

the President to remove any restraint on the use of marijuana "in small amounts."

Huge, powerful industries like tobacco and liquor would love to get their hands on yet another addictive product. According to reports, two U.S. tobacco companies have already purchased land in Mexico for growing marijuana if it is legalized.

How do we find out the facts? Not from M.D.'s who work for companies who want to legalize marijuana. Far better to rely on insurance companies, whose profits depend on keeping people healthy. According to Metropolitan Life, marijuana causes psychological addiction, leads to loss of energy and motivation, and causes hallucinations. "It makes him or her a good-for-nothing bum," in the words of the New York Daily News.

Every year 30,000 Americans are killed and 500,000 injured because of alcoholic drivers. Legalization of marijuana and widespread promotion of the drug could double the number of persons killed and injured on our highways.

Dr. D. Harvey Powelson, director of the Student Psychiatric Clinic at Berkeley, has treated 500 student marijuana smokers over the last five years. It appears to have a cumulative effect, he said, causing chronic changes "similar to those seen in organic brain diseases—lands of lucidity intermixed with areas of loss of function."

According to Dr. Frank Ayd, many of those who want to legalize marijuana disregard expert medical opinion that it is "a dangerous drug." Nor do they tell the public that there are at least six different types of marijuana. While increased doses may induce stupor, semicoma or coma, any dose "may cause anxiety, depression with suicidal tendencies, confusion, depersonalization, temporal disorientation, impaired judgment, panic reactions, paranoia and psychosis."

The President's Committee tried to pooh-pooh all that. On behalf of your children and grandchildren, send President Nixon a note and tell him what you think about it.

A NICE SOUND—FROM THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star

of April 3, 1972, should come as welcome news to tired taxpayers. This is a start; may Postmaster General Klassen's tribe increase. The editorial follows:

A NICE SOUND

What Postmaster General E. T. Klassen said last week is music to a lot of ears.

He announced plans to cancel a \$450 million rate increase scheduled for next January, saying the public is not ready for it.

He said, "We must learn to live within our income."

He ordered a freeze on hiring.

He called for a dramatic reduction in costs.

He ordered a renewed emphasis on service and customer courtesy.

He told a meeting of United States Postal Service management:

"All of us must understand that the survival of the U.S. Postal Service depends upon everyone giving service. Service is the only thing we have to sell."

Bravo! He is our kind of bureaucrat, if he will pardon the expression. It is likely he is almost everyone's.

Let's hope what he has—and it looks like a terrific case of good sense—is catching.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 18, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. L. G. Lipscombe, Allen Chapel AME Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Jesus said unto them, I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.—John 8: 12.

Almighty God, under the all-embracing canopy of Thy goodness and mercy, we come as children in our Father's house.

In our deep concern for the Republic and for mankind everywhere, strengthen, we pray Thee, our grim resolve at any cost to push back the forces of darkness which threaten the dearly heritage of friends.

These anxious days we remember gratefully the armed battalions of our youth who have inherited so sorry a world—the Americans boys in our uniforms called to contend with the ruthless powers of tyranny. The cheerful courage of these knights of the treacherous land and trackless air, long leagues from home, in the face of deadly peril, shames our petty complaints and our magnified discomfitures here in their homeland and ours.

Give us, pray, prophetic glimpses of the different earth we can construct after the pattern of Thy kingdom, if together we harness the sacrifices and the costly ingenuities of conflict to the service of Thy children everywhere on this spinning globe.

We ask it in the name of the one who declared that the field is the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9212. An act to amend the provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 to extend black lung benefits to orphans whose fathers die of pneumoconiosis, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 117. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; and

S.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution to pay tribute to law enforcement officers of this country on Law Day, May 1, 1972.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2676) entitled "An act to provide for the control of sickle cell anemia," with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

CUTTING THE CAKE AND EATING IT TOO

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the North Vietnamese evidently think they can have their cake and eat it, too.

The Communists have invaded South Vietnam with brutal fierceness. This is an invasion to crush the South Vietnamese and to push the remaining Americans into the sea.

The President has the responsibility to protect our remaining American servicemen. Air strikes in North Vietnam are absolutely necessary to do this. We really have no other alternative since airpower is the only military might we have.

The air strikes have hurt the enemy. Now they say they want to reopen negotiations, but on their own terms.

The North Vietnamese are a cruel and inhumane enemy, Mr. Speaker. They only understand and respect force. In my opinion, the President is making the right decisions to protect the last Americans in South Vietnam.

RISE IN INDEX OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION FOR THE 7TH CONSECUTIVE MONTH

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, this week the Federal Reserve Board reported that for the seventh consecutive month there was a rise in the index of industrial production in our economy. From February to March the index advanced 0.6 percent to a seasonally adjusted 109.6 percent of the 1967 average. This monthly increase is equal to a substantial 7.2 percent annual rate, and the rate at the end of March was 3.9 percent above a year earlier.

This good news regarding industrial production was matched by the report last Friday that construction contracting in 1972 is expected to reach \$85 billion, up from 1971's \$79.64 billion. This latest estimate, made by the F. W.

Dodge division of McGraw-Hill Information Systems Co., is about \$2 billion higher than the initial 1972 forecast by McGraw-Hill last October. The new projected contracting total puts the 1972 gain over the 1971 level at 7 percent, up from last October's 4 percent.

According to the new estimate non-residential construction contracting should register an 8-percent gain in 1972 over 1971. Public works and industrial and commercial building construction over 1972 should be around \$27.65 billion, up \$2 billion from 1971. Highway, sewer, and water facilities are also expected to register big gains. Residential building is expected to increase 4 percent in 1972, to \$36.30 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this strong growth in two such basic areas as industrial production contracting will contribute to a favorable performance for the economy in 1972.

APOLLO 16 STATUS REPORT

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, at 8 a.m. central standard time this morning, the Apollo 16 spacecraft was approximately 150,000 miles away from the earth on its journey to the moon. During the last evening, a midcourse correction burn with the service propulsion system was successfully performed producing a velocity change of 12.5 feet per second.

Captain Young and Colonel Duke entered the lunar module and checked on the lunar module communications systems and general condition of the lunar module. During the evening, the command module computer received an indication that the inertial measuring unit gimbal lock had occurred. Ken Mattingly successfully realigned the spacecraft platform, and the guidance system is again functioning properly. Subsequent to this problem, a command control problem developed and Mission Control Center has been unable to switch spacecraft antennas from the ground.

The spacecraft will go into orbit around the moon during the afternoon of Wednesday, April 19, with lunar landing scheduled for Thursday afternoon at approximately 2:41 p.m. central standard time.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Elections Campaign Act of 1971 went into law on April 7. At a time when public confidence in governmental institutions is shaken, this bill shows the good faith and self-restraint of the U.S. Congress. The law requires all candidates to make regular reports of campaign contributions and expenditures

and, perhaps more importantly, makes these reports available to the general public and to the news media through the offices of each Secretary of State and the clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives. The public has a right to know more about the electoral process and making available knowledge about the sources of financial support for a candidate is a giant step in the right direction.

Some people have, with tongue in cheek, called the act the Self-Destruction Act of 1971 because the law imposes so many disclosure rules on Members of Congress. But the overwhelming majority of Congressmen and Senators have always conducted their campaigns without the slightest hint of impropriety, and this act will allow the public to become aware of this first-hand.

A democrat government cannot be fully effective without the trust and confidence of the people. This act should reinforce and build anew the public trust in the leadership of our Federal Government.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2067) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

MARIA LUIGIA DI GIORGIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2070) for the relief of Maria Luigia Di Giorgio.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

MRS. ANNA MARIA BALDINI DELA ROSA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3713) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

CHARLES COLBATH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4310) for the relief of Charles Colbath.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MRS. CARMEN PRADO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6108) for the relief of Mrs. Carmen Prado.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RENE PAULO ROHDEN-SOBRINHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5181) for the relief of Rene Paulo Rohden-Sobrinho.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CATHERINE E. SPELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7312) for the relief of Catherine E. Spell.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FRANK J. McCABE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1862) for the relief of Frank J. McCabe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1862

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Frank J. McCabe, of Hampton, Virginia, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$497.95, representing an overpayment (made by reason of administrative error) of his per diem travel allowance for the period March 5, 1967, to May 5, 1967, in connection with his participation in a training course at the Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, as an employee of the Department of the Army. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank J. McCabe, of Hampton, Virginia, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

standing. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 12, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DONALD L. BULMER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1994) for the relief of Donald L. Bulmer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

MRS. MARINA MUNOZ DE WYSS (NEE LOPEZ)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5579) for the relief of Mrs. Marina Munoz de Wyss (nee Lopez).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CARMEN MARIA PENA-GARCANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6342) for the relief of Carmen Maria Pena-Garcano.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM H. NICKERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4064) for the relief of William H. Nickerson.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ANTONIO BENAVIDES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2394) for the relief of Antonio Benavides.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. CONCEPCION GARCIA BALAURO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2703) for the relief of Mrs. Concepcion Garcia Balauro.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

ALBINA LUCIO Z. MANLUCU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 559) for the relief of Albina Lucio Z. Manlucu.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMPARO CORONADO VIEUDA DE PENA AND HER THREE MINOR CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4679) for the relief of Amparo Coronado Vieuda de Pena and her three minor children: Yolanda Pena, Marisela Pena, and Lorenzo Pena.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 4679

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Amparo Coronado Vieuda de Pena and her minor children, Yolanda Pena, Marisela Pena, and Lorenzo Pena, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of section 101(a) (27) (B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Amparo Coronado Vieuda de Pena, Yolanda Pena, Marisela Pena, and Lorenzo Pena shall be held and considered to be returning resident aliens."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MARGARIDA ALDORA CORREIA DOS REIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6504) for the relief of Margarida Aldora Correia dos Reis.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EMILIA RUFFOLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10142) for the relief of Emilia Ruffolo.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

JERRY L. CHANCELLOR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7946) for the relief of Jerry L. Chancellor.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DONALD P. LARIVIERE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8952) for the relief of Donald P. Lariviere.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11045) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ARLINE LOADER AND MAURICE LOADER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 341) for the relief of Arline Loader and Maurice Loader.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1915) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1915

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall convey, to Mrs. Julian Souvenir of Cathlamet, Washington, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property

described as the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 26, township nine north, range six west of the Willamette meridian, except that portion thereof conveyed by deed from Richard Dick to A. D. Birnie and recorded in Book "D" of Deeds, page 357, records of Wahkiakum County, Washington, containing approximately thirty-three acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall convey to William D. Auld, of Ridgefield, Washington, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in the deed from Richard Dick to A. D. Birnie recorded in Book "D" of Deeds, page 357, records of Wahkiakum County, Washington, containing seven acres more or less.

SEC. 3. Conveyances under section 1 and 2 hereof shall be made upon payment of an amount determined by the Secretary of the Interior. Such amount shall be based upon an appraisal on the basis of the value of such land at the time of appraisal, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the land by the applicant or his predecessors in interest, and in such appraisal the Secretary shall consider and give full effect to the equities of any such applicant.

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

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOLLING. 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. 111)

Anderson, Tenn.	Eshleman Fountain	Nix Patman
Ashley	Fraser	Pelly
Badillo	Gallifanakis	Pepper
Barrett	Gallagher	Poage
Belcher	Gettys	Pryor, Ark.
Blackburn	Griffin	Scheuer
Brown, Mich.	Hanna	Selberling
Carney	Hawkins	Smith, Calif.
Chisholm	Hébert	Stanton
Clark	Heckler, Mass.	J. William Stanton
Clausen, Don H.	Hutchinson	James V. Steed
Clay	Johnson, Pa.	Stevens
Coughlin	Jones, Tenn.	Stokes
Culver	Karth	Stubblefield
Curlin	Kee	Teague, Calif.
de la Garza	Kyros	Teague, Tex.
Dennis	Landrum	Thompson, N.J.
Dent	Long, La.	Vander Jagt
Diggs	McKevitt	Wright
Dowdy	Macdonald,	Zwach
Downing	Mass.	
Dwyer	Mills, Ark.	
Edwards, La.	Moorhead	
	Morse	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 365 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

INSTITUTE FOR CONTINUING STUDIES OF JUVENILE JUSTICE

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 897 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 897

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 45) to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 897 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 45 to establish an Institute of Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice.

The purpose of H.R. 45 is to establish an Independent Institute of Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice, comprised of a director, an advisory commission, and a staff.

The Institute would collect, prepare and disseminate data bearing on juvenile justice and would train personnel in the juvenile justice area.

The advisory commission, composed of 21 persons, will have supervision of the overall policy and operations of the institute. The Director of the Institute will act as chairman of the commission.

Two million dollars are authorized for fiscal year 1972 and \$2 million annually are authorized for each of the 3 succeeding years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule in order that the legislation may be considered.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Could it be possible that the proponents of this legislation were serious when they came before the Rules Com-

mittee and asked for a rule on a bill providing an authorization of \$2 million for the fiscal year 1972, which has less than 2 months to run? Could it be possible they were serious? Did they look serious?

Mr. O'NEILL. Well, you will have to ask the gentlemen from the committee on that. Yes, they certainly did.

Mr. GROSS. I was only questioning the demeanor of the sponsors was when they came before the Rules Committee.

Mr. O'NEILL. They were exceptionally serious, and they convinced the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GROSS. They must have.

Mr. O'NEILL. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, let me hastily point out to my friend from Iowa that they did not impress this member of the Committee on Rules, as I am not in support of this legislation. I think it is duplication and is not needed.

I am supported in this by the Attorney General of the United States and in the person of Elliot Richardson, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I would like to read a couple of paragraphs from the report of the Attorney General on this bill:

It is the opinion of this Department that the existing statutes discussed above, the programs conducted under them, and the administrative coordination measures that have been taken constitute an adequate and effective program of action in the juvenile justice field. For this reason, the Department of Justice recommends against enactment of this legislation.

Mr. Richardson reported to the committee in summary:

In summary, we believe that the authority now existing in the Department as well as that existing in the Department of Justice under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act is sufficient to carry out the objectives of H.R. 45. We are working with the Department of Justice in determining the types of training to be carried out by each of our authorities and the type of data collection and dissemination in which each Department should be involved. The establishment of another independent agency in the form of an Institute would fragment Federal efforts in the field.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we ought to fragment our efforts in this particular field, it is too important that our efforts succeed. I do not think we need an outside and largely independent institute working on and I might say confusing the issues which are involved here.

The two major purposes of the institute would be, first, to collect, prepare, and disseminate data hearing on juvenile justice. At that point I might inquire as to who is better able to collect, prepare, and disseminate this information than the Department of Justice.

Second, to provide training to Federal, State, and local personnel in the juvenile justice area. At this point I might add we have already taken care of this. We did it adequately in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.

The Department of Justice already has authority to be given this institute, and I for one cannot understand why we need an outside group to fragment our efforts.

As the gentleman from Iowa already stated, they want \$2 million each year

for the next 3 years to do something that is already being done.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I might say that I oppose the rule and oppose the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. They not only want \$2 million for each of the succeeding fiscal years after July 1, but they want \$2 million for the 2½ months which remain of this fiscal year.

Mr. LATTA. I could not agree more with the gentleman.

I might say, also, on December 6, 1971, this bill failed for passage under suspension of the rules, and I hope that it fails today.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate passage of H.R. 45, legislation to establish an Institute for the Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice, because I am thoroughly convinced it will greatly assist us in solving our juvenile crime problem.

As a cosponsor of the bill, I have been pleased by the overwhelming support it has received. Over 100 Congressmen and 24 Senators have sponsored the legislation. Strong endorsements of H.R. 45 have come from such impressive organizations as the American Bar Association, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, the National Council on Juvenile Court Judges, and the American Parents Committee. Also, many hundreds of letters from concerned citizens have been sent to congressional offices, in the hope we will pass this bill to create an institute to deal with the complex problem of juvenile crime.

Besides establishing a coordinating center for the collection and dissemination of data on the subject of juvenile crime and preparing studies on this subject, the Institute would provide training programs and facilities to those individuals concerned with the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile justice. These training programs of short-term instruction modeled after the highly successful FBI Academy would make a significant contribution to the effectiveness of those persons who play such an important role in the young offender's life. The institute would also conduct regional workshops and seminars and develop technical training teams to aid State and local groups in setting up their own training programs. All of these activities would be open to the whole range of individuals involved in the juvenile justice system—including, but not limited to, law enforcement officials, judicial personnel, welfare workers, and probation officers.

Mr. Speaker, such an institute could provide very valuable assistance in my home community of Rockford, Ill., where the Council of Community Services and the League of Women Voters are currently working together on a survey of the juvenile crime problem and the need for additional services to deal with that

problem. The purpose of the institute is not to assume local responsibility for dealing with juvenile crime, but rather to encourage and assist local authorities and groups in improving their own programs.

