. Mann:												
Australia	A. dollar	7/5	7/7	2	44.33	50.00	89.30	100.00	2.00	2.24	91.30	102.24
Cambodia	Riel	7/3	7/3	1	2,744	50.00	2,744	50.00			2,744	50.00
Hong Kong, B.C.C	H.K. dollar	6/26	6/28	2	301	50.00	602	100.00	228.70	37.81	830.70	137.81
Thailand	Baht	7/2	7/4	2	1,041.25	50.00	2,082.50	100.00			2,082.50	100.00
Vietnam	Piaster	6/28	7/2	4	5,900	50.00	23,600	200.00			23,600	200.00
Germany	D. mark								7,175.07	1,971.71	7,175.07	1,971.71
Total								550.00		2,011.76		2,561.76
Hon. Abner J. Mikva:												
Israel	Pound	8/14	8/23	9	175	50.00	1,575	450.00	901.60	257.60	2,476.60	707.60
Greece	Drachma	8/23	8/28	6	1,500	50.00	9,000	300.00	1,088	36.27	10,088	336.27
Germany	D. mark								2,404.62	652.25	2,404.62	662.25
Total								750.00		956.12		1,706.12
Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.:												
Switzerland	S. franc	5/25	5/29	5	215.50	50.00	1,077.50	250.00	842.00	195.91	1,919.50	445.91
Germany	D. mark								3,528	882.00	3,528	882.00
Total								250.00		1,077.91		1,327.91
Hon. Jerome R. Waldie:												
Japan	Yen	11/28	11/29	2	18,000	50.00	7,695	18.60			7,695	18.60
Korea	Won	11/29	12/3	4	15,700	50.00	59,113	187.64			59,113	187.64
Hong Kong, B.C.C	H.K. dollar	12/3	12/5	2	303	50.00	606	100.00			606	100.00
Taiwan	N.T. dollar	12/5	12/7	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Germany	D. mark								6,572.78	1,809.69	6,572.78	1,809.69
Total								406.24		1,809.69		2,215.93
Hon. Chas. E. Wiggins:												
Japan	Yen	8/17	8/23	7	18,000	50.00	126,000	350.00	38,826	107.85	164,826	457.85
Germany	D. mark								6,255	1,563.75	6,255	1,563.75
Total								350.00		1,671.66		2,021.60
Hon. Charles E. Wiggins:												
Japan	Yen	11/28	11/29	2	18,000	50.00	7,695	18.60	6,850	19.03	14,545	37.63
Korea	Won	11/29	12/3	4	15,700	50.00	59,113	187.64			59,113	187.64
Hong Kong, B.C.C	H.K. dollar	12/3	12/5	2	303	50.00	606.00	100.00	48.30	7.92	654.30	107.92
Taiwan	N.T. dollar	12/5	12/7	2	2,000	50.00	4,000	100.00			4,000	100.00
Germany	D. mark								6,572.77	1,809.68	6,572.77	1,809.68
Total								406.24		1,836.63		2,242.87
Grand total								12,312.48		28,079.66		40,392.14

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	40,392.14

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

March 19, 1970.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 131, 1ST SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ralph E. Casey:												
Switzerland	Franc	10/15	10/28	14	216	50.00	3,024	700.00			3,024	700.00
	Franc								2,157	391.09	2,157	391.09
Frank M. Clark:												
Hong Kong	Dollar	3/27	3/28	2	301	50.00	602	100.00			602	100.00
Hong Kong	Dollar	4/3	4/5	3	301	50.00	903	150.00	152	25.19	1,055	175.19
Japan	Yen	4/5	4/8	4	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00	32,880	91.33	104,000	291.33
Thailand	Baht	3/28	3/31	3	1,041	50.00	3,123	150.00			3,123	150.00
Vietnam	Piaster	3/31	4/3	3	5,900	50.00	17,700	150.00			17,700	150.00
	Deutsche Mark								6,889	1,868.71	6,889	1,868.71
Michael A. Feighan:												
Poland	Zloty	9/1	9/2	2	3,450	50.00	6,200	95.38			6,200	95.38
U.S.S.R.	Ruble	9/2	9/7	6	45	50.00	205	227.78	8.80	9.78	213.80	237.56
Norway	Krone	8/23	8/24	2	356.84	50.00	713.75	100.00	189.20	26.51	902.95	126.51
Finland	Markka	8/25	8/27	3	207.96	50.00	383.70	92.31			383.70	92.31
Sweden	Krona	8/28	8/31	4	844	50.00	1,034	200.00	594.22	114.38	1,628	314.38
United Kingdom	Pound	9/13	9/17	5	20.8	50.00	104.3	250.00	2.18	6.96	106.3	256.96
Denmark	Krone	9/8	9/9	2	375	50.00	750	100.00	601.17	80.18	1,351	180.18
Germany	Deutsche Mark	9/10	9/12	3	181.50	50.00	544.50	150.00	2,889	795.70	3,433	945.70
	Franc								2,932	531.61	2,932	531.61

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 131, 1ST SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert W. Goehring:												
Hong Kong	HK dollar	3/27	3/28	2	301	50.00	602	100.00			602	100.00
Hong Kong	HK dollar	4/3	4/5	3	301	50.00	903	150.00			903	150.00
Japan	Yen	4/5	4/8	4	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00	13,060	36.28	85,060	236.28
Thailand	Baht	3/28	3/31	3	1,041	50.00	3,123	150.00			3,123	150.00
Vietnam	Piaster	3/31	4/3	3	5,900	50.00	17,700	150.00			17,700	150.00
	Deutsche Mark								6,889	1,868.71	6,889	1,868.71
Halert C Shepheard:												
United Kingdom	Pound	2/22	2/28	7	20.7	50.00	145.2	350.00	96.1	230.50	241.3	580.50
United Kingdom	Pound	9/5	9/11	7	20.7	50.00	145.2	350.00	116	277.20	261.2	627.20
	Deutsche mark								2,920	792.16	2,920	792.16
	Deutsche mark								2,931	807.40	2,931	807.40
Total						1,050.00		4,115.47				12,069.16