There are, no doubt, many excellent reasons for the kind of personnel training and upgrading envisioned in this legislation. However, I would like to underscore one in particular. This is the growing trend toward more precise definition of both individual rights and responsibilities and the procedures and due processes of our law enforcement, judicial and correctional institutions. As Congressman RAILSBACK pointed out in the hearings, currently only five States have complete juvenile justice systems; less than one-half of the States afford the right to trial by jury; and many others do not even have specialized juvenile judges. But all of this is beginning to change. More States are now moving toward a full system of juvenile courts and a more formalized, professionalized, and effective system of complimentary institutions and personnel. This development obviously will put an enormous strain on the supply of competent manpower, and thus will make all the more necessary the kinds of training activities proposed in H.R. 45.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying if we are to root out a problem so stubborn and complex as juvenile delinquency, we must have an effective vehicle, and I hope we delay no longer on its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the legislation which it would make in order.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in order that it does not go unnoticed that the Federal Government is already deeply involved in this area that is going to be covered when this Congress creates this institute, I think it is important that we look at page 6 of the report, and understand that the Department of Justice is already carrying out the very things that the gentleman from Illinois has pointed to, that this bill will do:

Under the Safe Streets Act the Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is authorized to make grants and contracts to improve police, corrections and the courts, to conduct research, and to provide information and technical assistance. These programs are applicable to juvenile as well as adult law enforcement and delinquency problems. In addition, with the recent amendments to the Safe Streets Act, added emphasis is placed on making grants to States for juvenile delinquency prevention and correctional programs.

Then, skipping down a little in the report, it reads:

In the area of training, education, and technical assistance LEAA has funded a number of programs. For example, an award of \$68,565 has been made to the Federal Bureau of Prisons to conduct a series of workshops on "Innovative Programming for Youthful Offenders" to increase the adequacy of institutional rehabilitation. A \$200,000 award has been made to the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services to develop a training center in that State for

representatives of the juvenile agencies in the New England area. In addition to these examples of discretionary grants—

Now, get this—

\$20,314,000 has been allocated by the States in their State block action funding for fiscal year 1971 for training and education in the juvenile field.

And this bill, as has already been pointed out, is only for \$2 million each year, under the act that is already the law, \$20,314,000 has already been allocated in this fiscal year for the same purposes.

Also, in Fiscal Year 1970 over \$400,000 in LEAA technical assistance funds were expended or obligated in connection with corrections technical assistance programs, many of these funds going to provide technical assistance to aid in the development of training programs in the area of juveniles and juvenile offenders.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we ought to give the legislation we have already passed, and is already being funded, an opportunity to work before we create an outside institute to fragment its work.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) speaking in support of this measure. I am always amazed by the increasing number of devotees to the theory that all you have to do to make a problem disappear, no matter how large or small, is to throw several millions or billions at it that will eliminate all worry about it in the future. And it does not make any difference how much duplication, overlapping or how much money is already being spent. Just throw some more millions at it, and it will disappear.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me, and compliment him on his excellent statement in opposition to this bill.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I might point out to the House that this bill was reported originally last November, and came out of the subcommittee and the full committee unanimously. It was placed on the suspension calendar on December 6, and the vote on that day was 238 for the bill and 135 against, obviously not receiving the required two-thirds vote under the rules.

Mr. Speaker, we are asking for 1 hour of general debate on this bill. I trust that the rule will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 45) to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Insti-

tute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 45, with Mr. DORN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER).

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

Mr. Chairman, the measure before the Committee, H.R. 45, would establish a much needed, independent, and permanent institute to be known as the Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice.

The Institute would be comprised of a director, staff, and an advisory commission.

Under the bill, as introduced, the Institute would perform two salient functions. First, it would prepare and disseminate data bearing on the juvenile justice system. Second it would provide for the training of persons working in the juvenile justice area.

Under the bill, as amended, the Institute would have a third principal function, being given authority to prepare, in cooperation with bar associations and other agencies, studies on juvenile justice and related matters.

A further committee amendment eliminates what had been an open-end authorization to appropriate, as has been observed earlier in the House. The amount authorized by the amended bill is \$2 million in the present and each of 3 succeeding fiscal years. I will refer to that a little bit later.

We believe that, especially with regard to the new programs like that of the Institute, there is a real advantage in terms of legislative oversight to maintain some limit on appropriations. As amended, as I have suggested, the measure would authorize appropriation for fiscal 1972 of not more than \$2 million and the same amount for each of the three succeeding fiscal years.

When the bill was first considered by the House, that provision was in it, and it remains in it today, notwithstanding the fact that very little time remains in the fiscal year 1972.

Assuming favorable action by the House and Senate, the Senate might well change that decision depending on the timing of their action.

I would assume, of course, that while \$2 million is authorized under this bill, it would not be appropriated for the balance of the fiscal year 1972.

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman assumes that the \$2,000,000 will not be appropriated. Why not take it out of the bill and at least give the taxpayers that much of a small sized break?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I think the gentleman well understands that on any bill of this sort which might be considered during the course of the fiscal year, depending on what time it is brought up, if one were to construe that it would be \$2 million for an entire fiscal year and you are 6 months into that fiscal year, you might make it \$750,000 or \$250,000. But that judgment has to be operationally left to the Committee on Appropriations because one cannot anticipate what you would do when you have a bill of this sort.

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is interesting to know the Judiciary Committee is capitulating to the Appropriations Committee in a matter of judgment of this kind. I do not understand it, but perhaps that is the state to which we have fallen in the House of Representatives. Either the Judiciary Committee believes the \$2,000,000 is warranted or it does not.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I think the gentleman misunderstands me. We have not capitulated to the Appropriations Committee. We have authorized not more than \$2 million for this and the succeeding fiscal years. I think we fully understand that \$2 million, practically speaking, will not in fact be appropriated during fiscal 1972.

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. By any stretch of the imagination is it anticipated that this new commission would be appointed and in operation by July 1 of this year? Is that possible?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. It might have been had it proceeded in December. That is hard to foretell. This is the same bill that the House already voted on, as the gentleman well knows, in December and which narrowly failed passage by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. GROSS. Today is what? April 18. This fiscal year is almost over. I am talking about legislating in the light of this date, not last November.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Well, we are legislating during this fiscal year 1972 and we have made provision for this Institute in this fiscal year. That is what the House I think is appropriately confronted with.

The need for an independent body that would perform these vital functions has been the subject of considerable congressional concern. In both the 91st and 92d Congresses more than 100 Members of the House have either introduced or cosponsored legislation identical to the measure now before us. Hearings were held in July 1970 and April 1971.

It would indeed be difficult to question the need for legislative action to review and strengthen our policies and practices in the area of juvenile justice. Too often do our existing procedures appear to turn youthful offenders into hardened crimi-

nals. This does not result from cynicism or indifference on the part of those who share responsibility for the administration of existing systems. The area does not lack devoted professionals. Rather, our juvenile justice procedures suffer from lack of coordination. There is a great need for an organized program for sharing expertise, disseminating data, and undertaking studies in depth.

I should stress the fact that the Institute proposed to be established by H.R. 45 will be outside and largely independent of the executive branch. The unsatisfactory state in which the administration of juvenile justice finds itself is the product of a system in which the Departments of Justice and Health, Education, and Welfare have shared, but have not too successfully discharged, the Government's responsibility for dealing with problems of the aberrant young.

It is for this reason that those concerned most deeply with the administration of the juvenile justice system, the National Council of Crime and Delinquency, originally expressed their support for only the objectives of the bill but not the establishment of the Institute. They have turned around and, on the basis of the performance of HEW and Justice, have come to support H.R. 45 in its precise form as we have it today.

Furthermore, the American Bar Association in commending support of H.R. 45 to its membership, said in its report that in spite of the millions of dollars referred to by the gentleman from Ohio spent during the past decade on innovative delinquency programs and research, much of the information remains in bureaucratic files, and apparently the information has not been disseminated into the Nation's juvenile justice program for implementation in the local courts.

That is why juvenile justices support H.R. 45. It is understandable that the HEW and Justice Departments, while espousing the goal of H.R. 45, still think that they, themselves, and their own bureaucracies should attend to the problem.

However, the Committee believes that an independent agency is essential if we are to achieve effective new methods of copying with the juvenile offender problem in an organized coordinated way.

The principal author of the bill is my good friend on the committee, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK) and the principal coauthors of the bill are our colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRESLER). The work of all three of these gentlemen is appreciated. I am glad to note their presence. I am sure they will assist in answering any questions.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, the soaring crime rate is of overriding concern to all Americans. In 1970, the most recent year for which figures are available, one murder took place every 33 minutes; a forcible rape every 14 minutes; an aggravated assault and a robbery—both—every minute and a half. In the last 10 years, the number of serious crimes has almost tripled while our population has increased by only 13 percent.

The most distressing aspect of all of this is the number of young people who are involved. Almost 50 percent of the individuals arrested in connection with serious crimes in 1969 were 18 or under. Also, youth crime continues to increase rapidly. In the last decade, the population of persons 18 or under increased by 27 percent, while the number of arrests in this age group jumped by almost 100 percent. Further, the recidivism rate among young offenders is shocking. An FBI study revealed that 72 percent of those arrested who are under 21 will be rearrested within 5 years.

It is obvious that until we solve our juvenile delinquency problem, we will make little progress in overcoming the national crime problem.

For many years, the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice have been provided with generous funds by Congress to combat crime.

However, the statistics on juvenile crime give evidence of the disappointing failure of present programs to have any measurable positive effect on juvenile crime. According to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, which analyzed the 1970 programs in this area by the Departments of Justice and Health, Education, and Welfare:

First, there is a lack of coordination and concerted planning among the Federal agencies;

Second, the continual shifting of organizational structure and requests for small appropriations has shown little commitment by HEW leadership over the years to mount and sustain a Federal delinquency program commensurate with the problem;

Third, in 1970, about one-third of the limited HEW appropriations were spent for planning and supportive services and the remainder were scattered throughout the country in small, underfunded, and uncoordinated programs; and

Fourth, it was the expectation and possibly the intention of many that LEAA would give priority attention to those areas of delinquency where HEW had failed; but, in 1970, LEAA committed only 14.3 percent of its resources to plans for delinquency programs. Because many approved plans do not develop into programs, far less than even this amount was actually spent to prevent and control juvenile delinquency.

Although the National Council on Crime and Delinquency has not as yet completed its investigations of the 1971 programs of LEAA and HEW, preliminary findings indicate that nothing more promising will be discovered.

For example, in 1971, 16.1 percent of LEAA's resources were committed to plans for delinquency programs—an increase of only 1.8 percent over the previous year.

Even more distressing is the fact that in 1971, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare spent only 12.9 percent of its total juvenile delinquency funds on training programs at a time

when 31 States had no training programs at all funded by HEW.

It is clear that a new approach to our crime problem is desperately needed. I am convinced the legislation before the House today provides at least a partial answer.

Briefly stated, H.R. 45 creates an independent Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. The primary functions of the legislation are threefold:

First, to provide training programs and facilities for personnel involved in the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile crime and delinquency;

Second, to provide a coordinating center for the collection and dissemination of useful data on treatment and control of juvenile offenders and the juvenile justice system in general; and

Third, to prepare studies on juvenile justice including comparisons and analyses of State and Federal laws and recommendations which will be designed to promote an effective and efficient juvenile justice system.

The Institute would be under the supervision of a director appointed by the President. Overall policy and operation would be set by the Director and his Advisory Commission composed of members of appropriate Federal agencies and experts on juvenile crime from the private sector.

The training program which the Institute would operate is a matter of the highest priority. One of our greatest problems is the lack of adequate training for those who deal with young people who have run afoul of the law.

The first contact with the juvenile justice system for most offenders is usually the policeman. His role is an important one for it is he who must make the initial decision as to how to treat the juvenile offender. He has a range of options—arrest, warning, dismissal, meeting with the parents to name but a few. It is imperative, therefore, that the police officer be aware that arrest is not his only option.

Unfortunately, according to a recent survey conducted by the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the average police recruit receives only 7½ hours of training on the problems of juveniles and delinquency. This says nothing, of course, about the quality of that training.

On-the-street contact with juveniles is a daily occurrence—and in-depth understanding of the particular problems of this age group is critical. Yet little in-service training is provided. In the cities with populations of one-quarter to one-half million surveyed by the police chiefs, only 15 percent of the officers assigned to special juvenile units had received any specialized training necessary for them to function effectively in their assignments.

This lack of special training in handling juvenile offenders is also true of juvenile court judges and probation officers, both of whom play a critical role in the young offender's first contact with the law.

The National Crime Commission reported that:

Less than 10% of all juvenile court judges in the country were full time, three-fourths devoted less than one-fourth of their time to juvenile matters.

Further, half of the juvenile court judges have no undergraduate degree; one-fifth no college education at all, and one-fifth were not members of the bar.

Probation personnel, perhaps more than any other segment of the juvenile justice system, need specialized training to provide each and every offender with an opportunity to become a well-adjusted and productive member of his community. Unfortunately, education and training requirements for probation officers vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Many require high school diplomas, some require college degrees, and some have no educational requirements at all.

The American Parents Committee questioned each of the State directors of juvenile justice programs on their priority needs for delinquency prevention and control. Almost without exception it was found that States desperately need trained probation officers for juvenile courts.

An offender's contact with the juvenile justice system can mark a turning point in his life. In far too many cases it marks the beginning of a life of crime.

Under the legislation before this subcommittee, the Institute will conduct short term courses on modern methods of dealing with delinquent youth. The enrollees would return to their States and communities with valuable information they can mold to their particular needs and circumstances.

Another priority of the Institute would be to provide a center to gather and disseminate information on the various programs being used throughout the country to combat juvenile delinquency. In the past, we have been plagued by existing fragmentation of Federal and State agencies and programs dealing with juvenile offenders and the lack of coordination among them. As Judge James Gulotta of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges stated:

Historically, there has been a lack of organization among the states in the areas of coordinated research, planning communication, and evaluation. Too often the individual child has suffered because his individual state received and processed fragmented information—or even completely misunderstood the resources and knowledge available to only a few.

Thomas G. Pinnock, deputy director of the Department of Institutions for the State of Washington, has called for a "central clearinghouse for materials regarding the problems of delinquents and some means established for the regular dissemination of the information to those of us directly involved with the problems of youth." This bill provides the clearinghouse.

Finally, the Institute is directed to analyze State laws on juvenile crime and develop model laws and codes. The American Bar Association and the American Law Institute have achieved striking results with a similar approach.

Support for the Juvenile Justice Institute bill has been gratifying. On the

House side, over 100 Members joined Congressmen BIESTER and MIKVA and me in introducing H.R. 45. Twenty-four Senators have sponsored companion legislation.

Support for the bill has also come from some of the best known authorities on the subject of juvenile delinquency in the country. At the time of its hearings, the House Judiciary Subcommittee received many telegrams and letters from around the country, supporting H.R. 45. I will now read a few of these.

On October 28, 1971, Milton Rector, Director of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, wrote Subcommittee Chairman Robert Kastenmeier the following letter:

We are writing you to express our strong support for H. R. 45, the bill to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice.

As you know, we testified before your committee on July 29, 1970, concerning H. R. 14950, H. R. 45's predecessor in the 91st Congress. At that time we strongly supported the concept of the bill and continue to do so. However, in our testimony before the committee we suggested that the Institute be lodged in either H.E.W. or L.E.A.A. This suggestion was based on the then existing plans of those two agencies.

Since that time our hopes for H.E.W. and L.E.A.A. were not realized. In the last fiscal year L.E.A.A. only planned to spend 14.6% of their state block funds in the area of Juvenile Delinquency. Of this pitifully low amount only 14.1% was spent on training.

H.E.W.'s performance has been equally disappointing. In the last fiscal year they expended only 12.9% of their resources on training. We have been informed by officials from H.E.W./Y.D.D.P.A. that in the present fiscal year they do not plan to spend any funds in the training area. This decision, made apparently in the face of the 1968 Juvenile Delinquency Act, is most discouraging.

Therefore, we would like to modify our previous testimony and urge that the Institute as described in H.R. 45 be enacted by Congress.

Judge James H. Lincoln, president of the National Council on Juvenile Court Judges, said in his telegram of October 26, 1971:

It is not the purpose of this telegram to again make a detailed statement. It is my purpose as President of N.C.J.C.J. to again reiterate our very strong support of H. R. 45. We have had long experience with dealing with the present departments and agencies in Washington concerning matters relating to juveniles. We have an abundance of grass roots knowledge at the local level. We know that H.R. 45 is long overdue legislation.

Orman W. Ketcham, judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, in a letter on October 26, 1971, wrote:

At the request of the Committee on Family Law Judges (of which I am chairman) the Family Law Section of the American Bar Association adopted a resolution last July in New York City, endorsing in principle H. R. 45, and urging the establishment of an independent Institute for Juvenile Justice.

Byron B. Conway, Wood County judge, explained to me in his communication of October 22, 1971:

I am a past president of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges and that organization has taken a deep interest in the passage of this bill since it (H. R. 45) was introduced. The bill is also supported by the National Council on Crime and De-

linquency, the Association of Parents, and many other sincere organizations that deal with the problems of children.

Hope Eastman, acting director of the American Civil Liberties Union, wrote on October 26, 1971:

The American Civil Liberties Union strongly supports H.R. 45, a bill to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice.

This legislation represents an imaginative effort to deal with this problem (lack of resources). It would provide training programs and facilities for persons connected with prevention, control and treatment of juvenile crime and delinquency. It would also establish a national clearinghouse of information and studies on juvenile delinquency and the juvenile justice system.

Trained personnel and greater knowledge are essential to achieving the specialized treatment and rehabilitation of juvenile offenders which is necessary to halt the alarming increase in juvenile crime and delinquency.

Mrs. Barbara McGarry, executive director of the American Parents Committee, has stated:

The enormity of the juvenile delinquency problem clearly calls for a new approach, in view not only of financial drain, but most importantly, in reclaiming the misdirected young lives of that segment of the nation's most important natural resource—its children. This new approach is soundly realized in H.R. 45.

Precisely because of lack of departmental inertia toward the mounting problem of juvenile delinquency, it is necessary to establish an independent Institute of Juvenile Justice, where Federal funds can be targeted directly to alleviating this problem—both by the training of special probation officers, intake and aftercare personnel, and by determining which programs show the greatest promise in controlling juvenile delinquency and in effectively rehabilitating the youthful offender.

More recently, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers—PTA—released a legislation memorandum which urges immediate enactment of H.R. 45:

To: State Chairmen for Legislation, National Board of Managers

From: Mrs. Walter G. Kimmel, Coordinator of Legislative Activity

CALL FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

H.R. 45 Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice

H.R. 45, a bill to establish an Institute for the Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice, is expected to be heard on the floor of the House very soon. The purposes of this legislation are threefold:

(1) to provide training programs and facilities for personnel involved in the prevention, control and treatment of juvenile crime and delinquency;

(2) to provide a coordinating center for the collection and dissemination of useful data on treatment and control of juvenile offenders and the juvenile justice system and;

(3) to prepare studies on juvenile justice including comparisons and analyses of state and federal laws and such model laws and recommendations which will be designed to promote an effective and efficient juvenile justice system.

Statistics underscore the urgency of the problem. Representative Thomas F. Rallsback (R. Ill.), who first initiated this legislation in the House, writes of some of these alarming facts in an article in the September/October issue of *Trial* magazine:

"Juveniles commit about one-half of all offenses.

"In the inner city 70% of the young people find themselves in trouble with the law.

"The juvenile crime rate is rising more rapidly than the adult rate; in the sixties juvenile arrests increased 90%.

"Recidivism of youthful offenders is staggering; almost 75% are rearrested within five years.

"The addition of such statistics to the overall crime rate is alone cause for great concern, but as tragic as this may seem, it is yet more serious when we consider that these figures represent only the beginning of a life at odds with society and, more than likely, a career in crime. What it means in human terms is the immeasurable loss to society of productive, integrated citizens and to the juvenile offender of a normal future."

It is believed by the sponsors of this bill that an efficient and effective method of training personnel to work with juvenile offenders can be developed. This legislation is supported by the Council of Juvenile Court Judges, with which the PTA has been co-operating for many years and with which we are now co-sponsoring regional conferences to train volunteers to work with juvenile courts in an effort to help children in trouble.

Please contact your congressman immediately—and urge him to support H.R. 45 when it reaches the floor in the near future.

The American Bar Association unanimously endorsed H.R. 45 on February 8, 1972, as explained in a letter to Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA. The text of that letter follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1972.

Hon. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am pleased to inform you that the American Bar Association, through its governing body, the House of Delegates, unanimously approved the following recommendations submitted by its Section of Criminal Law at the Mid-winter meeting at New Orleans, Louisiana, February 8, 1972:

Resolved, That the American Bar Association approves and supports in principle legislation represented by H.R. 45, 92d Congress, First Session, a bill "To amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice"; and

Be it further resolved, That the Section of Criminal Law be authorized to indicate support of the Association for such legislation by appearances before Committees of the Congress or in such other ways as may be appropriate.

Recommendations to the same effect were submitted by the American Bar Association Section of Family Law and likewise unanimously approved by the House of Delegates.

For your further information, I am enclosing a xerox of our Section's Report which contained those recommendations and a report in support thereof.

We trust this information will be of some assistance in the final enactment of this piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. ERICKSON,
Chairman.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION—SECTION OF CRIMINAL LAW RECOMMENDATIONS

The Section of Criminal Law recommends the following:

Resolved, That the American Bar Association approves and supports in principle legislation represented by H.R. 45, 92d Congress, First Session, a bill "To amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new

chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice"; and

Be it further resolved, That the Section of Criminal Law be authorized to indicate support of the Association for such legislation by appearances before Committees of the Congress or in such other ways as may be appropriate.

REPORT

In spite of the millions of dollars spent during the past decade on innovative delinquency programs and research, much of the information remains in bureaucrats' files. Very little information has been disseminated to the nation's juvenile justice personnel for implementation in local courts.

There is an urgent need for a national coordinated effort for systematic, evaluated information and training on proven effective programs. Legislation is now before Congress which would provide this coordination through the establishment of the Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice, as proposed in H.R. 45 and companion bills.

Such an Institute would help to capitalize on the value of the millions of dollars already spent from Federal, State and private sources. More importantly, priceless human values could be preserved or rehabilitated by the selective publication of successful methods and by providing training in those methods.

H.R. 45 was introduced by Congressman Thomas F. Railsback (Illinois) on behalf of himself and many others. It has extensive bipartisan support. It attacks the problems referred to above.

H.R. 45 authorizes the Institute to (a) serve as an information bank by systematic collection of data from all sources re juvenile delinquency; (b) publish data in useful forms; (c) disseminate published data to interested persons; (d) conduct seminars and workshops; (e) provide short-term training of law enforcement officers, juvenile welfare workers, juvenile judges, probation officers, correctional personnel, and other persons, including lay personnel, connected with the treatment and control of juvenile offenders; and (f) send out training teams to work at State and local levels.

The Institute would be under the supervision of an Advisory Commission consisting of the Administrators of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the Bureau of Prisons, the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the United States Judicial Center, plus fifteen persons having training and experience in the various areas of juvenile delinquency, thus assuring helpful services, directly applicable to practical field problems.

H.R. 45 has been reported out favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States House of Representatives, with a "do pass" recommendation. On December 6, 1971, during a House session working under a suspension of rules, H.R. 45 came within 11 votes of the required two-thirds majority. Sponsors will now work with the Rules Committee to bring the Bill on the floor for a regular vote.

H.R. 45 was recommended to the Section of Criminal Law by the Committee on Juvenile Delinquency. It was discussed at the Council meeting held in San Francisco, California, November 13, 1971, and voted upon favorably by a unanimous vote of the Council.

The Section's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and its Council strongly feels that approval of the Recommendations contained in this Report would substantially contribute to the American Bar Association's nationwide leadership in the improvement of justice, and give appropriate needed attention to justice for the child; hence urges Association approval of these Recommendations.

A copy of this Report has been sent to the Section of Family Law because of its logical interest in the subject matter.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM H. ERICKSON,

Chairman, Section of Criminal Law.
December, 1971.

Mr. Chairman, America's best hope for reducing crime is to reduce juvenile delinquency and youth crime. That is the purpose of H.R. 45. I urge its immediate passage.

Further, the American Bar Association and, I might add, both its criminal justice section as well as its family law section, have now strongly endorsed H.R. 45.

I hope that the House will now pass this much needed and widely supported bill.

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois in his very clear, concise, and powerful statement that he has made. I know how hard he has worked on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of this legislation in both the 91st and 92d Congresses, I wholeheartedly endorse its immediate passage. I was disappointed that it did not pass under suspension of the rules when it was before the House on December 6 and I am glad that we now have the opportunity to rectify this error.

I will not repeat the remarks I made then except to point out that at a time when juvenile crime is reaching staggering proportions, a unified, coordinated Federal effort is clearly called for. As a needed answer to an urgent social problem, this bill merits our immediate endorsement.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. I yield to my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the immense irony resulting from our country's increasing crime rate has been effectively shown by the fine work on this bill of my friend and colleague from Illinois, Congressman RAILSBACK. Apartment tenants peer from behind protective window bars instead of criminals confined by jail bars. In some areas of our cities, life for some people resembles the existence of animals in a zoo. More and more Americans are hiding behind locked and bolted doors, buying dogs for protection, and constantly fearing that they may be crime's next victim. In fact, each person in the United States has one chance in 36 of becoming a victim of a serious crime such as murder, rape, or robbery. Private citizens do not deserve such an existence.

The gun-toting hoodlum has made people afraid to walk their neighborhood streets at night. He instills terror in those innocent individuals he confronts and untold suffering and pain in those he decides to harm.

Statistics seem so impersonal, but they do convey the staggering increases in crime. In the 10 years from 1960 to 1970,

serious crimes nearly tripled. Murders went up 76 percent, aggravated assaults rose by 117 percent, and robberies increased 224 percent. What makes these figures even more significant is that in 1970, guns were used in 65 percent of all murders and 63 percent of all robberies.

Congress is today considering a bill creating an institute for continuing studies of juvenile justice. This action recognizes the immense need for improving the systems through which juvenile delinquents can be helped—before they turn into hardened criminals. Juvenile welfare workers and judges will have a chance to learn more about treating and controlling young offenders through creation of a training center similar to the FBI Academy. The most advanced techniques in dealing with juvenile delinquency will be compiled and distributed to law enforcement officials nationwide. I am especially proud to be listed as a cosponsor of this bill.

However, when all of our best efforts are unable to deter some from a life of crime, something must be done to protect the innocent members of society.

With the passage of the Gun Control Act of 1968, hopes ran high that criminals would have a hard time obtaining weapons. But statistics for 1968-70 show that the use of guns in murders increased by 16 percent. Assaults committed with a gun rose 23 percent and armed robberies shot up by 34 percent.

If you add up the 10,300 firearms murders in 1970, the 3,000 annual domestic victims of gun accidents, and the some 10,500 gun suicides, you get almost 24,000 gun victims. This figure, for a single year, represents more than one-half of all U.S. combat deaths in Vietnam during the last 10 years.

It seems to me that the Gun Control Act of 1968 has not and will not be effective. The act did not prohibit the importation of parts for making the cheap "Saturday night specials," the criminals' favorite, accounting for no less than 50 percent of all crimes involving guns.

The act provides no sure way for a gun dealer to check the background of the purchaser, and, there is nothing to stop a legal purchaser from reselling the gun to any other individual—even a criminal.

And right now in the United States, a new handgun is sold every 13 seconds and used handguns are being traded at more than two a minute.

We need to quit molly-coddling these gun-toting criminals who more and more seem to derive sadistic pleasure from using a gun. Often, money or revenge seem to be the primary goal of the criminal. Inflicting bodily harm and even death seem to be the mode for today.

Here in the Washington area, we have witnessed the D.C. Transit Co. adopting a "no change policy" after the shooting of a busdriver. Many gas station attendants no longer make change for purchases and place money into concrete drop boxes to which they have no keys. But what about the criminal who refuses to believe the attendant does not have a key?

The burden has shifted to the innocent citizen, and the criminal now feels free to roam anywhere—perhaps to your

neighborhood grocery clerk or movie cashier. If he shoots the clerk or kills the cashier, he has not committed a Federal offense, but he has certainly committed the greatest of atrocities to the victim and his family.

The Gun Control Act of 1968 recognized the gun as the primary means of criminal violence. But the act was ineffective as a means of controlling that violence.

I am, therefore, introducing a bill which would amend the laws now on the books to make it a Federal crime to use a gun to commit a felony where a State's legislature has made such use a State offense. This bill would also require a mandatory jail sentence for anyone convicted, and the sentence could not run concurrently with any sentence for another offense. The bill is identical to one I drafted and introduced with 16 cosponsors in April 1970.

This bill recognizes that criminal law has been primarily a State concern. It does not require any State to pass a law making it an offense to carry a gun during commission of a crime; but where States do, the offense automatically becomes Federal as well as State in character.

The intent of this legislative approach is to place the burden of criminal use of guns on those who use them, not on law-abiding citizens. A man would think twice before using a gun to commit a crime if what was previously only a State offense is now made a Federal offense also. The resources of the Federal Government could be utilized to rid America of the gun-toting criminals who have permitted the lawlessness of the dark ages to permeate our cities and rural areas.

The stiff, new penalties provided in this bill for using a gun to commit a crime should help to deter some, and those who will not be deterred will be detained. This may be bitter medicine for the criminals in our society, but it is far better than the pain and suffering they inflict upon their fellow citizens.

I would like to ask the gentleman further, in regard to his explanation as to the Department of Justice's attitude. There is a little trouble in the Department of Justice that is reported in the committee report as being opposed to the bill. Can you give us an explanation of that?

Mr. RAILSBACK. Let me state to the gentleman that when we began, before the legislation was even introduced, I, along with Congressman BIESTER and Congressman MIKVA, visited the Department of Justice and met and spoke with the then Attorney General John Mitchell. It was my belief that there was a good chance at getting support from that Department as well as from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, because we also met with Secretary Robert Finch. We had further meetings with, among others, Pete Velde of LEAA as well as John Dailey, who was then with the Department of Justice. They made some of what I believe to be valuable contributions as far as suggesting language is concerned.

If you are asking me my opinion, my opinion about why the Department of Justice and HEW are opposed, I would say that there has been a traditional jurisdictional dispute between HEW and the Department of Justice over who has primary jurisdiction over juvenile affairs. I think that is pretty well established. As a matter of fact, there has been something like three different letters of cooperation that have been exchanged between departments cited because of criticism of the continuing friction between the two governmental agencies.

My belief is that when we chose to give this an independent character, that is, we did not rest it with Justice and did not put it under the jurisdiction of HEW, because we thought we would get into exactly the same problems that occurred, namely, the friction that I mentioned previously. The two departments decided to oppose this legislation. I think they regard it as kind of an infringement on their separate jurisdictions.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to point out to my distinguished colleague from Illinois that I disagree with him. I do not believe that statement is consistent with the facts. We have a Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act now on the books and we have a Safe Streets Act.

Mr. RAILSBACK. We amended the Juvenile Delinquency and Control Act on the floor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is right.

Mr. RAILSBACK. If the gentleman will recall, it was my amendment that completely changed the structure of that act.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will read in the report, when we extended the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1971 we spelled out the jurisdiction, and in the report the committee stated prevention programs in juvenile crime would belong to the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act and be administered by HEW. That is what is being done. The criminal justice aspect of juvenile crime would remain within the LEAA, and that is being done.

So I am wondering if the gentleman would be good enough to tell the House how does this program that is before us today differ both from the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act and the Safe Streets Act.

Now, the Safe Streets Act has jurisdiction over dangerous crime reposed in the Department of Justice and the Juvenile Delinquency Act has jurisdiction of preventive programs.

How will this act before us today differ from those two acts?

Mr. RAILSBACK. Let me say to the gentleman that there has been a recent study with which I am sure the gentleman from Illinois is familiar with by the National Council on Delinquency and Crime. That study, frankly, has found, as I mentioned earlier, that there has been a glaring lack of commitment.

Let me tell the gentleman how I think this legislation differs.

Let me also mention to the gentleman that there are some programs that you would think would be under HEW but which are still being funded by LEAA; namely, some training programs which the bill would be primarily concerned with.

At the present time there is no central place where local law enforcement, probationary, judicial and correctional personnel can come to share expertise, to discuss what has been successful in some States and what has not been successful.

There is no central place to train people nominated by the local and State governments.

I would say that the primary purpose of this bill is patterned after what I think has been a very successful institution and that is the FBI Training Academy which began with about 200 people who had been nominated by the State and local governments and sending them to a central place where they receive short-term training—a 6-week training program—and they have returned to their local communities and it has had the ripple effect of letting them share with their colleagues what has been successful in the field of law enforcement.

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BIESTER. I think an additional answer to the question which has been asked by the gentleman from Illinois is contained on page 30 of the hearings on this bill in the testimony of Judge James C. Gulotta, president of the National Council of Court Judges, working in the field. The testimony we had during the hearings came from people working in the field dealing with the practical problems involved here. He said:

We respect the opinions of representatives of the existing Federal agencies who state that their existing services can best solve the problems of delinquency. We do not doubt the sincerity of their intentions. Oceans of studies and projects have been conducted. But they need specific goals and guidelines such as those contained in this legislation for a Juvenile Justice Institute, in order to draw together the conclusions and expertise that are available and convert them into useful, practical publications and training programs that youth workers can immediately apply right on the job.