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$12,069.16

EDWARD A. GARMATZ
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mar. 20, 1971.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 269, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. T. J. Dulski:												
Switzerland	S. franc	10/1	10/5	5	116.64	27.00	583.20	135.00			583.20	135.00
Transportation—round trip	D. mark								3,151.90	868.07	3,151.90	868.07
Total						27.00		135.00		868.07		1,003.07

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,003.07

THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

March 1971.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 192, 1ST SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalen: or U.S. currency
Geo. P. Miller:												
New Zealand	NZ dollar	1/1	1/4	4	44.29	50.00	177.16	200.00			177.16	200.00
New Zealand	NZ dollar	1/6	1/9	4	44.29	50.00	177.16	200.00			177.16	200.00
Netherlands	Guilder								[1] 6,115.57	1,697.83	6,115.57	1,697.83
Ireland	Pound	9/4	9/6	3	21	50.00	63.00	150.00	38.7	91.70	101.7	241.70
United Kingdom	Pound	9/7	9/11	5	21	50.00	104.3	250.00	73	174.27	177.3	424.27
Spain	Peseta	9/11	9/13	3	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00	2,500	41.00	129.40	191.00
										[2] 1,690.63		1,690.63
Total												4,645.43
R. P. Hines:												
Ireland	Pound	9/4	9/6	3	21	50.00	63	150.00	38.7	91.70	101.7	241.70
United Kingdom	Pound	9/7	9/11	5	21	50.00	104.3	250.00	73	174.27	177.3	424.27
Spain	Peseta	9/11	9/13	3	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00	2,500	41.00	12,940	191.00
										[2] 1,690.63		1,690.63
Total												2,547.60
K. G. Nichols:												
Ireland	Pound	9/4	9/6	3	21	50.00	63	150.00	38.7	91.70	101.7	241.70
United Kingdom	Pound	9/7	9/11	5	21	50.00	104.3	250.00	73	174.27	177.3	424.27
Spain	Peseta	9/11	9/13	3	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00	2,500	41.00	12,940	191.00
										[2] 1,690.63		1,690.63
Total												2,547.60
R. J. Maglione:												
Ireland	Pound	9/4	9/6	3	21	50.00	63	150.00	38.7	91.70	101.7	241.70
United Kingdom	Pound	9/7	9/11	5	21	50.00	104.3	250.00	73	174.27	177.3	424.27
Spain	Peseta	9/11	9/13	3	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00	2,500	41.00	12,940	191.00
										[2] 1,690.63		1,690.63
Total												2,547.60
J. J. Gibbons:												
Ireland	Pound	9/4	9/6	3	21	50.00	63	150.00	38.7	91.70	101.7	241.70
United Kingdom	Pound	9/7	9/11	5	21	50.00	104.3	250.00	73	174.27	177.3	424.27
Spain	Peseta	9/11	9/13	3	3,480	50.00	10,440	150.00	2,500	41.00	12,940	191.00
										[2] 1,690.93		1,690.93
Total												2,547.60

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
E. A. Nesmith:												
Ireland	Pound	9/1	9/4	4	21	50.00	83.10	200.00	38.7	91.70	121.8	291.70
United Kingdom	Pound	9/5	9/9	5	21	50.00	104.3	250.00	73	174.27	177.3	424.27
Spain	Peseta	9/10	9/13	4	3,480	50.00	13,920	200.00	2,500	41.00	164.20	241.00
Germany	D. mark								[1] 1,911.6	526.47	1,911.6	526.47
Total												1,483.44
Paul Van Gilder:												
Ireland	Pound	9/1	9/4	4	21	50.00	83.10	200.00	38.7	91.70	121.8	291.70
United Kingdom	B. pound	9/5	9/9	5	21	50.00	104.3	250.00	73	174.24	177.3	424.27
Spain	Peseta	9/10	9/13	4	3,480	50.00	13,920	200.00	2,500	41.00	16,420	241.00
Germany	D. mark								[1] 1,911.6	526.47	1,911.6	526.47
Total												1,483.44
Robert Price:												
Ireland	Pound	9/4	9/6	3	21	50.00	63	150.00	38.7	91.70	101.7	241.70
France	Franc	9/7	9/9	3	276	50.00	828	150.00	166	30.00	994	180.00
United Kingdom	B. pound	9/9	9/10	1	21	50.00	21	50.00			21	50.00
France	Franc	9/10	9/11	1	276	50.00	276	50.00			276	50.00
Spain	Peseta	9/11	9/13	3	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00	2,500	41.00	9,460	141.00
										[2] 1,416.71		1,416.71
Total												2,079.41
F. R. Hammill:												
Germany	D. mark	7/6	7/9	4	181.5	50.00	726	200.00	502.75	138.16	1,228.7	338.16
France	Franc	7/10	7/12	3	275	50.00	830.00	150.00			830	150.00
United Kingdom	Pound	7/13	7/17	5	21	50.00	104.5	250.00	3.3	7.62	107.8	257.62
Netherlands	Guilder	7/18	7/20	3	180	50.00	540.00	150.00			540	150.00
Germany	D. mark								[1] 3,239.1	890.11	3,239.1	890.11
Total												1,785.89
W. H. Boone:												
Germany	D. mark	7/6	7/9	4	181.5	50.00	726	200.00	502.75	138.16	1,228.7	338.16
France	Franc	7/10	7/12	3	275	50.00	830.00	150.00			830	150.00
United Kingdom	B. pound	7/13	7/17	5	21	50.00	104.5	250.00	3.3	7.62	107.8	257.62
Netherlands	Guilder	7/18	7/20	3	180	50.00	540.00	150.00			540	150.00
Germany	D. mark								[1] 3,239.1	890.11	3,239.1	890.11
Total												1,785.89
P. B. Yeager:												
France	Franc	2/1	2/4	4	275	50.00	1,110	200.00			1,110	200.00
Belgium	B. franc	2/4	2/6	3	2,500	50.00	6,000	121.50			6,000	121.50
United Kingdom	B. pound	2/7	2/11	5	21	50.00	88.7	214.30			88.7	214.30
Germany	D. mark								[1] 1,815.3	491.97	1,815.3	491.97
Total												1,027.77
J. E. Karth:												
Italy	Lira	9/20	9/24	4	31,450	50.00	125,800	200.00	19,262	3,060	50,712	230.62
Switzerland	S. franc	9/25	9/26	2	215	50.00	430	100.00			430	100.00
Spain	Peseta	9/27	9/28	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960	100.00
Germany	D. mark										3,797.8	1,045.96
Total												1,476.56
W. G. Wells:												
Italy	Lira	9/20	9/24	4	31,450	50.00	125,800	200.00	19,262	30.60	50,712	230.60
Switzerland	S. franc	9/25	9/26	2	215	50.00	430	100.00			430	100.00
Spain	Peseta	9/27	9/28	2	3,480	50.00	6,960	100.00			6,960	100.00
Germany	D. mark										[1] 3,797.8	1,045.96
Total												1,476.56
Jas. G. Fulton: Canada	Dollar	2/8	2/10	3	53.00	50.00	101.90	94.91	135.00	128.00	236.90	222.91
Chas. A. Mosher: Canada	Dollar	2/8	2/10	3	53.00	50.00	101.90	94.91	135.00	128.00	236.90	222.91
Jas. Symington: Canada	Dollar	2/8	2/10	3	53.00	50.00	101.90	94.91	135.00	128.00	236.90	222.91
J. T. Ratchford: Canada	Dollar	2/8	2/10	3	53.00	50.00	94.72	91.00			229.72	219.00
Barry M. Goldwater, Jr.:												
United Kingdom	Pound	3/24	3/26	3	21	50.00	41.10	100.00			41.10	100.00
France	Franc	3/27	3/28	2	277	50.00	554	100.00			554	100.00
Italy	Lira	3/29	3/31	3	31,450	50.00	94,350	150.00			94,350	150.00
Total												350.00
Louis Frey:												
Hong Kong	Dollar	6/27	6/28	2	301	50.00	602	100.00			602	100.00
Thailand	Baht	7/2	7/3	2	1,041.2	50.00	2,082.5	100.00			2,082.5	100.00
Australia	Dollar	7/5	7/7	3	44.65	50.00	133.95	150.00	21.80	24.46	155.75	174.46
Germany	Mark								[1] 7,175	1,971.71	7,175	1,971.71
Total												2,346.17
Jerry L. Pettis:												
New Zealand	Dollar	1/1	1/4	4	44.29	50.00	177.16	200.00			177.16	200.00
New Zealand	Dollar	1/6	1/9	4	44.29	50.00	177.16				177.16	200.00
Netherlands	Guilder								[1] 6,115.57	1,697.83	6,115.57	1,697.83
Total												2,097.83
Stafford Beer: United Kingdom	Pound								[3] 332.10	794.94	332.10	794.94
F. Garcia-Roel: Mexico	Peso								[3] 2,450.29	196.18	2,450.29	196.18
Sloan Stancescu: Rumania	Lev								[3] 19,571	1,098.28	195.71	1,098.28
Osmo Wiio: Finland	Markka								[3] 4,208	1,004.54	4,208	1,004.54

[1] Cost of overseas transportation.
[2] Cost of transportation furnished by Department of the Air Force.
[3] Special consultants to committee as per authority of House Administration Committee, November 25, 1970.

Mar. 18, 1971.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 47, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date		Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. G. V. Montgomery:												
Vietnam	Piaster	12/19	12/20	2	13,750	50.00	27,500	100.00			27,500	100.00
Laos	Kip	12/21	12/22	2	25,175	50.00	42,750	85.07			42,750	85.07
Thailand	Baht	12/22	12/23	1	1,041.25	50.00	821	39.42			821	39.42
Vietnam	Piaster	12/24	12/26	3	13,750	50.00	41,250	150.00			41,250	150.00
Germany (transportation)	Deutsch mark								7,519.29	2,071.43	7,159.29	2,071.43
Subtotal								374.49		2,071.43		2,445.92
Hon. Margaret M. Heckler:												
Japan	Yen	4/11	4/15	4	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00	18,442	51.23	90,442	251.23
Hong Kong	HK Dollar	4/15	4/17	2	301.00	50.00	602.00	100.00	99.90	16.52	701.90	116.52
Vietnam	Piaster	4/17	4/19	2	5,900	50.00	11,800	100.00			11,800	100.00
Laos	Kip	4/19	4/20	2	25,000	50.00	25,000	50.00			25,000	50.00
Germany (transportation)	Deutsch mark								6,805.52	1,805.52	6,805.52	1,805.52
Appropriated funds (Department of Navy).	Dollar											202.59
Subtotal								450.00		1,873.27		2,525.86
Wm. H. Long, Maj., USMC:												
Japan	Yen	4/11	4/15	4	18,000	50.00	72,000	200.00			72,000	200.00
Hong Kong	HK Dollar	4/15	4/17	2	301.00	50.00	602.00	100.00			602.00	100.00
S. Vietnam	Piaster	4/17	4/19	2	5,900	50.00	11,800	100.00			11,800	100.00
Laos	Kip	4/19	4/20	2	25,000	50.00	15,000	30.00			15,000	30.00
Germany (transportation)	Deutsche mark								6,819.15	1,829.41	6,819.15	1,829.41
Subtotal								430.00		1,829.41		2,259.41
Total								1,254.49		5,774.11		7,231.19

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$7,028.60
Appropriated funds:	
Government Department:	
Department of Navy	202.59
Total	7,231.19