And I can assure, gentlemen, that as a president of a national organization representing every State and Territory in our Nation, the most vital area within this proposed legislation is that of a singular Federal agency to serve as a clearinghouse for all matters concerning youth and delinquency in these United States.

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman has talked about those things which, hopefully, the institute, if created, could do.

Would the gentleman tell me whether or not there is anything prohibiting these things being done under the provisions

of the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency?

Mr. RAILSBACK. It is my belief that when you read the so-called Omnibus Safe Streets Act, and when you read the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act, it is my belief that the language under either act is not written, really, to encompass what we believe is a central focus on the problems of juvenile delinquency.

Let me just add one thing. It is my belief that an important part of this bill which we have not mentioned is the establishment of a full-time director to deal with these training programs. Perhaps, even more important, we provide by statute for the first time an advisory commission that would not be limited to government people but would rather have some people from the private section including juvenile court judges, probationary personnel, correctional personnel and other interested people from the private sector.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAILSBACK. Let me yield to my friend here, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) first.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say one thing, the LEAA, which has been brought into this discussion, and that we are now putting millions of dollars into that the LEAA is using for juvenile delinquency prevention programs, and establishing juvenile delinquency prevention programs around the country, that I believe this merely highlights the desperate need for this type of legislation at this time, because of the great lack of coordination and understanding on how to treat juvenile problems. This bill directly speaks to that situation, and as to how it should be conducted.

I also noticed, if I may continue, in the report filed here by HEW where it speaks of title I money in education being used for this purpose. I would certainly not depend on title I money under the Education Act being used to coordinate and handle the juvenile delinquency prevention programs. I believe this again clearly highlights the desperate need for this legislation.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER).

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this bill which was reported out by the Committee on the Judiciary by a unanimous vote. The bill already has received the support of a majority of the membership of this House.

Juvenile crime and delinquency throughout the country is indeed staggering. The hearings bear me out in that regard. Our future depends on our youth. The present system does not work. Juvenile crime plus youth drug addiction plague our Nation. Our State and municipal processes are varied, and greatly fragmented, and are not productive. There is an appalling lack of knowledge and expertise on the subject. State procedures are often chaotic, and at times

antediluvian, and they must be brought up to date. There must be a greater spreading of the good gospel of rehabilitation which is woefully absent under the present system, and much can be done in that regard by the setting up of this institute.

For these purposes there must be a center from which knowledge can emanate for the prevention and cure of juvenile offenders. A national bank of information is required and is essential.

Much talk has been heard concerning the Department of Justice and HEW objections. There is only one explanation, and that is jealousy. They do not want anyone to poach on their preserves.

I admire the parsimony of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS). He has very frequently saved this Nation considerable sums of money. He now objects because this may cost so many dollars, but I assure him that anything worthwhile costs money.

I am reminded of the Scotch story about a lad who comes to his father after he had come home from school, and he said, "Daddy, I came home from school, and I ran after the bus, and I therefore saved 3 pence." The father whacked him over the jaw, and the boy said, "Wherefore do you punish me, Father?" The father said, "You should have followed a taxi, and saved a shilling."

So I would say to the gentleman from Iowa, we do not seem ever to satisfy him. No matter what sums we agree to pay for some things that are worthwhile, we are always confronted with his objection.

Now this is a worthwhile project, and if it is worthwhile, and the majority of this House thought it was worthwhile—it is going to cost money and we have to pay that money for that which is worthwhile.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the principal sponsor of the bill on the majority side, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) 10 minutes.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to assure my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) that the bill is in the exact form in which he asked to be paired for it when it came up the first time some months ago.

I hope nothing has happened to his views on the bill to keep him from voting for it this time.

As was explained by the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee of the Judiciary, this is exactly the same bill that the majority of the House approved when it was before the House under suspension of the rules.

Let me also say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, because the bill has been before the House before, because it has had a long and tedious journey through the committee, waiting for reports from the various departments involved and then finally through the Committee on Rules the second time—the authorization remains the same even though less time is remaining. Obviously, \$2 million will not be spent and it will not be appropriated during the balance

of this fiscal year. But, of course, he is aware of that.

Mr. Chairman, if I were to put my finger on any single factor that has caused difficulty with some of the departments of Government—I believe my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) asked about the basis of the opposition and of the Department of Justice—it is not as to the substance of the bill and it is not as to the need for an agency which will collate and pull together all of the research that is being done and act as a clearing house. Indeed, I feel that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK) could have eliminated the opposition of at least one of the agencies if he would have been willing to choose up sides on what is basically a jurisdictional dispute.

The Department of Justice thought it could handle it. HEW thought it could handle it. As a result, it was not handled.

I recall from a meeting with the Attorney General, there was no disagreement on the need for this kind of central agency. There was no disagreement on the proposition of substantive law.

Indeed, there was no disagreement when we sought to analogize this kind of agency to the successful FBI Academy. As I recall, the Attorney General agreed that was a pretty good analogy.

There have been a lot of agencies in this field and they have overlapped. No one agency at this point is willing to say—we agree it ought to be taken from us.

In fact, the problems of juvenile delinquency, and really this concern has been voiced again and again, have not lent themselves to a solution.

So some of our colleagues say, "Well, the proposals we have tried do not work. Therefore, let us forget about the problems. Obviously, that ought not to be the attitude of the Congress and it cannot be the attitude of the Congress."

When one looks at the total crime statistics that are existing in this country, even after some of the dramatic declines in places like Washington, D.C., one finds juvenile crime has continued to increase by a startling 42 percent since 1965 and an even more startling 113 percent since 1960.

The present law says when a juvenile is delinquent, we will use the penal institutions and the reform institutions ostensibly to correct them. But we are missing that first signal light of trouble to realize that this is the time when we ought to be able to try to turn those people from a life of crime, long before the years of unemployment, alcoholism, dope addiction, and time in penal institutions, all of which confirm the life of a hardened criminal.

We suggest that the present pattern allows them to start this life as a criminal without any meaningful interference by the agencies of Government and without Government even being aware which kinds of interference will be meaningful and which kinds will not.

I would suggest that the FBI statistics bear this out. On the whole, 63 percent of those people released from prison are

rearrested within 4 years. This is the tragic recidivism rate we all have to remember and as to which we bear the freight. But for juveniles, the figure is even higher. Nearly 75 percent of those under 21 at the time of their release get in trouble again. The need for action I do not think needs argument to this House.

We do believe that reduction in juvenile crime will produce a disproportionate reduction in total crime by taking out of circulation the youngsters who might otherwise commit crime over and over and over again.

We just do not have all the answers to juvenile delinquency, but we do have some. The problem is that we are not making effective use of the knowledge we do have. We are not making effective use of the many programs that are already on the books, but scattered through the Federal bureaucracy dealing with different aspects of juvenile crime.

Let me cite briefly the Government agencies which have jurisdiction in the juvenile crime field: They are the Department of Labor; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Department of Justice. They all have proliferating programs under various legislative mandates, seeking to develop effective new techniques to stem delinquency. All of them paddle their own canoes. As my distinguished colleague from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK) said, we have reached the point of great embarrassment on the third attempt to cooperate in trying to get some coordination on research programs that they are engaged in together.

Unfortunately, the knowledge that these various departments have developed just does not get out into the field where it is needed. That is basically what H.R. 45 will do.

We have already heard our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRESTER) refer to the testimony of one of the witnesses from the Department of Justice who stated he thought there were many programs on the books that did work which were worth pursuing but unfortunately they did not get to him and to his colleagues; the judges are unable to find out which ones were the good ones and which ones were the bad ones.

The second important function of the Institute would be the training of personnel working in the field. Too many judges and probation officers and juvenile correction people around the country are years behind the current state of knowledge in their field. Every single study that has been made of the needs of the juvenile justice system has pinpointed lack of trained personnel as a serious problem.

In searching for a vehicle to meet this need, the model which stands out is the Federal Government's FBI Academy. It has been a model for law enforcement professionalism, training thousands of State and local law-enforcement officials, and it has not resulted in the takeover of local law enforcement by the Federal Government. If we are to begin solving the serious problem of juvenile crime

which we now face in this country, we have to make a comparable effort in training, motivating, and providing information to juvenile justice specialists.

In 1966 the Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime of the President's Crime Commission recommended that juvenile specialists should be present and aid in the disposition of juvenile first-offenders, when we can still reach these potential subjects of a long and unfortunately productive criminal life. Yet the Commission found that barely 5 percent of all the personnel employed in State juvenile facilities in 1965 were professionally trained treatment personnel. This is the challenge which H.R. 45 is designed to meet.

H.R. 45 offers a kind of revenue-sharing plan, if you please, for redistributing to the States and local governments the wealth of knowledge collected by the Federal Government in the juvenile-justice field. Through the various action and research programs spread throughout the Federal bureaucracy we are finding answers to some of the problems. But we are not getting those answers back to the people who must apply them—the judges and probation officers who must deal with juvenile offenders on a daily basis.

The Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice will bring that knowledge to the people who need it, through continuing education programs and a centralized information source. That is why I urge my colleagues to join in supporting the enactment of H.R. 45.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wish to support my colleague on this measure, but the speech which he has just made is almost a rewrite of the same speech I made here when this House unanimously adopted the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Program of 1971, which I sponsored in the House. Would my colleague be good enough to tell this House what you cannot do under title II or the other titles of the Juvenile Delinquency Act that you could do under this act?

In other words, what we are doing here, whatever we are proposing to do—and I am not going to quarrel with the statistics, because, of course, we have juvenile delinquency problems in this country—but let me point out the House reduced the appropriation for the Juvenile Delinquency Act from \$15 million by \$5 million, to an amount of \$10 million in 1972. The only problem with the Juvenile Delinquency Act is that it is underfunded. What can we do in this bill, H.R. 45, that we cannot do in the existing law? If the gentleman can convince me of that, I will support his bill.

Mr. MIKVA. I want to apologize to the gentleman from Illinois for any unintentional plagiarism of my colleague's speech. I was not aware of it. I am flattered that our minds run in the same trajectory.

I would point out the last time the bill was up for House consideration, the gentleman was shown as paired for the bill, and I hope nothing has happened in

the interim to change his mind about support of the bill.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman answer my question?

What can we do under H.R. 45 that we cannot do under existing law?

Mr. MIKVA. Let me answer my colleague from Illinois by saying very simply there is nothing in title II which would authorize the kind of academy for training that would pull together all the expertise—State, local, and Federal as is done in the FBI Academy.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is there anything that prohibits either the Juvenile Delinquency Act or the LEAA from doing that? Is there anything in either one of the existing laws that says if they decide they want such an academy, they cannot fund it?

Mr. MIKVA. There is nothing that prohibits it, and there is nothing in the Constitution that prohibits it, and yet, like the Constitution, these programs must be implemented. There is nothing in either of those two bills which contemplates anything like the central research or academy visualized in this bill. That is why we are here with this bill.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of an identical bill, I am pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 45, which would establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice.

The expression of alarm over the increase in juvenile crime has become almost a cliché in recent years, but the statistics are truly alarming. In our inner cities, for example, an almost incredible 70 percent of our young people find themselves in trouble with the law before they reach the age of 19 years. Moreover, about three-fourths of these same youngsters are arrested a second time within 5 years.

One other fact deserves mention: almost one-half of those arrested in 1968 for serious criminal offenses were under the age of 18; in other words, juvenile crime constitutes about one-half of the Nation's total crime problem.

These hard statistics lead us to the inescapable conclusion that existing programs to combat juvenile delinquency are just not working. Experts tell us present efforts are fragmentary and ineffective. What is needed is not new and harsher laws, but better coordination of existing laws and programs.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 45 is designed to serve that end. It would initiate a two-pronged attack on juvenile crime. The proposed Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Delinquency would establish a clearinghouse for existing information about juvenile crime, information which is not now being properly analyzed or disseminated. Uncoordinated studies and programs at various levels of government have accumulated substantial amounts of relevant data, but we have not been able to put that data to its best use.

The second function of the Institute would be to provide training and education to those directly involved in State

and local efforts to control juvenile delinquency. The training would be patterned after a similar, highly successful program for regular law enforcement personnel now being conducted at the FBI Academy.

Among those who will benefit from this legislation will be family counselors, who have the first—and sometimes the only—chance to correct family situations which frequently force a child into delinquency. Some years ago, I was instrumental in establishing a family counseling court in Hawaii. The court has proved most successful in Hawaii, and I believe the Institute envisioned in H.R. 45 could help develop this promising idea. At the proper time I will offer an amendment to include family counseling specifically as within the scope of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 45 would go far toward resolving a problem which continues to plague our society in increasing intensity—the problem of juvenile justice. I urge its overwhelming adoption.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I was impressed by the gentleman's statement that this bill is going to help to coordinate programs. But section 407 of existing law provides:

There is hereby established an Interdepartmental Council on Juvenile Delinquency, hereinafter referred to as the Council, whose function shall be to coordinate all Federal juvenile delinquency programs.

That is the law now. In the 1971 act we authorized \$75 million for juvenile delinquency prevention and the House voted only \$10 million.

If the gentleman is suggesting the program is not working, the answer is not in another program but in fully funding the existing program. Would the gentleman not agree?

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am sorry, my time has expired and I am unable to respond to the gentleman.

(Mr. QUIE, at the request of Mr. RAILSBACK, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of this legislation, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 45, which would create the Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice.

I am sure everyone is alarmed at the trend in criminal statistics which shows that the average age of persons committing crimes is continually reaching into lower age brackets. The failure of juvenile justice institutions is demonstrated by the fact that almost three-fourth of the youths who are arrested are again arrested within a few years. This society cannot stand a continuation of this trend.

Some techniques are proving beneficial in rehabilitating juvenile offenders and restoring them to a useful life in society. We do not have adequate methods of informing the various officials around the country concerned with juvenile justice

about these new techniques. One of the primary purposes of this new Institute would be to collect current data on juvenile delinquency treatment and control and to disseminate it to appropriate persons throughout the Nation.

A second purpose of the Institute would be to conduct training programs for persons involved in the juvenile justice system.

The overall direction of the Institute would be the responsibility of an advisory commission which would set forth policy with the actual administration of the Institute under control of a director.

I am hopeful that the House of Representatives will approve this bill overwhelmingly today.

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 45, which I am proud to cosponsor. In particular, I want to commend my very able colleagues from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK and Mr. MIKVA) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER) for their untiring efforts on behalf of this important measure.

This legislation would establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice, to compile and distribute relevant data and provide personnel training in the juvenile delinquency field. The Institute would constitute a clearinghouse for information presently fragmented among 50 States and numerous Federal agencies. Innovative juvenile court experiences and legislative recommendations would be collected and disseminated. Also, the Institute would train individuals for State and local juvenile justice positions such as probation officers, law-enforcement and welfare workers. These are the officers most directly concerned with the juveniles.

I need not dwell too long on the serious problem this country faces with youthful offenders which has been recounted by others. Persons under 18 account for 50 percent of the offenses committed nationally. The rate of increase in juvenile crime is four times that of the increase of the juvenile population itself. Just as shocking is the number of repeat offenders—almost three-quarters of these youths are rearrested within 5 years, as the gentleman from Illinois has pointed out. The fact is that juvenile crime and delinquency are not under control.

It would be improper to contend that overnight H.R. 45 would materially change the recidivism rate with regard to the juvenile offender. However, it is proper to contend that whatever is being done today has not changed the serious problem of the juvenile lawbreaker—a problem that was clearly brought to this Nation's attention by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice in 1967.

H.R. 45, Mr. Chairman, is a beginning at meeting a major crime problem. Its focus is on that age group which ultimately swell the population of our prisons.

Today, existing agencies emphasize adult offenses and adult offenders. Testi-

mony before our subcommittee by practicing juvenile judges was clear on the need for a central agency to speak for the child.

H.R. 45 is a redirection. It would provide a coordinating and unifying force that would bring together what is now a multifarious and disjointed attack on juvenile delinquency.

H.R. 45 is an experiment and a relatively inexpensive one when balanced by the gravity and the importance of the situation which it confronts.

Mr. Chairman, support for H.R. 45 has been expressed by numerous authorities and organizations including the American Parents Committee, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges.

I hope the Members will support the enactment of H.R. 45.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FORSYTHE).

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to be a cosponsor of the juvenile justice bill, and I am hopeful that my colleagues will join me in support of this legislation.

Every year in this country, about 100,000 children under 18 are locked up in jails.

What happens to them there? When they go back to the streets, are they better, or are they worse?

Are our prisons really colleges of crime?

The juvenile justice bill is intended to provide training and information for persons working to combat juvenile delinquency at the State and local levels.

The program would provide short-term training of law-enforcement officers, juvenile welfare workers, juvenile judges, probation officers, correctional personnel and other persons connected with the treatment and control of juvenile offenders.