Mar. 23, 1971.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, U.S. GROUP, INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Edward J. Derwinski:											
France	Franc	304.75	55.00	54.00	9.75					358.75	64.75
Monaco	Franc	770.00	140.05	274.35	49.38			74.40	13.50	1,118.75	202.93
Monaco	U.S. dollar				79.00		465.00				544.00
Tunisia	Dinar							15.000	28.57	15,000	28.57
Netherlands	FL	1,191.00	330.84	449.05	124.73			1,651.30	460.05	3,291.35	915.62
Netherlands	U.S. dollar		49.33		26.67		55.60				131.60
Belgium	BF	2,239.00	44.78	1,055.00	21.10			6,180.00	123.50	9,747.00	189.38
Germany	Deutsche mark					942.20	256.00			942.20	256.00
Michael Feighan:											
Poland	Zloty	1,226.00	18.86	321.00	4.94			180.00	2.77	1,727.00	26.57
Romania	Lei	480.00	26.88	56.70	2.94					536.70	29.82
Netherlands	FL	855.00	237.50	430.65	119.61					1,285.65	357.11
Belgium	BF	1,120.00	22.40	2,895.00	57.90					4,015.00	80.30
E. Ross Adair:											
France	Franc	189.75	34.25	32.20	5.80					221.95	40.05
Monaco	Franc	700.00	126.00	391.70	70.70			45.80	8.45	1,137.50	205.15
Tunisia	Dinar							26,250.00	50.00	26,250.00	50.00
Jackson E. Betts:											
Poland	Zloty	1,044.00	160.06	104.50	1.61			158.00	2.43	1,306.50	164.10
Romania	Lei	480.00	26.88	49.00	2.52					529.00	29.40
Netherlands	Guilders	855.00	237.50	169.80	47.19			6.50	1.81	1,031.00	286.50
Belgium	Franc	2,240.00	44.80	1,128.00	22.56					3,368.00	67.36
Emilio Q. Daddario:											
France	Franc	189.75	34.25	32.20	5.80					221.95	40.05
Monaco	Franc	800.00	145.50	705.30	127.66			108.20	19.58	1,630.50	292.74
Robert McClory:											
Monaco	Franc	700.00	127.30	255.75	46.95			83.60	14.65	1,039.35	188.90
Monaco	U.S. dollar				99.10						99.10
Tunisia	Dinar							1,000	2.00	1,000	2.00
Poland	Zloty	1,226.00	18.86					183.00	2.81	1,409.00	21.67
Romania	Lei	480.00	26.88	19.50	.87					499.50	27.75
Netherlands	Guilder	855.00	237.50	40.55	11.30					895.55	248.80
Netherlands	U.S. dollar				67.02						67.02
Belgium	Franc	2,240.00	44.80	381.00	7.65					2,621.00	52.45
F. Bradford Morse:											
Monaco	Franc	61.00	11.12	9.00	1.63					70.00	12.75
Netherlands	Guilder	577.00	160.28	218.25	60.63	7,493.09	2,080.26	871.50	242.97	9,159.84	2,544.14
Belgium	Franc	1,514.00	30.28	1,298.00	25.96			8,768.00	175.36	11,580.00	231.60
Germany	Deutsche mark					3,109.39	856.35			3,109.39	856.35
Lucien N. Nedzi:											
Poland	Zloty	1,226.00	18.86	8.80	.29			183.00	2.82	1,427.80	21.97
Romania	Lei	480.00	26.88	46.00	2.37					526.00	29.25
Netherlands	Guilder	855.00	237.50	1,384.15	385.55					2,239.15	623.05
Belgium	Franc	1,120.00	22.40	4,261.00	85.22			450.00	9.00	5,831.00	116.62

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging: Foreign currency	Lodging: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Meals: Foreign currency	Meals: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Miscellaneous: Foreign currency	Miscellaneous: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Alexander Pirnie:											
France	Franc	189.75	34.25	22.00	3.95			2.50	.50	214.25	38.70
Monaco	Franc	490.00	89.10	363.00	65.85			58.00	10.55	911.00	165.50
Tunisia	Dinar							12,000	22.86	12,000	22.86
Poland	Zloty	1,090.00	16.77	450.90	6.93					1,540.90	23.70
Romania	Lei	480.00	26.88	12.00	.47					492.00	27.35
Netherlands	Guilder	485.00	148.61	291.50	80.98			263.50	73.55	1,040.00	303.14
Total			3,013.15		1,732.58		3,713.21		1,267.73		9,726.67

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$4,683.69
Appropriated funds: Other 22 U.S.C. 276	5,042.98
Total	9,726.67

Mar. 16, 1971.

JOHN SPARKMAN, Chairman

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY A COMMITTEE, HOUSE DELEGATION, CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name	Country	Name of currency	Lodging: Foreign currency	Lodging: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Meals: Foreign currency	Meals: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Miscellaneous: Foreign currency	Miscellaneous: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Mark Andrews	United States	Dollar		66.96								66.96
Hon. C. E. Gallagher, Chairman of Delegation.	do	do		108.96		9.75				3.05		121.76
Hon. Frank Horton	do	do		66.96		10.42				3.20		80.58
Hon. Harold T. Johnson	do	do		64.88		5.93				.30		71.11
Hon. Abraham Kazen, Jr	do	do		66.96								66.96
Hon. William S. Mailliard	do	do		66.96		8.00				1.50		76.46
Hon. Thomas E. Morgan	do	do		66.96								66.96
Hon. Claude Pepper	do	do		66.96		4.49				4.05		75.50
Hon. J. J. Pickle	do	do		66.96		2.60				.50		70.06
Hon. William J. Randall	do	do		38.65		3.65						42.30
Hon. Henry P. Smith III	do	do		66.96		16.18						83.14
Hon. Robert T. Stafford	do	do		66.96		5.78				4.38		77.12
Balance forward				815.13		66.80				16.98		898.91
Albert C. F. Westphal	United States	Dollar		56.50		2.03				.30		58.83
Mary Louise O'Brien	do	do		48.20		5.60				1.20		55.00
Delegation expenses	do	do								9,346.26		9,346.26
Total				919.83		74.43				9,364.74		10,359.00

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-42	$10,359.00

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Chairman, House Delegation, Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DELEGATION, MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name	Country	Name of currency	Lodging: Foreign currency	Lodging: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Meals: Foreign currency	Meals: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Miscellaneous: Foreign currency	Miscellaneous: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Eligio de la Garza	United States	Dollar		154.08		31.45				0.18		185.71
Hon. Sherman P. Lloyd	do	do		131.61		29.50				.54		161.65
Hon. Charles E. Wiggins	do	do		154.08		15.16				5.41		174.65
Hon. Abraham Kazen, Jr	do	do		163.71		28.53				.36		192.60
Hon. Manuel Lujan, Jr	do	do		163.71		10.50				1.96		176.17
Albert C. F. Westphal	do	do		154.08		14.62				.36		169.06
Helen L. Hashagen	do	do		109.14		10.18				2.53		121.85
Delegation expenses												14,377.01
Total				1,030.41		139.94				11.34		15,558.70

CAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Other Public Law 86-420	$15,558.70

ROBERT N. C. NIX,
Chairman, House of Representatives Delegation, Mexican-United States Interparliamentary Group.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 551, 1ST SESS., 88TH CONG., HOUSE DELEGATION TO NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date			Per diem rate		Total amount per diem		Transportation		Total	
		Arrival	Departure	Total days	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Frank Annunzio:												
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Great Britain	Pound	11/14	11/18	5	20.10.0	50.00	104.3.3	250.00			104.3.3	250.00
Hon. Jack B. Brooks:												
Belgium	Belgium franc	6/30	7/1	2	2,500	50.00	5,000	100.00			5,000.00	100.00
Belgium	Deutsche mark								3,081.72	846.86	3,081.72	846.86
Great Britain	Pound	7/2	7/3	2	20.10.0	50.00	41.13.0	100.00	18.0.0	43.20	59.3	143.20
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Netherlands	Guilder								1,543.50	429.11	1,543.50	429.11
Great Britain	Pound	11/11	11/12	2	20.10.0	50.00	41.13.3	100.00			41.13.3	100.00
Great Britain	Pound								25.17.6	61.81	25.17.6	61.81
Hon. Phillip Burton:												
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Great Britain	Pound	11/14	11/15	2	20.10.0	50.00	41.0.0	100.00	31.18.0	76.20	72.18.0	176.20
Hon. Frank M. Clark:												
Belgium	Franc	6/28	7/6	9	2,500	50.00	22,500	450.00			22,500	450.00
Belgium	Deutsche mark									846.86	3,081.72	846.86
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Great Britain	Pound	11/14	11/18	5	20.10.0	50.00	104.3.3	250.00			104.3.3	250.00
Hon. Samuel L. Devine:												
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Great Britain	Pound	11/14	11/18	5	20.10.0	50.00	104.3.3	250.00			104.3.3	250.00
Hon. Paul Findley:												
Great Britain	Pound	6/25	6/27	3	20.10.0	50.00	62.8.3	150.00	77.17.3	186.86	140.5.6	336.86
Belgium	Belgium franc	6/28	7/1	4	2,500	50.00	10,000	200.00	685	13.80	10,685	213.80
France	Franc	7/2	7/5	4	276	50.00	1,104	200.00			1,104.00	200.00
Italy	Lira	7/6	7/7	2	31,150	50.00	62,300	100.00	54,050	85.93	116,350	185.93
Germany	Mark	7/8	7/9	2	181.50	50.00	363.00	100.00	3,606.56	991.09	3,788.06	1,091.09
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Great Britain	Pound	11/14	11/15	2	20.10.0	50.00	41.0.0	100.00	15.19.0	38.28	56.19.0	138.28
Hon. Sam Gibbons:												
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Ireland	Pound	11/14	11/15	2	20.10.0	50.00	41.0.0	100.00			41.0.0	100.00
Hon. Wayne L. Hays:												
France	Franc	2/5	2/8	4	277	50.00	1,108.00	200.00			1,108.00	200.00
Italy	Lira	2/9	2/11	3	31,450	50.00	94,350	150.00			94,350	150.00
Belgium	Belgium franc	5/18	5/20	3	2,500	50.00	7,500	150.00			7,500	150.00
Great Britain	Pound	5/21	5/22	2	20.10.0	50.00	41.0.0	100.00			41.0.0	100.00
Great Britain	Pound	6/27	6/28	2	20.10.0	50.00	41.0.0	100.00			41.0.0	100.00
Belgium	Belgium Franc	6/29	7/2	4	2,500	50.00	10,000	200.00			10,000	200.00
Great Britain	Pound	7/3	7/4	2	20.10.0	50.00	41.0.0	100.00			41.0.0	100.00
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Great Britain	Pound	11/14	11/18	5	20.10.0	50.00	104.3.3	250.00			104.3.3	250.00
Hon. William T. Murphy:												
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.50	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
United Kingdom	Pound	11/14	11/18	5	20.16.8	50.00	104.3.3	250.00			104.3.3	250.00
Hon. Bertram Podell:												
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Great Britain	Pound	11/14	11/18	5	20.10.0	50.00	104.3.3	250.00			104.3.3	250.00
Hon. Albert H. Quie:												
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Ireland	Pound	11/14	11/15	2	20.10.0	50.00	31.13.4	76.05			31.13.4	76.05
Hon. L. Mendel Rivers:												
Belgium	Belgium franc	6/28	7/1	4	2,500.00	50.00	10,000	200.00			10,000	200.00
Great Britain	Pound	7/2	7/3	2	20.10.0	50.00	41.13.3	100.00	80.10	193.18	122.3.3	293.18
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Great Britain	Pound	11/17	11/18	2	20.10.0	50.00	41.13.3	100.00			41.13.3	100.00
Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.:												
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00	290.50	80.76	1,367.50	380.76
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Great Britain	Pound	11/14	11/18	5	20.10.0	50.00	104.3.3	250.00			104.3.3	250.00
Hon. Vernon W. Thomson:												
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Great Britain	Pound	11/14	11/18	5	20.10.0	50.00	104.3.3	250.00			104.3.3	250.00
Hon. J. Irving Whalley:												
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Great Britain	Pound	11/14	11/15	2	20.10.0	50.00	41.0.0	100.00	31.18.0	76.21	72.18.0	176.21
Phil Billings:												
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/9	5	179.5	50.00	897.5	250.00			897.5	250.00
Italy	Lira	11/10	11/13	4	31,150	50.00	124,600	200.00			124,600	200.00
Great Britain	Pound	11/14	11/18	5	20.10.0	50.00	104.3.3	250.00			104.3.3	250.00
Boyd Crawford:												
Netherlands	Guilder	11/5	11/10	6	179.5	50.00	1,077	300.00			1,077	300.00
Italy	Lira	11/11	11/13	3	31,150	50.00	93,450	150.00			93,450	150.00
Great Britain	Pound	11/14	11/18	5	20.10.0	50.00	104.3.3	250.00			104.3.3	250.00
Delegation expenses, including office rental, telephone, transportation and official representation:												
Netherlands												11,192.47
Italy												3,191.19
France												200.00
Turkey												66.67
United Kingdom												5,285.08
Total							13,376.05		3,970.15			37,281.61

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$37,281.61

WAYNE L. HAYS,
Chairman, House Delegation to North Atlantic Assembly.