Rather than simply further study juvenile delinquency, this bill attempts to establish a clearinghouse, or data bank, for all the valuable information presently existing—but not in any one convenient location—a function that could not be easily fulfilled except at the Federal level.

Moreover, as a result of changes in committee, the Institute would develop model legislation and model codes for the States to deal with juvenile delinquency problems.

The program proposed in this legislation is an important one. It is a program to really help coordinate State efforts to save children.

This, in my view, is certainly worthy of our support.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to our distinguished ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH).

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I feel compelled to oppose H.R. 45, but it would add little to the existing legislative authority in the area of prevention and treatment of juvenile delin-

quency. However, by establishing another independent agency in the form of an Institute, the bill would further fragment Federal efforts in this field.

The Institute provided for in the bill would be authorized to establish an information bank for the collection and dissemination of useful data regarding the treatment and control of juvenile offenders. The Institute is also authorized to devise and conduct a training program of short-term instruction, including seminars and workshops for a variety of personnel engaged in juvenile delinquency programs.

The authority to collect and disseminate information and to train personnel was granted to the Justice Department and to HEW by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 and the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968. Additional authority for these purposes has been granted under legislation in several different areas such as education, child welfare, and social services, mental health, and vocational rehabilitation. At the present time, Justice and HEW support projects which include training for professionals and nonprofessionals from a number of agencies, including educational, health, law enforcement, parole and probation, juvenile courts, correctional institutions, youth employment, social welfare, and recreation. The Justice Department is also supporting original research at various universities which is aimed at preventing delinquency and rehabilitating youthful offenders.

HEW will continue to fund juvenile delinquency research under the authority granted in sections 1110 and 426(a) of the Social Security Act.

It is far better to continue to support the numerous colleges and universities which have training and research programs than to establish a National Institute. These institutions of higher education can train the recipients close to their place of activity, and therefore, can stress the particular needs and problems of a State or local community.

Ample authority exists for the collection and dissemination of information as well as for the training of personnel. Under title III of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to collect, evaluate, and disseminate information relating to research and projects conducted under the act in addition to any other matters relating to the prevention and treatment of delinquency. The National Institute of Mental Health also compiles and disseminates information to those involved in research, law enforcement, and correctional work. In addition, Justice is currently developing a National Criminal Justice Reference Service which will include the most comprehensive information bank in the country in the criminal justice area. A substantial portion of the research findings included in this reference service will deal with juvenile delinquency, since delinquency constitutes such a significant portion of the Nation's crime problem.

Both the Omnibus Crime Control and

Safe Streets Act, administered by Justice, and the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act, administered by HEW, were passed in 1968. As I have pointed out, both acts provided for the training of personnel and the dissemination of information. At first, these overlapping authorities caused confusion and bureaucratic in-fighting between the two Departments. The Congress then recognized the need to minimize this kind of overlapping and duplication of the Federal Government's efforts in the juvenile delinquency prevention area. It amended the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act to establish an Interdepartmental Council to coordinate all Federal juvenile delinquency programs. Since the Council's inception, significant progress has been made in coordinating the effort of Justice, HEW, and the other agencies involved in the juvenile delinquency area, with the result being a much more effective use of resources. Both, Justice and HEW are opposed to this legislation.

If another independent agency is established, the task of reducing this duplication of effort and of focusing the existing resources to achieve maximum results will become even more difficult.

Perhaps a greater effort should be made to accomplish the purposes of H.R. 45. But, these efforts clearly can be made under the existing legislation. What is necessary now is to continue the effort to utilize the considerable resources which currently exist in a cohesive manner.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE).

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, probably one of the easiest things for all of us in the Congress of the United States to do is to vote "yes" for every program that comes along the line.

It is very difficult for a Member to take a position against a bill that has to do with possibly solving some of the problems relating to juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a complete stranger to law enforcement, having been a FBI agent for 5 years and a prosecuting attorney in the capital city of my State for a number of years. I recognize the very, very serious problems of juvenile delinquency. I would hope that we in the Congress have made strides toward solving the problem. I do not, however, agree that this legislation which we are considering today will solve it. In fact, I think it will compound the problem which we now have in the Government and that is putting another layer on another layer and on another layer by attempting to solve all of our problems by covering them with money.

I am perfectly mindful of the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, a very able lawyer on the Judiciary Committee, made a reputation for himself in the State legislature in Illinois in this very field and I can understand the gentleman's interest in it.

However, Mr. Chairman, when we look at this legislation we find that the Department of Justice is opposed to it and that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is opposed to it. I would

ask the question: "Why?" There have been all kinds of reasons given as to why they were opposed to it, but I think the possible key to the matter appears on page 6 of the report wherein there is stated the following:

The Department is of the opinion that enactment of this legislation would result in overlapping and duplication of efforts in the juvenile delinquency field by federally funded organizations because all of the functions proposed for the Institute of Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice presently can be performed under existing law.

Mr. Chairman, that is one of our great problems in government. We keep putting program on top of program, on top of program, and it still does not solve the problem.

Already, \$20 million has been committed to the States in State grants for fiscal year 1971.

Further, I would invite the attention of the Members to the fact that under the Safe Streets Act the LEAA is authorized to make grants and contracts to improve their methods of law enforcement, to train personnel, to perform research, and to provide technical assistance.

Mr. Kleindienst states the Department of Justice is in opposition to the bill and Mr. Richardson, Secretary of HEW, states his opposition as follows:

The bill would provide for the establishment of an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. The Institute is authorized to establish an information bank for collecting, publishing, and disseminating data relating to the prevention and treatment of delinquency.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is enacted you are going to build buildings and all of these things that we have already provided the funds to do in each of these programs we are talking about and that is the LEAA and Safe Streets Act. If they are so bad and are failing to accomplish the results, even though we have spent millions upon millions on those programs, why are not the sponsors of this legislation attempting to repeal those so-called bad acts because they are not solving the problem, rather than putting another layer on these already existing programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out the fact that the ranking Member from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch) takes a very courageous, logical, and objective approach to this legislation.

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

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Ohio on his stand and his very enlightening remarks today.

Is it not true that we have already in this Congress appropriated over \$20 million to the States for the very same thing that this bill now attempts to accomplish? We already have over 40 Federal programs dealing with juvenile problems—why this boondoggle?

Mr. DEVINE. I appreciate the contri-

bution of the gentleman from New Jersey. He, too, has been engaged in the law enforcement field for over 20 years and he knows the problems of juveniles and has worked with them, as has the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

When you look through this act you will see that we have another one of these \$100 a day per diem setup. It even goes so far in section 5043 to provide for applications for admission to the institute, and authorizes allowances for travel and per diem for students and enrollees to the institution. This could become so large that it could almost approach HEW.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE) has expired.

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

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 45, the proposal which would establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. Probably no one in this body would dispute the continuing need for collecting, coordinating, and disseminating information on how juvenile delinquency may best be prevented and controlled, nor would anyone dispute the continuing need to upgrade the professional competence of personnel making important decisions about juveniles coming into contact with the juvenile justice system. But, while the substantive objectives of H.R. 45 are laudatory, and I commend the great vigor with which the distinguished Member from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK) and other proponents defend this legislation, I am obliged to oppose this legislation.

Enactment of H.R. 45 would result in an overlapping and duplication of efforts in the juvenile delinquency field by several Federal agencies. All of the Institute's proposed functions can now be performed under existing statutory authority by existing Federal agencies, under laws including the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968, as amended, and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration has made significant progress in its administration of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act. This office under title II of the act is authorized to support training programs for persons connected with the treatment and control of juvenile offenders. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized by title III of the act to collect, evaluate, publish, and disseminate information related to the prevention of delinquency and the treatment of juvenile offenders.

The Omnibus Crime Control Act authorized the Justice Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to provide funds for training persons who are connected with the treatment and control of juvenile delinquency. In fiscal year 1971, the Law Enforcement

Assistance Administration, or LEAA, funded at least 100 projects totaling almost \$8 million, all aimed directly at upgrading the competence of persons who work with youngsters who become involved and get in contact with the juvenile justice system. This does not include other millions spent by LEAA in other projects that deal with both adults and juveniles and affecting juveniles.

The LEAA has broad legislative authority in the training area, under which it can spend funds for training through block and discretionary funds, through National Institute moneys, and through funding technical assistance programs. These moneys are being used to train the wide range of professional disciplines and skills needed throughout the system of juvenile justice, and to train paraprofessional and volunteer lay people to work in juvenile justice programs. The proposal for a new Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice would duplicate these efforts already in being.

The proposed Institute's information transfer function would also duplicate several LEAA programs. For example, the LEAA is developing a National Criminal Justice Reference Service, including the most comprehensive information bank in the country in the criminal justice area. This computerized information system will contain most of the available research information on crime, on criminal justice, and on juvenile delinquency. Furthermore, the Statistics Division of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice is now performing many of the functions of the proposed Institute's coordinating center for the collection and dissemination of useful data regarding the treatment and control of juvenile offenders.

Not only does LEAA collect and disseminate information in the juvenile delinquency and juvenile justice area from existing sources, it also supports original research aimed at preventing delinquency and rehabilitating youthful offenders and at upgrading the various component parts of the juvenile justice system. These projects are supported by the research and development arm of LEAA, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

An example of such an LEAA research project aimed at improving the effectiveness, efficiency, and fairness of society's dealings with troubled children is the juvenile justice standards project conducted by the New York University Law School's Institute of Judicial Administration.

Another LEAA-supported project at the University of Michigan is evaluating the effectiveness of juvenile corrections programs throughout the United States. The study is designed to develop minimum performance standards for corrections personnel who work with juvenile offenders. Once these minimum standards have been arrived at, it should be helpful to develop more effective training programs enabling juvenile corrections personnel to function with higher levels of competence.

Still another LEAA National Institute supported study is attempting to identify

those types of volunteer workers who function most effectively in juvenile probation work, with the thought that the findings should assist in selecting better volunteer probation workers and in providing them with the type of training and skills which will make them more effective.

In addition, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has established the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, working with the Institute of Judicial Administration and other LEAA funded agencies to establish standards for juvenile delinquency prevention, control and rehabilitation through its task force on community crime prevention, police courts, and corrections.

Certainly these ongoing LEAA projects well illustrate the fact that the LEAA does have broad authority for juvenile justice research. Not only does it collect and disseminate existing information, but it also has authority to collect needed new information that can be disseminated quickly to juvenile justice personnel.

Depending on how the juvenile delinquency problem is defined, there are about 40 Federal programs at present with some direct or indirect involvement in the juvenile delinquency area. Recognizing the great overlapping and duplication in governmental efforts in the juvenile delinquency area and seeking better coordination, Congress amended the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 to establish the Interdepartmental Council to Coordinate All Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs. That Council, chaired by Jerris Leonard, Administrator of LEAA, has moved aggressively in its efforts to coordinate all Federal, State, and local efforts in the juvenile delinquency area. These coordination efforts have been strongly bolstered by the written agreement between the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. That agreement has minimized the overlapping and the duplication of Federal efforts in the juvenile delinquency area. It is no wonder that both the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare strongly oppose H.R. 45, which would tend to add to rather than minimize this overlapping of programs and which would tend to proliferate expenditures and to work against rather than promote coordination of efforts.

Mr. Chairman, as I stressed in the House Judiciary Committee deliberations on this bill, and again in the House floor debate last December 6, there is very little similarity between the FBI National Academy and the Institute for Studies of Juvenile Justice proposed in this bill before the House. I regret the effort to wrap the proposed Institute in the mantle of the very successful National Academy through which the Federal Bureau of Investigation trains State and local law enforcement officers.

The FBI National Academy is operated entirely with FBI agents, occasionally supplemented with volunteer nonsalaried guest speakers. The trainees come from the police and sheriff departments from

all over the United States. Until recent years when Law Enforcement Administration grants provided assistance to the trainees, either the trainees themselves or their State or local law enforcement agency employers paid their travel expenses and living costs while in the National Academy. The FBI budget now includes funds paying for the travel expense of each trainee and a \$16 per diem which enables the trainees to live rather spartan lives, two to each bachelor apartment, while receiving training at the National Academy in Washington. The trainees live in barracks at Quantico, Va. for at least 2 weeks of their course. I understand that the next FBI National Academy class, the 99th, will start in June, and will be occupying the new facilities constructed at Quantico. Thereafter all trainees will receive room and board, and will receive all their training at Quantico. No per diem will be paid. I am advised that it is estimated that the FBI will be able to meet the costs of each trainee for \$6. Certainly this is far, far less than what is involved in the proposed Institute.

The proposed Institute is not going to have a faculty immediately at hand, it will have to recruit them and pay them. It will have to build its entire facility from the ground up. The students will not be living the comparatively spartan existence of law enforcement officers who come here and to Quantico as trainees in the FBI National Academy. You may be sure that the lawyers, judges, law professors, and others that H.R. 45 apparently contemplates bringing together will not be living in barracks or be satisfied with less than \$25 per diem. Those who become members of the Commission for the proposed Institute will receive \$100 per day per diem.

Obviously this bill proposes a far more costly and expensive institution than the FBI National Academy, and it is going to create still another layer of bureaucracy which is duplicative of ongoing efforts, is unneeded, and should be defeated. Enactment of H.R. 45 will still further fragment Federal efforts to reduce recidivism and to prevent and control juvenile delinquency. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join in defeating this legislation.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Wisconsin has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In response to some of the Members who opposed this legislation, and who insist that there is present authority that could be used through the LEAA program, I went back and looked at the authorizing language, and, with all due deference to the thinking of my distinguished colleagues, I do not believe that the authorizing bill reads quite the way that they say it does.

The LEAA program specifically refers to grants to be made to State and local agencies, and to educational institutions, but nowhere does the LEAA have the authority, and it was never intended to give them the authority, to set up this kind of an institute. Even with the amounts of money that we have appropriated for them they simply do not have the authority to create the kind of agency we are talking about here. It would be very much the same as if we would suggest that the FBI could have set up its Academy without any authorizing language within the bill; they need specific authorization, and as I recall they utilize a line item within the Department of Justice appropriation when they come in each year.

So I must say to my colleagues that they can authorize the programs that do exist, but they simply cannot authorize or envision the establishment of an Academy such as we are talking about which will be the central clearinghouse both for all the Federal and State research programs, and in addition will be a training academy to seek to handle and instruct all of those who are working in the field of the juvenile problems at all levels of government.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman could address himself to one concern and fear that I have. As I said earlier, I want to support this bill, but we know that the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1971, which authorized \$75 million, was only funded at the \$10 million level this year.

What assurance is there that if this authorizing legislation should pass, whatever money is appropriated for this bill will not further deteriorate appropriations for the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act, which was put together, if I may recall for my colleagues, after we had spent some \$40 million over a number of years on research into juvenile delinquency. And it was as a result of that research over a number of years that the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act emerged, and was approved by this House by a unanimous vote.

What assurances do we have that if this legislation is adopted that it will not siphon off funds that normally ought to be appropriated for the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act?

Mr. MIKVA. Of course, every time we pass an appropriation bill it could be acknowledged that we are siphoning off funds from one purpose for some other more needed field.

But I would merely point out to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) that our track record in the juvenile delinquency field has been far from one that would suggest that Congress has already been spending too much, or even enough money in this field, because we clearly are not handling this problem.

As indicated before, even as we can

point with some pride to the lowering of the overall crime rates in some of the large cities—and not very many of them—we still have to acknowledge the fact that juvenile delinquency and juvenile crime continues to rise. We simply have not found the answers. I am hoping that this \$2 million, very little of which will be spent this year, but at the rate of \$2 million a year, will enable us to get some good out of the other money we are spending by getting the results of the research out into the field where it is needed. Right now we are chasing ourselves by not even using what we are finding.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I support the legislation before us today, H.R. 45, which will establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. I have cosponsored this bill; and, as a member of the subcommittee that considered it, I can attest to the need for legislation that will deal effectively with the problem of juvenile crime.

To illustrate the severity of this problem, it has been shown in various studies that arrests of juveniles for serious crimes increased by 78 percent from 1960-68, while the population of individuals below the age of 18 increased by only 25 percent. Juveniles are responsible for one-half of all serious crime in this country, and between 50 and 75 percent of those arrested will be arrested again.

In an attempt to design a solution to this problem, H.R. 45 will establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. The Institute will provide a data coordinating center for the collection and distribution of the information regarding the preparation of studies, and the operation of training programs for the treatment and control of juvenile offenders. An important aspect of the Institute's work will be the training and information it will provide for local as well as State and Federal personnel connected with the treatment and control of juvenile offenders.

The Institute will be under the operational guidance of a Director, appointed by the President, who will employ and supervise a staff, acquire property, receive donations, and appoint consultants.

The overall policy and operations of the Institute will be supervised by an Advisory Commission composed of 21 persons who will be appointed by the President. These 21 individuals will be comprised of people from the Federal and local level who have had experience with juvenile crime.