Mar. 19, 1971.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS, TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY H. RES. 976, 2D SESS., 91ST CONG., SELECT COMMITTEE ON U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1970

Name and country	Name of currency	Date: Arrival	Date: Departure	Date: Total days	Per diem rate: Foreign currency	Per diem rate: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total amount per diem: Foreign currency	Total amount per diem: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Adair, E. Ross:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	10	5,900	50.00	52,300	443.22			52,300	443.22
Laos	Kip	6/25	6/26	1	25,000	50.00	18,045	36.09			18,045	36.09
Cambodia	Riel	6/26	6/27	1	2,744	50.00						
Anderson, Burnett: Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	12	5,900	50.00	69,200	586.44			69,200	586.44
Anderson, Wm. R.:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	10	5,900	50.00	58,830	498.56			58,830	498.56
Laos	Kip	6/25	6/26	1	25,000	50.00	23,140	46.28			23,140	46.28
Cambodia	Riel	6/26	6/27	1	2,744	50.00	2,744	50.00			2,744	50.00
Bryant, C. C.: Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	12	5,900	50.00	68,700	582.20			68,700	582.20
Clancy, Donald D.:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	10	5,900	50.00	53,400	452.54			53,400	452.54
Thailand	Baht	6/25	6/26	1	1,041.25	50.00	797.75	38.30			797.75	38.30
Cambodia	Riel	6/26	6/27	1	2,744	50.00	101	2.32			101	2.32
Clemandot, Andre: Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	12	5,900	50.00	55,800	472.88			55,800	472.88
Hamilton, Lee H.:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	6/27	5	5,900	50.00	29,500	250.00			29,500	250.00
Thailand	Baht	6/25	6/26	1	1,041.25	50.00	709.87	34.08			709.87	34.08
Japan	Yen	6/27	7/1	3	18,000	50.00	54,000	150.00			54,000	150.00
Hansen, Orval:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	7	5,900	50.00	41,300	350.00			41,300	350.00
Thailand	Baht	6/25	6/26	1	1,041.25	50.00	1,026.25	49.28	4,080	195.97	5,106.25	245.25
Indonesia	Rupiah	6/26	6/28	3	19,050	50.00	44,912.66	117.95	45,448	118.05	90,360.66	236.00
Malaysia	M. dollar	6/28	6/29	1	150	50.00	150	50.00			150	50.00
Harkin, Thomas R.: Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	12	5,900	50.00	70,800	600.00			70,800	600.00
Hawkins, A. F.:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	10	5,900	50.00	59,000	500.00			59,000	500.00
Thailand	Baht	6/25	6/26	1	1,041.25	50.00	951.25	45.68			951.25	45.68
Cambodia	Riel	6/26	6/27	1	2,744	50.00	2,640	48.12			2,640	48.12
Keith, Hastings:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	7	5,900	50.00	15,300	229.66	41,807.50	354.30	57,107.50	583.96
Thailand	Baht	6/25	6/26	1	1,041.25	50.00	624.75	30.00			624.75	30.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	6/26	6/28	3	19,050	50.00	31,387.33	67.95			31,387.33	67.95
Malaysia	M. dollar	6/28	6/29	1	150	50.00	131	44.50			131	44.50
Lester, Kenneth D.: Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	12	5,900	50.00	70,800	600.00			70,800	600.00
Marshall, D. S.:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	7	5,900	50.00	41,300	350.00	41,807.50	354.30	83,107.50	704.30
Thailand	Baht	6/25	6/26	1	1,041.25	50.00	1,041.25	50.00			1,041.25	50.00
Indonesia	Rupiah	6/26	6/28	3	19,050	50.00	44,812.67	117.95	2,500	6.49	47,312.67	124.44
Malaysia	M. dollar	6/28	6/29	1	150	50.00	150	50.00	30	9.85	150	59.85
R. H. Mollohan:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	10	5,900	50.00	59,000	500.00			59,000	500.00
Thailand	Baht	6/25	6/26	1	1,041.25	50.00	671	32.22			671	32.22
Cambodia	Riel	6/26	6/27	1	2,744	50.00	1,870	34.23			1,870	34.23
G. V. Montgomery:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	10	5,900	50.00	55,570	470.93			55,570	470.93
Laos	Kip	6/25	6/26	1	25,000	50.00	9,760	19.52			9,760	19.52
Cambodia	Riel	6/26	6/27	1	2,744	50.00	616	11.22	9,563	172.52	10,179	183.74
John H. Napier:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	10	5,900	50.00	51,000	432.20			51,000	432.20
Laos	Kip	6/25	6/26	1	25,000	50.00	25,000	50.00			25,000	50.00
Cambodia	Riel	6/26	6/27	1	2,744	50.00	2,730	49.75			2,730	49.75
H. W. Robison:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	10	5,900	50.00	53,130	450.25			53,130	450.25
Thailand	Baht	6/25	6/26	1	1,041.25	50.00	738.25	35.45			738.25	35.45
Cambodia	Riel	6/26	6/27	1	2,744	50.00	100	2.30			100	2.30
Neal Smith:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	10	5,900	50.00	44,300	375.42			44,300	375.42
Thailand	Baht	6/25	6/26	1	1,041.25	50.00	541.25	25.98			541.25	25.98
Cambodia	Riel	6/26	6/27	1	2,744	50.00	1,640	30.08			1,640	30.08
Albert Watson:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	10	5,900	50.00	59,000	500.00			59,000	500.00
Thailand	Baht	6/25	6/26	1	1,041.25	50.00	981.25	47.12			981.25	47.12
Cambodia	Riel	6/26	6/27	1	2,744	50.00	2,135	39.01			2,135	39.01
A. C. F. Westphal:												
Vietnam	Piaster	6/21	7/2	10	5,900	50.00	55,360	469.15			55,360	469.15
Thailand	Baht	6/25	6/26	1	1,041.25	50.00	1,041.25	50.00			1,041.25	50.00
Cambodia	Riel	6/26	6/27	1	2,744	50.00	2,541	46.34			2,541	46.34
Total								10,615.17		1,211.48		11,826.65

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	11,826.65
Appropriated funds:	
H. Res. 1071	3,897.03
Total	15,723.68

G. V. MONTGOMERY,
Chairman, Select Committee on U.S. Involvement in Southeast Asia.

Mar. 20, 1971.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

494. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal sections 3692, 6023, 6025, and 8692 of title 10, United States Code, with respect to pilot rating requirements for members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force; and to insert a new section 2003 of the same title; to the Committee on Armed Services.

495. A letter from the U.S. Commissioner of Education, transmitting a report on the Federal Government's role in education and an assessment of the status of education in the United States, pursuant to section 412 of Public Law 91-230, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

496. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, transmitting the 1971 annual report of the Council, pursuant to section 134(c) of Public Law 91-230; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

497. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the final report on Federal participation in HemisFair '68, San Antonio, Tex., pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 89-685; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

498. A letter from the Sercetary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed amendment to a concession contract for the continued operation of a motion picture, lecture, and photographic studio for the public on the south rim of Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz., for an additional period of 1 year ending December 31, 1971, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271 and 70 Stat. 543; to

the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

499. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of the study of national health insurance proposals, pursuant to Public Law 91–515; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

500. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting an interim report on an aviation cost allocation study, pursuant to section 209(b) of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

501. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the annual report of the Board for fiscal year 1970; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

502. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report for fiscal year 1970 on extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense, pursuant to section 4(a) of Public Law 85–804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

503. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require loadlines on U.S. vessels engaged in foreign voyages and foreign vessels within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

504. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus which revises the authorized Federal Law Enforcement Training Center at Beltsville, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

505. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of financial reports of the Tennessee Valley Authority for fiscal year 1970, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 841 (H. Doc. No. 92–76); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

506. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need for the Department of Defense to remove more low-cost, low-usage items from inventories; to the Committee on Government Operations.

507. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report that postage due and handling costs for processing mail with insufficient postage are not being recovered by the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 789. An act to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92–98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLOOD: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7016. A bill making appropriations for the Office of Education and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 92–99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 354. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4724. A bill to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce (Rept. No. 92–199). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 355. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5352. A bill to amend the act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1971 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce (Rept. No. 92–101). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 356. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5981. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish feed grain bases, wheat domestic allotments, and upland cotton base acreage allotments for certain growers of sugar beets (Rept. No. 92–102). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 333. Resolution to authorize additional investigative authority to the Committee on Education and Labor; with amendment (Reput. No. 92–103). 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. FLOOD:

H.R. 7016. A bill making appropriations for the Office of Education and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 7017. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a special program of transportation research and development utilizing the special experience and manpower of the aerospace and defense industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 7018. 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.

H.R. 7019. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that pensions paid to retired law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for amounts expended by State, regional, city, county, and town policemen for meals which they are required to eat while on duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 7021. A bill to designate the Kettle River, in the State of Minnesota, as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 7022. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 7023. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, by inserting a new title X to authorize aid in developing, constructing, and operating privately owned nuclear-powered merchant ships; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas (for himself, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. DOWDY):

H.R. 7024. 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. CONABLE:

H.R. 7025. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit affiliated banks to contribute in their fiduciary capacities to a common trust fund maintained by one of the affiliated banks for the benefit of the entire group; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7026. A bill to amend section 214 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to expenses for care of certain dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI (for himself, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. SCOTT):

H.R. 7027. A bill to liberalize eligibility for cost-of-living increases in civil service retirement annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 7028. A bill to make possible appropriate, economical, and accessible learning opportunities for all adults, both for their individual fulfillment and for the social and economic well-being of the Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7029. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that wages paid by an employer to a former employee's survivors or estate after the year of such employee's death shall not constitute covered remuneration for benefit or tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 7030. A bill to establish a National Cancer Authority and to authorize international programs and joint ventures in order to conquer cancer at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 7031. A bill prohibiting the issuance of Federal food stamps to strikers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 7032. A bill to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Natchez Trace Parkway in Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 7033. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a volunteers in the national forests program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7034. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 7035. 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. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BARING, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HAYS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ROE, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROY, and Mr. SANDMAN):

H.R. 7036. 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. KOCH (for himself, Mr. CULVER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 7037. 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. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. LENT, Mr. MORSE, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. ROE, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WHALEN, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 7038. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BURTON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NIX, Mr. PELLY, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 7039. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska natives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 7040. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7041. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to recovery of a reasonable attorney's fee in case of successful maintenance of an action for recovery of damages sustained in transportation of property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7042. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that the procurement of certain transportation and public utility services shall be in accordance with all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations governing carriers and public utilities; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 7043. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to expedite the making of amendments to the uniform standards for evidencing the lawfulness of interstate operations of motor carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7044. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to require carriers by railroad to exhaust certain State remedies prior to petitioning the Interstate Commerce Commission for relief in intrastate rate cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7045. A bill to strengthen Federal-State cooperation 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.