A major aspect of the Institute's organization is its administrative independence. Matters regarding juvenile crime are currently administered by the Justice Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Under the provisions of H.R. 45, the Institute, aside from the utilization of Federal personnel and facilities, will have individual control over the administration of juvenile justice.

Judging from the lack of success at reducing juvenile crime in the present system, it seems evident that new methods are needed. The problem should be studied from a new vantage point. I believe there is a necessity to establish an independent framework that would study new approaches and develop new programs to deal with juvenile crime. This legislation will establish an Institute that will help fulfill this function, and I urge the House to support it.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 45, the juvenile justice bill.

More than 100 House Members have cosponsored this legislation including myself. It also has the support of such distinguished organizations as the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, the National PTA, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, the American Parents Committee, the American Bar Association, and the American Civil Liberties Union.

Last December, under suspension of the rules, H.R. 45 was approved by the overwhelmingly affirmative vote of 246 ayes to 127 nays. However, this fell three votes short of the required two-thirds, and therefore, we have the opportunity today to vote again on this important measure.

The bill now before us would establish an independent institute for continuing studies of juvenile justice charged with the responsibilities of collecting, preparing, and disseminating data bearing on juvenile justice and providing training to personnel in the juvenile justice area. H.R. 45 authorizes appropriation of \$2 million annually for each of four fiscal years, beginning in fiscal year 1972, to carry out these provisions.

Presently, the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are sharing responsibility for dealing with problems involving juveniles. Despite the efforts of these two agencies, however, statistics show that approximately 50 percent of all individuals arrested on criminal charges in the United States are juveniles, and almost three-fourths of youths once arrested are rearrested within a few years.

In testimony submitted to the Judiciary Committee, Milton G. Rector, Director of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, said:

In the last fiscal year the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (in the Department of Justice, only planned to spend 14.6% of their state block funds in the area of juvenile delinquency. Of this pitifully low amount only 14.1% was spent on training. HEW's performance has been equally disappointing. In the last fiscal year they expended only 12.9% of their resources on training.

It is apparent from the foregoing that strengthening our policies and practices in the area of juvenile justice is urgently needed. An independent agency would be more effective in determining and implementing new methods for coping with the juvenile offender problem. It would also bring greater coordination and more efficient functioning to our juvenile justice system by training people at the State and local levels in the newest and

most effective methods of treatment and control of juvenile offenders and by disseminating information and expertise in the field of juvenile delinquency treatment and control.

The urgent problem is apparent. A meaningful solution is offered by H.R. 45. I urge my colleagues to join in bipartisan support and early enactment of H.R. 45, the juvenile justice bill.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 45, of which I am a cosponsor. This bill would establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice which would have two basic purposes. It would first disseminate information and expertise in the field of juvenile delinquency treatment and control. Secondly, it would train people at the State and local levels in the newest and most effective methods of treatment and control of juvenile offenders.

One of the major problems which must be dealt with in the area of crime is that of repeat offenses by juveniles. I understand that almost three-fourths of the youths once arrested are rearrested within a few years. This is completely unacceptable.

The juvenile justice system has for far too long suffered from a lack of coordination. To date the Departments of Justice and Health, Education, and Welfare have unsuccessfully shared the responsibility for dealing with these juvenile problems. H.R. 45 would establish an Institute which would be entirely outside of and largely independent of the executive branch. It will for the first time provide for an organized program of sharing expertise and disseminating information.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this very important legislation.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, today we have before us H.R. 45, a bill to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. I am happy to say that I am a cosponsor of this bill which I feel meets the need for an organized program for sharing expertise and disseminating information in the area of juvenile justice.

If we are serious in attempting to overcome our national crime problems, then we must take advantage of this opportunity to pass H.R. 45 as a positive approach to juvenile corrections; providing the expertise, training, and education to all of the persons who deal with the juvenile daily. I would like to express my strong support of this legislation and at the same time urge that my colleagues do also.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 45, a bill to establish an independent Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. I am a cosponsor of this measure and have given it my active support in the Judiciary Committee.

I wish to commend my friend and colleague, Congressman TOM RAILSBACK, for his determined efforts on behalf of this bill during the last several sessions of Congress. I also wish to commend Congressmen ABNER MIKVA and EDWARD BISTER for their leadership on this issue.

The "reform" schools, trade schools,

and youth prisons have failed in their efforts to rehabilitate juvenile offenders. The depth of that failure is revealed by shocking statistics from my own State of Massachusetts: Half the inmates of adult prisons served time during their youth in reform or trade schools—including almost all those serving life sentences—most reform school graduates end up in adult prisons, and between 60 and 80 percent of youthful offenders serve more than one term in reform schools or juvenile prisons. For the Nation as a whole, one study showed that 79 percent of all offenders under the age of 20 released from correctional institutions in 1963 were rearrested by 1969.

The growing literature on prison reform, by and about convicts, indicates that the criminal "style" is often, if not invariably, defined during youth. According to Dr. Jerome Miller of the Youth Services Department in Massachusetts, boys become hardened criminals because of the treatment they receive in the State's so-called youth correctional institutions.

The boys had their heads shaved and were required to go naked 24 hours a day. When they arrived the guard told them to bend over, spread their cheeks to "show their brains". When they did so they were whacked with a stick.

If you want to produce criminals, Dr. Miller suggests—

You would design a training school or penitentiary.

H.R. 45, which would establish an independent institute to study juvenile justice, is an essential part of the reform movement which must be undertaken to cope with the pattern of perpetual criminality which tragically characterizes the prison population of our country.

This bill would provide training programs for individuals involved in the juvenile delinquency control and treatment fields. It would provide facilities to collect and disseminate data on juvenile crime. It would fund studies of the operation of the juvenile justice system.

These functions are not now being performed in any coordinated manner. As I listened to the testimony regarding this measure in the Judiciary Committee, the frequent descriptions of the gap between prudent proposals and the current state of juvenile justice made a deep impression on me. We simply do not have a responsive institutional framework to train individuals or to study and propose reforms in this field.

I greatly regret that this bill comes here today under the shadow of controversy. The executive agencies which are responsible for the control of juvenile crime—the Departments of Justice and Health, Education, and Welfare—claim they have been doing, or are capable of doing, an adequate job. Unfortunately, the statistics belie their claims. Milton G. Rector of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, who 2 years ago suggested in testimony that the proposed Institute be under HEW-Justice Department control, has since written to the Judiciary Committee expressing his disappointment at the performance of these two departments, and supported

the independent institute concept embodied in H.R. 45. Other experts have expressed similar sentiments.

Finally we must realize, with Dr. Jerome Miller of Massachusetts, that by reforming the juvenile correction system, we can apply a pressure by implication to the American penal system as a whole.

Dr. Miller observes:

Historically, reform comes through the juvenile door. If I close the training schools, it'll be harder for them to say they must have closed settings for adults.

As a much-needed reform in the dispensing of juvenile justice, and as a long-overdue first step in the overhaul of the entire corrections system, H.R. 45 deserves the support of every Member of the House. The Judiciary Committee has studied existing programs with great care and has concluded that we need a new approach. I urge my colleagues to support that recommendation.

I wish to insert at this point the following article from the Boston Globe of April 9, 1972, entitled "Could Society Cope Without Prisons?" by Deckle McLean:

COULD SOCIETY COPE WITHOUT PRISONS?

Before the end of 1972, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts will probably have no prisons for non-adult offenders. Three counties, however, will maintain training schools; thus the year will not be as remarkable as it might. And yet, as quiet and unnoticed as the step is, it will be a genuine landmark.

With it, the state in effect allows—although individual judges may use the county schools to circumvent this purpose—that young criminals will no longer be institutionalized in any enduring way, in fact, that crime by then will no longer lead to what we have come to think of as punishment. This is a precedent, and it obeys a curious truth about penal systems: that they may effectively achieve certain ends, but have not worked to control crime.

Credit for closing the state schools will go foremostly—if he will take it—to Dr. Jerome Miller of the Youth Services Department, a reformer who has had some success inside the prison system. Committed to eliminating cruelty and to moderating the effects of institutionalization, he has rather decisively altered his corner of the prison network. In his three years as Youth Services Commissioner he has also, as one would expect, run afoul, particularly, of some of his staff and of punitive minded legislators. Miller has closed several youth prisons already—the boys' quarters at Bridgewater and the Boston Girls Home. He has moved children into foster homes, established a cottage system to replace the single inmate population at the Lyman School in Westboro, sent spies into the detention centers, and developed something like an Outward Bound program. Now, he will put all of his kids into half-way houses and foster "group" homes, no more than ten per location; in some cases, better situations than they were in before their crimes. And he has done this well aware that he is applying a pressure by implication to the whole system. "Historically, reforms come through the juvenile door" he observes. "If I close the training schools, it'll be harder for them to say they must have closed settings for adults." The unrevealed purpose of closed penal institutions, says Miller, is to create criminals.

But what kind of provocation is this? Everyone knows, do they not, that the purpose of prisons is to eliminate criminals, either by forcing them out of their criminality or by locking them away for other people's security.

This attitude, however—holding that prisons are devices of crime control—can be maintained only through the acceptance of the most blatant contradiction. To reject evidence, of course, is not necessarily bad, nor is contradiction itself: sometimes these are necessary—truth may be nice, but it's the untruths that sustain. Yet, rejections of the order of magnitude here, suggest that something very important, if undisclosed, is at stake. The evidence, for example: In Massachusetts, at least half the inmates of adult prisons served time in "reform" schools when younger; the available figure is that about 40 percent of adult convicts have been in Massachusetts youth service division training schools, plus an undetermined number in county training schools and out-of-state reform schools. Furthermore, according to informal polls, almost all lifers in Massachusetts have come through in-state training schools. Furthermore, a majority of reform school graduates go on to grown-up prison; and between 60 and 80 percent have returned to youth service prisons after a first sentence. Furthermore, although the United States hands out the longest sentences of any Western country, it has the highest rate of recidivism: 74 percent return within five years. In terms of their stated purposes, then, prisons don't work.

"Professionally, adults could be handled without institutions," says Miller, "but, politically, probably not. Maybe within my lifetime, I will see prisons regarded as stupid. Because as a way to control crime, they are really nonsense. Prisons give no real security to a community because usually the prisoner will come back. But I seriously question whether society is ready for a world without prisons. Can society tolerate the rehabilitation of prisoners?" Miller, who comes from Minnesota, and trained for five years in a Maryknoll seminary before turning to his present work, has made certain discoveries. We call them discoveries: they are ideas which came to him as discoveries; and might be taken similarly by others. The discoveries, then, boil down to a single theme: that penal institutions serve a social need which is not physical security; but is instead, the desire to externalize our own ogreishness.

"The evidence is," he says, "that we need a certain number of scapegoats, and the penal systems have produced them. Actually, there aren't that many terribly dangerous people. And people that produce dangerous situations are not necessarily dangerous, given other options. A purse snatcher is, I suppose a dangerous person, but not if he can see life in terms of alternatives to purse snatching. Even if you took a regular well run penitentiary and opened the doors, added some new programs and talked to the inmates about them, most of the prisoners would stay, probably 70%. So you have to sort out how much of the dangerousness we have created ourselves. For example, a boy came to us (the Youth Service Board) on a murder charge. He had been part of a group that robbed a store, and one of the other boys shot the storekeeper. Eventually, he went to court as a material witness in the trial of one of the others, and the judge wanted to know what he was doing out walking the street. The boy was thrown in jail and stayed there for nine months. When he got out we hired him to work in the office here. Usually, the way to handle him would be to put him in jail for three or four years; and he would be more dangerous when he came out.

"It is easy, though, to institutionalize someone. It lets everyone off the hook. Then the psychiatrist comes along with something that makes you feel better: 'Oh, he's a psychopath.' Actually out of every 1000 prisoners, there are probably no more than 20 who couldn't be safely out on the street. They're not all mad dogs."

The role outside professionals in providing labels is one of Miller's peeves. "Diag-

nosis, particularly of the criminal of whatever type," he has written, "is in part a social control mechanism that provides the dominant social system with the means of disregarding the products of its own internal contradictions . . . The movement, for instance, from moral models of delinquency ('moral imbecile') to medical models ('constitutional psychopathic inferior') to psychological models ('character disorder') to behaviorist models (the individual who is unresponsive to verbal conditioning) has hardly altered the violent treatment of such defined persons . . ."

He offers a description of the Massachusetts training schools as they used to be. "The love had their heads shaved and were required to go naked 24 hours a day. When they arrived the guard told them to bend over, spread their cheeks to 'show their brains'. When they did so they were whacked with a stick. If you wanted to produce psychopaths," he suggests, "you would design a training school or penitentiary."

But what is ultimately wrong with these institutions is their capacity—let's say this is an identifying characteristic—to convert the dreams of well intentioned reformers into nightmares, a result, Miller says, of not allowing the participation of prisoners and of getting no feedback from them.

"The California prison system was once considered one of the most enlightened psychologically, but now the psychological adjustment center at San Quentin has become the worst place in that prison." The most benign devices can become punitive when made available within a setting defined as punitive. This is particularly true in prisons, Miller says, because inmates have no say in what happens to them. "Consideration and decisions include only staff and administrative concerns. Recently a guard at Norfolk revealed the mishandling of prisoners, and then he and his family had to move because they were threatened; but it wasn't the inmates that threatened him. Yet there wasn't any interest in finding out who was threatening him. Prisoners are basically a captive population, at best treated paternally, at worst exploited. But unless you're going to turn them out into a totalitarian society, you must give inmates some say in their lives."

Perhaps this is easy talk for Miller. He is, after all, concerned with youth, who by his own acknowledgement, are less threatening to those who oppose reforms. It is perhaps remarkable that he has almost deinstitutionalized his own shire. But if it became a distinct possibility tomorrow morning that adult penitentiaries would be replaced by decentralized, community based, small group rehabilitation programs without locked doors; the public reaction would likely be close to panic.

Ultimately, among the truly Boschian images that haunt the timid and well-scrubbed, there is that one of escaped convicts in the night, packing like wolves and doing their worst. The options then loom to extremes, to either cage the prisoners or have them wild in the streets, even though, and Miller makes this point, they may be less dangerous than persons who have never been incarcerated.

The local ledger, then, reads somewhat as follows: The youth service prisons—the Shirley School in Shirley, the Lyman School in Westboro, and the Girls Industrial School in Lancaster—will be closed. Miller will collect the locks and mount them as souvenirs, as he did with the Bridgewater lockwork. About 350 kids will be scattered. Meanwhile the Essex, Hampden, and Middlesex county training schools where abuses have recently been reported—such as forced calisthenics in manure piles—will continue indefinitely, as will also the youth service department's own three detention centers in Roslindale, Worcester and Westfield, where nearly 1000 kids await trial, and where Miller found staff

abuses as recently as six months ago. And beyond that, 5500 grown persons will remain institutionalized in the state's penitentiaries and county jails. For Miller, then, small gains, to be sure: but the change has clear direction.

Ignoring even questions of humaneness or charity, most people who want less crime will eventually have to account for this kind of argument—it's coming on strong now—you cannot produce public security by recolling from criminals, or by using punishment to distinguish them from yourself.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, the time for this legislation is now. It is in fact long overdue. The interests of our youth have for too long been sandwiched in between the bureaucratic concerns of super agencies, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Justice Department, and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Even when legislative authority exists juvenile justice is the recipient of more talk than action.

Establishing an institute for continuing studies of juvenile justice will help us attain the goals we have set. I have long supported the aims of this legislation, and am a cosponsor of H.R. 46 a duplicate bill with the same aims as the matter before us now.

I contend that we are getting only minimal benefits for the hodgepodge of laws now on the books whose principal aims are to secure adequate, swift, and effective juvenile justice. And the reasons for that is that the agencies charged with administering these laws are too busy with other matters to give them the attention they require.

Too often, the needs of the juvenile are considered as an afterthought to the main concerns of these agencies. The study and administration of juvenile justice is a highly specialized field. The effective handling of juvenile offenders is the last best hope of making a serious and an effective dent in the crime problem as a whole. There is a pressing need for an organized program for sharing expertise and disseminating information in this field. By no measure have the Federal, State, or local governments successfully discharged their responsibility for dealing with problems of the aberrant youth. To the contrary, things have been getting worse instead of better.

I contend that the answer is not money alone. A good deal of the money we have already spent has been wasted through inefficiency, poor planning, duplication of and triplication of studies, and by embarking on long range and expensive studies that are not among the most urgent needs in this field.

And, Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand the negative view the administration takes of this bill. Their reluctance to go along with the long-range economies that will result from the efficient administration of juvenile justice finds itself today was achieved in a system in which the Departments of Justice and Health, Education, and Welfare have shared but which has failed miserably in dealing with the problem.

I say we should not continue to send good money after bad. Let us do it now before another generation of youth is lost.