H.R. 7046. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 to clarify Congressional intent as to the appropriateness of the judicial fixing of penalties for certain safety violations, and to modify the grant-in-aid program to State agencies participating in safety regulations under the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7047. A bill to amend section 410 of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to pay the expenses of certain State officials serving in joint hearings with the Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7048. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to establish a Federal-State joint board to recommend uniform procedures for determining what part of the property and expenses of communication common carriers shall be considered as used in interstate or foreign communication toll service, and what part of such property and expenses shall be considered as used in intrastate and exchange service; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 7049. A bill to provide for the payment of Veterans' Administration benefits where a child has been properly and legally adopted; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 7050. A bill to eliminate racketeering in the sale and distribution of cigarettes and to assist State and local governments in the enforcement of cigarette taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 7051. A bill to repeal chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to firearms), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself and Mr. HARSHA):

H.R. 7052. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1905, to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Army over transporting and dumping materials in certain waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COTTER:

H.R. 7053. A bill to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, to require more stringent reporting of campaign contributions and expenditures in elections for Senator and Representative; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 7054. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research, educational, and assistance programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 7055. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a monthly clothing allowance to certain veterans who, because of a service-connected disability, regularly wear a prosthetic appliance or appliances which causes exceptional wear or tear of clothing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 7056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax deduction for depreciation on capital expenditures incurred in connecting residential sewerlines to municipal sewage systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7057. 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 Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7058. 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. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 7059. A bill to amend section 410(a) of title 38, United States Code, to provide a statutory presumption of service-connected death of any veteran who has been rated totally disabled by reason of service-connected disability for 20 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 7060. 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.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 7061. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7062. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Mr. MCCLURE, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

H.R. 7063. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for annual reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General concerning certain price increases in Government contracts and certain failures to meet Government contract completion dates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 7064. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to provide mustering-out payments for certain members discharged from the Armed Forces after August 5, 1964; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 7065. A bill to provide for the development of a uniform system of quality grades for consumer food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7066. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require a packaged perishable food to bear a label specifying the date after which it is not to be sold for consumption as food; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7067. A bill to require that certain processed or packaged consumer products be labeled with certain information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7068. A bill to require that certain drugs and pharmaceuticals be prominently labeled as to the date beyond which potency or efficacy becomes diminished; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7069. A bill to require that durable consumer products be labeled as to durability and performance life; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7070. A bill to require that certain short shelf-life durable products be prominently labeled as to the date beyond which performance life becomes diminished; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7071. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited samples of cigarettes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. PICKLE):

H.R. 7072. A bill to amend the Airport and Airway Development and Revenue Acts of 1970 to further clarify the intent of Congress as to priorities for airway modernization and airport development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 7073. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7074. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7075. 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. 7076. 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. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 7077. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-540); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISH:

H.J. Res. 527. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the President to proclaim September 12 to 19, 1971 to be "American Field Service Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 528. 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 Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.J. Res. 529. Joint resolution to place the question of approval of dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) for human use as a prescription drug before the National Academy of Sciences; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.J. Res. 530. Joint resolution declaring it the sense of Congress that all American servicemen be withdrawn from Indochina at the earliest practicable date; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BARING, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DULSKI, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GARMATZ, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MCCLURE, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution proposing unconditional large-scale repatriation of enemy prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MAYNE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. MYERS, Mr. POFF, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THONE, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WINN, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. WYDLER):

H. Con. Res. 248. Concurrent resolution proposing unconditional large-scale repatriation of enemy prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. NIX, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. LLOYD, and Mr. HALPERN):

H. Con. Res. 249. Concurrent resolution proposing unconditional large-scale repatriation of enemy prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H. Con. Res. 250. Concurrent resolution urging that Lt. William Calley be invited to address a joint session of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H. Res. 357. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

98. By the SPEAKER. Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the mistreatment of American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

99. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to a payment in lieu of taxes to the State of Idaho and its local units of government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

100. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the manner in which the Census Bureau records college students; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 7078. A bill for the relief of Herman James Young and Mrs. Norma Brenda Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):

H.R. 7079. A bill for the relief of Sergio Farina, Maria Farina, Sergio Giovanni Farina, Gino A. Farina, Maria L. Farina, and Blanca Farina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 7080. A bill for the relief of Trinidad Trevino-Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 7081. A bill for the relief of Jadwiga Sobon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7082. A bill for the relief of Pietro Ratta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7083. A bill for the relief of Beatrice Dascil Aquino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 7084. A bill for the relief of Evelyn and Francesco Mujemulta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 7085. A bill for the relief of Eugene M. Sims, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 7086. A bill for the relief of Lyuba Bershadskaja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 358. Resolution to authorize the pardon of Lieutenant Calley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

55. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Leoncio Monell, Culebra, P.R., et al., relative to the establishment of a committee of "Citizen-Sons of Culebra," which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MORE DOUBTS ABOUT F-14 AND F-15 DEVELOPMENT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in December 1970. I noted the bad news that the F-14 had crashed on only its second test flight. Yesterday's Washington Post reports growing doubt about the F-14 and F-15 stemming from the crash and other factors. The Post report, by Michael Getler, is further evidence for the need to bring the F-14 and F-15 programs under the "fly before you buy" policy that has been endorsed for future systems by the House Appropriations Committee and the Department of Defense.

The Post article, "'Twin' Navy, Air Force Planes Questioned," follows:

"TWIN" NAVY, AF PLANES QUESTIONED

(By Michael Getler)

A confidential study by aeronautical experts is raising doubts in Congress about Pentagon plans to spend some $15 billion over the next several years to mass-produce two separate fighter planes whose fighting qualities are judged to be roughly the same.

The investigators, according to well informed sources, found little difference in performance between the Navy's carrier-based F-14 and the Air Force's F-15.

Each service wants to buy roughly 700 planes, with the F-15 costing just below $10 million each and the F-14 with a Navy-estimated price of $11.5 million each. That is about three to four times as expensive, respectively, as the current F-14 Phantom, which both services now use and which the new planes are meant to replace.

The study also reportedly points out that the United States may in fact be gambling with its air superiority over the Soviet Union's fighters by putting all its money into two admittedly good—but expensive and roughly similar—aircraft.

The argument is that because of the high price, the military may not be able to buy as many planes as are really needed (the U.S. eventually bought more than 4,000 Phantoms) and may also be neglecting other types of fighters.

Capitol Hill sources say the study suggests it might be worth considering a shift of one of these projects to a cheaper, lighter-weight plane that could be bought in large quantities to help tackle the thousands of light, maneuverable Mig-21 class fighters already in Communist inventories and other similar fighters to follow.

The F-14 and F-15 are designed to counter the latest and most sophisticated Soviet fighters which are only now entering service.

Or, according to Hill sources, the investigators suggest that more attention might be given to a fighter even more advanced than the F-14 or F-15 that could take on Soviet air threats of the 1980s still on Kremlin drawing boards and unknown to U.S. intelligence.