Mr. Chairman, as an example of the third and fourth rate priorities given juvenile matters by these two giant Departments of Government, I would like to cite the letter of Richard G. Kleindienst, Deputy Attorney General, contained in the report of this bill. In the letter, Mr. Kleindienst, for the administration, opposes this legislation, and in so doing he says of Justice and HEW:

In particular they have agreed to work together and with the States to develop procedures to enable each State to submit a single comprehensive criminal justice plan which will comply with the statutory requirements of both the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act and the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act! . . .

This is proof of my argument. Now, some 3 years after both of the acts he mentions have become law, the two principal agencies involved have finally agreed to "work together." Wonder of wonders that little is accomplished. Since these acts became law and were funded to the tune of millions of dollars, several million more young people have become teenagers and have come into contact with the law, have become a burden on law enforcement, the courts, and the detention facilities. But the aims and the purposes of these laws were bogged down with third, fourth, and fifth rate priorities in the super agencies and there were little or no hard results for the public.

Elliot L. Richardson, Secretary of HEW, in a similar letter for the administration in disapproving of this bill, says:

We are working with the Department of Justice in determining the types of training to be carried out by each of our authorities and the type of data collection and dissemination in which each department should be involved . . .

Again, Mr. Chairman, Justice and HEW seem to be involved in a tug-of-war over who will do what while juvenile justice deteriorates even further. There has been enough of this bureaucratic infighting, fumbling, and confusion. Let us get on with it. The best way to do that is to establish and institute for continuing studies of juvenile justice, find out what is wrong with the present system, get the results to the people where they will do some good.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, once again I rise in support of the establishment of an Institute for Continuing Studies or Juvenile Justice. I was strongly in favor of this legislation when it first came to the floor last December under suspension of the rules. The bill before us today, as introduced by my distinguished colleague Tom RAILSBACK, would provide much-needed specialized training for juvenile court judges, probation officers, and others who work with juvenile offenders. More specifically, the bill would authorize \$2 million per year for implementation of these studies for fiscal years 1972 through 1975. Certainly, this is a small price to pay to strengthen a system that presently is far from successful.

We have, in this country, a "prison crisis" of major proportions. Our rate of successful rehabilitation of criminal

offenders is a meager 5 percent. Our prisons and our penal institutions suffer from neglect, waste, and human degradation. If we are to start reform anywhere, surely our juvenile system is the logical and most needy area in which to begin.

I am very proud, Mr. Chairman, to be a cosponsor of H.R. 45. It is my opinion that this legislation could be the initiatory force for a new type of national criminal justice system—a system that would have as its main objective the rehabilitation and reabsorption of our juvenile offenders into society as productive citizens.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it is a great privilege to rise today in support of H.R. 45, which would establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. This was the first piece of legislation which I introduced during the 92d Congress, and I think it is one of the most important.

Our Nation is now attempting to grapple with a serious crime problem. The root of this problem has been attributed to a number of causes: increased drug usage, breakdown in morality, poverty, urban congestion, and the like.

But an important factor that is often overlooked is the effect of incarceration on juvenile offenders. The irony of the present situation lies in the fact that our society does not know how to treat these young people. At times they are treated differently from adults, and given harsher penalties in juvenile institutions than an adult offender would receive in a traditional jail for a similar offense. Only recently has it been recognized that juveniles possess the same rights under the Constitution as do their adult counterparts.

In contrast, these youngsters are sometimes treated as adults, and incarcerated along with adults in overcrowded prison facilities. This experience allows these young people to become acquainted with some of society's most hardened criminals, and teaches them the lessons they need to know to continue in that profession.

Of course, the problems which we experience in juvenile justice are but mirrors of the problems with correction facilities throughout the country. Lack of adequate personnel, facilities, and counseling services are all part of this pathetic picture.

Our Nation must begin to realize that unless we commit ourselves to taking an early interest in young offenders and their problems, we are almost certain to force them into lives of crime, drug abuse, and despair.

I urge passage of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

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

SECTION 1. Part IV of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"Chapter 404.—INSTITUTE FOR CONTINUING STUDIES OF JUVENILE JUSTICE

"Sec.

"5041. Establishment; purpose.

"5042. Functions.

"5043. Director and staff.

"5044. Powers.

"5045. Advisory Commission.

"5046. Location; facilities.

"5047. Curriculum.

"5048. Enrollment.

"§ 5041. Establishment; purpose

"There is hereby established an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice (hereinafter referred to as the 'Institute'). It shall be the purpose of the Institute to provide a coordinating center for the collection, and the dissemination of useful data regarding the treatment and control of juvenile offenders, and it shall also be the purpose of the Institute to provide training for representatives of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers, juvenile welfare workers, juvenile judges, and judicial personnel, probation personnel, correctional personnel, and other persons, including lay personnel, connected with the treatment and control of juvenile offenders.

"§ 5042. Functions

"The Institute is authorized—

"(a) to serve as an information bank for collecting systematically the data obtained from studies and research by public and private agencies on juvenile delinquency, including, but not limited to, programs for prevention of juvenile delinquency, training of youth corrections personnel, and rehabilitation and treatment of juvenile offenders;

"(b) to publish data in forms useful to individuals, agencies, and organizations concerned with juveniles and juvenile offenders;

"(c) to disseminate pertinent data and studies (including a periodic journal) to individuals, agencies, and organizations concerned with juveniles and juvenile offenders;

"(d) to devise and conduct in various geographical locations, seminars and workshops providing continuing studies for persons engaged in working directly with juveniles and juvenile offenders;

"(e) to devise and conduct a training program of short-term instruction in the latest proven-effective methods of prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency for law enforcement officers, juvenile welfare workers, juvenile judges and judicial personnel, probation officers, correctional personnel, and other persons, including lay personnel, connected with the treatment and control of juvenile offenders; and

"(f) to develop technical training teams to aid in the development of training programs within the several States and with the State and local agencies, which work directly with juveniles and juvenile offenders.

"§ 5043. Director and staff

"(a) The Institute shall be under the supervision of an officer to be known as the Director of the Institute who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve for a term of four years. The Director of the Institute shall receive basic pay at the rate provided for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

"(b) The Director shall have authority to supervise the organization, employees, enrollees, financial affairs, and all other operations of the Institute and may employ such staff, faculty, and administrative personnel as are necessary to the functioning of the Institute. The Director shall have the power to acquire and hold real and personal property for the Institute and may receive gifts, donations, and trusts on behalf of the Institute. The Director shall also have the power to appoint such technical or other advisory councils comprised of consultants to guide and advise the Advisory Commission. The Director is authorized to delegate his powers under this Act to such persons as he deems appropriate.

"(c) If the Office of Director is left vacant, by resignation or otherwise, the President shall appoint a successor who shall serve for the unexpired portion of the term of office.

"§ 5044. Powers

"The functions, powers, and duties specified in this Act to be carried out by the Institute shall not be transferred elsewhere or within any executive department unless specifically hereafter authorized by the Congress. In addition to the other powers, express and implied, the Institute is authorized—

"(a) to request any Federal department or agency to supply such statistics, data, program reports, and other material as the Institute deems necessary to carry out its functions. Each such department or agency is authorized to cooperate with the Institute and shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consult with and furnish information and advice to the Institute;

"(b) to arrange with and reimburse the heads of Federal departments and agencies for the use of personnel or facilities or equipment of such departments and agencies;

"(c) to confer with and avail itself of the cooperation, services, records, and facilities of State, municipal, or other public or private local agencies;

"(d) to enter into contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, or individuals, for the partial performance of any of the functions of the Institute;

"(e) to compensate consultants and members of technical advisory councils who are not in the regular full-time employ of the United States, at a rate to be fixed by the Director of the Institute but not exceeding \$75 per diem and while away from home, or regular place of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently; and

"(f) to report to the Congress at appropriate intervals on programs which have been implemented with the cooperation of the Institute within and among the several States, and to recommend to the Congress further legislative action which may appear desirable.

"§ 5045. Advisory Commission

"(a) The overall policy and operations of the Institute shall be under the supervision of an Advisory Commission.

"(b) The Advisory Commission shall consist of the Director of the Institute, the Attorney General (or his designee), the Director of the United States Judicial Center (or his designee), the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health (or his designee), and fourteen persons having training and experience in the area of juvenile delinquency appointed by the President from the following categories:

"(1) law enforcement officers (two persons),

"(2) juvenile or family court judges (two persons),

"(3) probation personnel (two persons),

"(4) correctional personnel (two persons),

"(5) representatives of private organizations concerned with juvenile delinquency (four persons), and

"(6) representatives of State agencies established under the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 or under title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (two persons).

"(c) Members of the Advisory Commission shall serve for terms of four years and shall be eligible for reappointment, except that for the first composition of the Commission, one-third of the members shall be appointed to one-year terms, one-third to two-year terms, one-third to three-year terms, thereafter each member's term shall be for four years. 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. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect, or malfeasance in office.

"(d) While performing their duties, members of the Commission shall be reimbursed under Government travel regulations for their expenses, and members who are not employed full time by the Federal Government shall receive in addition a per diem of \$100 in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) The Director shall act as Chairman of the Advisory Commission. The Commission shall establish its governing rules of procedure.

"§ 5046. Location; facilities

"(a) A suitable location for the Institute shall be selected by the Advisory Commission.

"(b) Following the selection of a location for the Institute, the Director, with the approval of the Advisory Commission, shall—

"(1) acquire such property as has been selected pursuant to subsection (a), and

"(2) make such arrangements as may be necessary or desirable for the construction, equipping, and physical organization of the Institute.

"§ 5047. Curriculum

"The Advisory Commission shall design and supervise a curriculum utilizing a multidisciplinary approach (to include law enforcement, judicial, correctional, and welfare as well as probation disciplines) which shall be appropriate to the needs of the Institute's enrollees.

"§ 5048. Enrollment

"(a) Each candidate for admission to the Institute shall apply to the State agency established under the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 462; 42 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.), or the State agency established under title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 198; 42 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), in the candidate's State. The State agency or agencies shall select an appropriate number of candidates and forward their applications for admission to the Director of the Institute. The Director shall prescribe the form of all applications for admission to the Institute and shall make the final decision concerning the admission of all students or enrollees.

"(b) While studying at the Institute and while traveling in connection with his study, including authorized field trips, each student or enrollee in the Institute shall be allowed travel expenses and a per diem allowance in the same manner as prescribed for persons employed intermittently in the Government service under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code."

SEC. 2. The table of contents to "PART IV—CORRECTION OF YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS" of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

"403. Juvenile delinquency ----- 5031" the following new chapter reference:

"404. Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice ----- 5041".

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. KASTENMEIER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 7, after "collection" insert "the preparation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, line 7, after "studies" insert "(including a periodic journal)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, line 11, insert:

"(d) to prepare, in cooperation with bar associations, Federal, State and local agencies, and appropriate individuals and private agencies, such studies as it considers to be necessary with respect to juvenile justice and related matters including comparisons and analyses of State and Federal laws and model laws and recommendations designed to promote an effective and efficient system of juvenile justice:"

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman move to strike out the last word?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the author of the amendment, the committee chairman—how will this amendment that is now pending before the Chamber, the committee amendment, affect the existing provision of the juvenile delinquency act, section 407(a) which reads as follows:

"Sec. 407. (a) There is hereby established an Inter-Departmental Council on Juvenile Delinquency (hereinafter referred to as the 'Council') whose function shall be to coordinate all Federal juvenile delinquency programs.

"(b) The Council shall be composed of the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or their respective designees, and representatives of such other agencies as they shall designate.

"(c) The Chairman of the Council shall be elected by the members of that body at their first meeting which shall occur not later than 30 days after the enactment of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act Amendments of 1971.

"(d) The Council shall meet a minimum of six times per year and the activities of the Council shall be included in the annual report as required by section 408(4) of this Act."

(b) The first sentence of section 408 is amended by striking out "who are consulted and".

Now how will this advisory council with the bar associations and various agencies that are provided in the amendment—how will all of that affect the coordination program of existing law?

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAILSBACK. It would be my belief that to the extent that the language is inconsistent and preemptory, it would supersede the language to which you referred, if this is enacted into law.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In other words, if I am correct, then the bill now before us and the amendment being offered by the committee to the bill, H.R. 45, the amendment now being offered by the committee would supersede existing law?

Mr. RAILSBACK. What it would do, since it would be enacted at a later time, if it is enacted, to the extent that it would be inconsistent or contradictory—it would supersede previous enactments of law. I am not certain, however, if the committee amendment is inconsistent or contradictory.

I might mention to the gentleman, this information comes from the recommendations of the Select Committee on Crime which held hearings concerning the problems of juvenile delinquency and this is precisely the language recommended by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment which is now before us is going to supersede language in an existing bill which is under the jurisdiction of another committee on which there has been no hearings—is it in order then to raise a point of order on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is not in order. The amendment has already been reported and debated.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, in the light of the explanation by the author of the bill that the amendment before the House now is going to supersede the language in an existing bill by another committee, I had no way of knowing that this was the intention of the committee in offering the amendment that is now before the House, that is, the committee amendment.

But if they are going to supersede an existing law, I want to know whether it is proper to make a point of order against the amendment, and I was on my feet trying to protect the reservation.

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

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. I think the gentleman misunderstood my remarks. I did not say it was superseded. I said if it was inconsistent. I am not at all sure from what the gentleman read that anything would be inconsistent, but as the gentleman knows, to the extent that it would be inconsistent, it would be superseded. I am not saying that that is the case.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It seems to me if that

is, indeed, the case, we are going to find at some subsequent time that by adopting this amendment, which is a committee amendment, we shall have negated a very substantial portion of an Act previously enacted or passed by the House which came out of another committee, a committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter. I am raising the question of whether or not a point of order lies on this particular amendment.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. The bill before us does not amend the act that you refer to, and does not eliminate or otherwise strike out the Advisory Council you refer to. Accordingly, it is not eliminated or struck down in this particular bill.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONER. Is it not a fact that when the committee amendment was offered the gentleman from Illinois was on his feet, that he stated while on his feet that he reserved the right to object, and the Chair refused to recognize him to make that reservation, but the Chair did recognize him under the last word provisions of the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman was recognized for 5 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the reporter read back the gentleman's request wherein he reserved the right to object and he was not recognized for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not recognize the distinguished gentleman from Illinois to reserve a right to object because there was nothing pending to support such a reservation.

Mr. WAGGONER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONER. Does the Chair then admit that he refused initially to recognize the gentleman to state his reservation?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the right to recognize.

Mr. WAGGONER. Does the Chair refuse now, having initially refused to recognize the gentleman, to permit the gentleman to state his reservation? Does the Chair now recognize him for that purpose?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not recognize the gentleman from Illinois for that purpose at this time.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, the RECORD will show tomorrow that the Chair refused to recognize him for that purpose.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will state it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Two previous committee amendments were accepted and

adopted by the Committee of the Whole after the Chair asked if there were any objections to the committee amendments, and having heard no objections the Chair ruled that the two amendments were adopted.

This is the third amendment, and it is my understanding that it takes unanimous consent to adopt a committee amendment. The Chair having asked for such unanimous consent, I at that point said I reserved the right to object and asked for recognition. The Chair declined to recognize me for that purpose but rather recognized me for 5 minutes under the procedure striking the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair at that time had not put the question on the committee amendment and there was no unanimous consent request pending.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. For the record, did not the gentleman from Illinois state his reservation immediately upon the reading of the amendment by the Clerk?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, however the Chair at that time had not put the unanimous consent request on the committee amendment.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Is it then illegal under the rules of the House for the gentleman from Illinois or any other Member of the House to state a reservation upon the reading of a proposed committee amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had not put the question, and therefore there was nothing to reserve.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If that be the case, then it will be in order for the gentleman from Illinois to state his reservation and make that reservation when the question is put. Am I correct?

The CHAIRMAN. It is too late at this point to raise it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. How can it be too late if it is required that the question be put before the House before an objection can be made?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the question on the amendment now pending.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Will the Chair please advise the House then under such proceedings at what time a reservation can be made to object to a proposed committee amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman could have raised a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will state it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, in the light of the explanation of the Chair just now, how could the gentleman from Illinois voice a reservation when the Chair had not even put the question to the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had not put the question; after the amendment had been read the gentleman could have reserved a point of order or make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Would the Chair please respond to my last question, wherein I asked that the Chair advise the House exactly when and how such a reservation could have been stated by an objector?

Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary inquiry is simply this: Where then does the point of order become allowed?

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the committee amendment was reported.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Is that not the point at which the gentleman from Illinois asked for recognition to state a reservation?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman could have raised a point of order.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, do not the rules of the House allow a prospective objector to reserve a point of order, to institute, to make an inquiry, and at the conclusion of that inquiry either withdraw his reservation of objection or make an objection?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not allow a reservation to object since there was nothing pending to object to, or to reserve the right to object. The Chair was trying to recognize the gentleman, so he could speak for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. There was no point of order.

Mr. WAGGONNER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Would the Chair respond to my last question as to whether or not the rules of the House allow a potential objector to a proposed amendment to state a reservation, to conduct an inquiry, and at the conclusion of that inquiry to withdraw his reservation or make an objection?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not let the gentleman from Illinois reserve the right to object since there was nothing pending to object to.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will state it.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that the Record would show, if it were read back, that the gentleman from Illinois rose desiring to reserve an objection to the amendment and did at no time mention a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes it was to a unanimous-consent agreement to the committee amendment, but the Chair had not put the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SISK. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will state it.

Mr. SISK. Is it not a fact that there was no objection that would have lain on that particular occasion? There was no unanimous-consent request pending, and therefore an objection was not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SISK. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and the chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 28, noes 22.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, line 19, redesignate subparagraph "(d)" as subparagraph "(e)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, line 23, redesignate subparagraph "(e)" as subparagraph "(f)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 4, line 6, redesignate subparagraph "(f)" as subparagraph "(g)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 6, lines 20 and 21, strike out "Congress at appropriate intervals" and insert in lieu thereof "President and the Congress annually".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 7, strike out lines 4 through 20 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) The Advisory Commission shall consist of:

(1) the following officials of the Federal Government:

(A) the Director of the Institute;

(B) the Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration;

(C) the Director of the Bureau of Prisons;
(D) the Administrator of the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration;

(E) the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health;

(F) the Director of the United States Judicial Center; and

(2) 15 persons having training and experience in the area of juvenile delinquency appointed by the President from the following categories:

(A) law enforcement officers (two persons);

(B) juvenile or family court judges (two persons);

(C) probation personnel (two persons);

(D) correctional personnel (two persons);

(E) representatives of private organizations concerned with juvenile delinquency (five persons); and

(F) representatives of State agencies established under the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 or under Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (two persons).

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 8, strike out line 26 and on page 9 strike out lines 1 through 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Members appointed by the President to the Advisory Commission shall serve for terms of four years and shall be eligible for reappointment, except that for the first composition of the Commission, one-third of these members shall be appointed to one-year terms, one-third to two-year terms, and one-third to three-year terms; thereafter each of these member's terms shall be for four years. 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. Any member appointed to the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 12, lines 1 and 2, strike out "such sums as may be necessary" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000,000 during fiscal year 1972, and \$2,000,000 annually for the three succeeding fiscal years".

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, whether or not we can under the provisions of the LEAA legislation and the Juvenile Delinquency Act do the things proposed by this legislation, to me is really not in question because the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who administer those two proposals, believe that they can.

I am sure most of you have had some experience with changing the minds of the bureaucracy. We need this proposal like we need another hole in the head, because we have to have one to begin

with in order to be creating such a new institute. It will overlap.

If Mr. RAILSBACK's answer to me earlier about prohibitions is good, then the only thing we need to do—and I do not know whether we need to do this or not, but it was his answer—is to provide more money under existing programs.

However, now Mr. RAILSBACK makes the argument that we ought to create a new, separate and apart institute for continuing studies on juvenile delinquency and pattern it after an institute in the Federal Bureau of Investigation for education and training purposes.

Let me point out to those of you who have any doubt that the institute to which he refers is domiciled in and supervised by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which is domiciled in and controlled by the Department of Justice.

Now, if this Institute elects to use as a pattern an institute which is domiciled in and functions under the Department of Justice, why in heaven's name cannot this job be done in the Department of Justice under the provisions of existing legislation?

But, I am going to tell you why it will not work.

You can pass all of the institute legislation you want to pass. It never can work under the conditions which exist.

First of all, no President is going to sign a piece of legislation into law that is opposed by his Attorney General and by his Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But, even if he did, the language of the bill is so poorly drawn that it can never work.

They say that HEW and the Department of Justice will not now cooperate with each other. Under the language of this bill, how on earth can you expect they would cooperate with this Institute if life were breathed into it?

I want you to take the bill and turn to page 5, paragraph 5044, which has to do with "powers" of the Institute. On line 14, the last two words on line 14, there is the following language:

In addition to the other powers, express and implied, the Institute is authorized—

And listen to these two other words—

To request any Federal department or agency to supply such statistics, data, program reports, and other material as the Institute deems necessary to carry out its functions. Each such department or agency is authorized to cooperate with the Institute and shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consult with and furnish information and advice to the Institute.

There is no mandate here that gives any authority to this Institute to transfer any existing legislation to supersede laws already resting with the Department of Justice and with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

You are laminating another layer on the Federal bureaucracy. You are accomplishing absolutely nothing. You are creating a consultants' paradise. This \$2 million if you spend every penny of it, will never get down where it will do any good. You are going to subsidize these highly paid consultants to travel, to come to Washington and talk about studies.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to stop studying and start doing something about the

problem. We must let the courts do something about it and mete out punishment where punishment is required under the law and you will see something then that is done about it.

But, legislation and government cannot do it. The people in the homes of this country can do more to stop juvenile delinquency than you and I will do if we live to be 10,000 years old and if Congress lasts forever. It simply cannot be done by this mechanism.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have had my doubts and have debated with myself about this particular measure, because I think perfectly reasonable and legitimate arguments can be made and have been made on both sides of the issue.

Everything the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK) said about the horrifying conditions which this measure is designed to meet is absolutely true—absolutely true.

Everything that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) says to the effect that money alone will not cure it is equally true.

The real question is how effective will this measure be?

If it is going to be truly effective, to reach even in part the evils the gentleman from Illinois speaks about, then the money involved, although a substantial sum, is really no object, because if we could meet those problems to a substantial degree, we really would be accomplishing something most worthwhile.

Mr. Chairman, no one can really say whether this bill will be effective or to what extent it will be effective. I am one who tends to be a little skeptical about how effective legislation can be in many cases.

But, nevertheless, we have to make an effort, and there are a few things that are true. One is that juvenile justice has pretty much, both locally and federally, been a stepchild so far as criminal justices and the courts are concerned. Another is that the juvenile is where we begin; if we have any chance to do anything constructive in this field it is to begin with the juvenile, the person who first gets into trouble while he is young. This measure here, so far as I know, is the first measure presented to us which is professionally tailored toward the specific problem of the juvenile.

These other programs that we have been talking about could do some of the things which are sought to be attempted in this bill, but the fact is they do not do them, and they do not intend to do them, as I understand it. There is no suggestion that under any of these other programs would this type of an institute, this type of a clearing house, this type of a training school be set up. This is an effort to specifically address ourselves to this particular problem in this particular way.

I do not know how well it will work, but I have spent a fair part of my working life in the wasteland of the present juvenile justice system and I, unlike some others, have spent it on both sides of the table, both the prosecution side and the defense side. I say that if this legislation

presents any reasonable hope, or if it will do any substantial good, it is certainly worth a try, because we are not doing anything now, and we have not been doing anything for the past 20 years, to my personal knowledge.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I support the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to announce that a memorial service will be held in the Supreme Court for the late Justice Black, at 3 o'clock.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 45. I feel that this bill as it now stands is an excellent and much-needed piece of legislation.

As you know, when the Select Committee on Crime was created, I pledged to conduct a thoroughgoing investigation of the root causes of juvenile crime and delinquency, and to seek preventive measures to thwart that burgeoning problem. Throughout our committee's hearings and investigations there was one recurring theme—the Federal Government just was not doing its share in the prevention and elimination of juvenile crime.

These findings coming after the creation of LEAA and the Office of Juvenile Delinquency were indeed surprising. The reasons, however, shortly became clear. There were many agencies within the Federal Government charged with dealing with the delinquency problem—perhaps too many. Indeed, we found 11 different bureaus and agencies with primary authority in some area of juvenile justice.

Where then was the problem? The major problem involved seemed to be the low priority these bureaus were given by their parent agency. The problems of juvenile crime took a back seat to the other affairs with which these agencies were involved.

Additionally, communication between the various agencies involved was minimal if at all existent. This led to serious problems of duplication and unwarranted and needless competition.

Assisted by a noted panel of experts including Judge Orman Ketcham of the District of Columbia Superior Court; Ralph Susman, former Acting Director of the Office of Juvenile Delinquency; Patricia Wald, former Head of Legal Services for the District of Columbia; Norman Lefstein, Associate Director of the Public Defender's Office, and Dean Monrad Paulsen of the University of Virginia Law School, the committee undertook the preparation of legislation to streamline the bureaucratic responsibilities in the juvenile justice system. In the third report of the Select Committee on Crime—Juvenile Justice and Corrections—the committee strongly emphasized the need for legislation such as this. At the same time, my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER) were preparing their versions of similar legislation. After both bills were introduced, each with many cosponsors, the

proponents of the bills held extensive discussions. The bill before the committee now contains the best portions of both measures.

I am proud of the part the Select Committee on Crime and I personally, have played in the preparation of this bill, and I am pleased with the support it has received. The research work being done in juvenile justice must be coordinated if it is to have maximum effect. The heads of each bureau or agency involved in juvenile justice must have a common forum they can meet to exchange ideas and information about their respective activities. Professionals in the field must have the opportunity to communicate to each other new ideas and concepts as they evolve. In this way, useless duplication and counterproductive competition will be avoided, and the true objects of our concern—the young people who urgently need guidance and assistance—will finally receive the attention to which they are entitled.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 45 is an important and necessary piece of legislation. I heartily endorse it and urge its passage.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this bill primarily because I believe we are again engaging in that frequent practice of rocking-chair philosophy which gives us a feeling of motion while going nowhere. I do not want to further frustrate the juvenile delinquency program with additional fragmentation.

I do not have much faith in this bill before us today. I think if we look at the District of Columbia itself I can best describe my lack of faith. I do not personally know any place in the United States where we have a higher rate of juvenile delinquency per capita, nor a place where we at the same time have as many experts on juvenile delinquency as we have here, or more employees working on the problem. And yet we have the problem.

Why do we fail to make progress? I think we fail because we try harder to excuse delinquency than to treat it. I think we have tried to study rather than to implement, and to name rather than to explain. I hasten to add at this point that I speak against the bill not because I am disinterested, but because I am sincerely interested in fighting delinquency; not because I am parsimonious, but because I believe we ought to spend our money more meaningfully.

On Saturday night last I visited three different youth aid division centers in the District of Columbia. I visited the detention center for juveniles, where modern practices accepted are in operation.

For instance, on Saturday night in one corner of the detention center they had a motion picture show. At the other end of the building, there was a dance and the boys and girls, both of whom are quartered there, were engaged in recreation with a good live band furnishing the music.

The rooms are clean. The food is good. I do not think anyone could point a

finger of criticism at this juvenile home. There is not a better juvenile bureau in any police department anywhere. Yet, we have a problem and it seems to grow. Why?

In this bill we seek again a national answer to what has to be a local problem. I think we have to move away from trying to get a standard answer to delinquency and put it on an individual basis.

The gentleman from Florida has done tremendous work in regard to the drug abuse problems of the country. He would tell you very emphatically the drug problem is a psychological matter.

I think the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH) really came closer to trying to solve this problem than any other speaker today when he pointed out that the answer to delinquency does not lie in the kind of thing that is proposed today, but it does lie rather in education and social work, in economics.

We spent \$40 million to study delinquency. With what was learned we established a juvenile protection agency. Then came LEAA. Let us make those programs work, and if they cannot work, let's find out why? Let us not add another layer of the same on top.

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

Mr. Chairman, I note in section 5043—and I ask the attention of the sponsors of this bill—I note in section 5043 the bill provides for a director of the Institute to be appointed by the President for a 4-year term. Yet, the financing of this new Institute is for 3 years—that is 3 years and some 2 months.

I wonder if the gentleman could explain why there is a 4-year term for the Director under the financing provisions?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIKVA. Initially, as I indicated before, the bill started with 4 full years, but as the gentleman from Iowa correctly points out, there are only 3 years and a couple of months left.

If the Institute continued beyond that, the authorization then would be for the 4-year period.

But as the gentleman from Iowa knows, if it does not—then the person who holds the office goes out of office by the time the authorization for the Commission ends.

Mr. GROSS. This would not be used as a nice little lever to come in at the end of 3 years, if we are so unfortunate as to see this bill passed, and use this as a lever to continue this organization?

Mr. MIKVA. I assure the gentleman that under previous examples when a commission expires, the man who held the office there—his office expires with it.

Mr. GROSS. Again, with respect to the director, on what basis did you arrive at a level 5 executive job and that kind of pay for this bureaucrat?

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

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. I would say to the gentleman that that was arrived at after several meetings with people who had

had experience in this kind of thing and suggesting to us that this would be the appropriate executive level for such a director. It was patterned after some existing Institute, the name of which I am sorry I do not have before me right now. But I remember the gentleman raising the question before about his committee's jurisdiction.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman did get into a field foreign to the Judiciary Committee, did he not, in establishing this job as a level 5?

Mr. RAILSBACK. Let me say that both in establishing the funding and in selecting the personnel and in selecting a director, in my opinion it was done carefully. We tried to come up with the proper amount of authorization. We do not think it is as luxurious, expensive, or expansive as many programs have been. As the gentleman knows, we have an itemized breakdown in the hearings which I shall be glad to refer the gentleman to.

Mr. GROSS. I seem to get the impression from the gentleman's answer that it is fashionable to establish directors for new institutes at a salary of a level 5 in the executive branch of government. It seems to be fashionable to do this. I suspect that that is the real answer to the question.

Section 5046 of the bill provides that the Institute can acquire property and enter into the construction of buildings. What is envisioned by the sponsors of this bill with respect to the acquiring of property and the construction of buildings for this brandnew Institute?

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Let me tell you my hope, and I hope that the gentleman believes me when I mention that I have been impressed with the FBI Training Academy and with the general format there. I used that as the genesis of the idea. It seems to me one of the reasons the Academy had been successful was that it involved sharing facilities and sharing personnel. When I went to the Justice Department and asked, for instance, how much money was involved in setting up the Training Academy, both the FBI and the Justice Department never did give me accurate information about what personnel compensation would be involved, and the reason is they are sharing both personnel and facilities. It would be my hope that this Institute we are talking about with \$2 million would have the same kind of experience where they would try to either rent—we do not envision building any kind of empire or any kind of bureaucracy. Rather, it would be my hope that they would live as frugally as they could. They would rent or get facilities that are in existence. That is the intent of this sponsor, and I am sure it is the intent of most sponsors.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. Well, we have been given

a lot of hope but not much promise from the gentleman from Illinois that this thing will stop short of more Government buildings with all the expenditure that goes with it. I wonder who is going to express some hope and sympathy in behalf of the taxpayers of this country?

When I was at home during the Easter recess one of the consistently angry protests I heard was to spending and taxes—taxes and more taxes—yet here today is a bill providing for a new commission in Government and the explicit provision that the Institute that will also be created can acquire property and construct buildings on it. When, I ask again, is there to be some hope—some regard for the taxpayers?

The House ought to have meaningful assurance here and now that this Institute is not going to embark upon a multi-million-dollar building program.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman very briefly, because I want to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, (Mr. MAYNE), if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Let me say in the itemization, if the gentleman checks it, I think he will get the answer to the question as far as the intent of the sponsors when we requested \$2 million. Furthermore, let me say to the gentleman what I expressed to him was my hope and belief, that this will not build any kind of bureaucracy.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman told me that previously. That is a hope and only a hope.

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

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the Institute to be created, which has been spoken of so hopefully by a number of our Members, obviously will be very dissimilar to the FBI Law Enforcement Academy. I do not think our colleagues have been quite candid with us in seeking to cloak this Institute in the mantle of the highly successful and respected FBI Law Enforcement Academy. That Academy did not start out with any \$2 million appropriation per year, nor with a level V director at \$36,000 per year and other high salaried officials such as are being asked for this Institute. At first, law enforcement officers from all over the country were sent to the FBI Academy by their own departments at local expense. They lived in the barracks down at Quantico, in the existing FBI Academy building there and they received their instruction from the regular FBI training staff with very little additional expense to the Government. These trainees now receive a per diem of only \$16 per day while in Washington. Starting with the next class, they will not receive any per diem as they will reside in the new facilities at Quantico throughout their entire period of training.

Having lived and worked in those barracks at Quantico myself, I can tell my colleagues that it is indeed a Spartan existence. It is not something set up to start with a \$2 million annual appropriation, with \$36,000 salaries and per diem

for Commission members of \$100 per day plus travel expenses.

It is misleading and inexcusably presumptuous to compare this lavish operation with the highly efficient FBI National Academy, which has been managed at minimum expense to the taxpayers while achieving outstanding results. No, my colleagues, it is clear that the Institute proposed in this bill is not going to be any Spartan operation similar to the FBI Academy.

It is not all surprising that lawyers in the American Bar Association who work in the juvenile field and a number of juvenile court judges have been lobbying for this bill. I can understand their thinking they could do a great many things with \$2 million a year. They could attend institutes and seminars and conventions and act as consultants and instructors and commissioners, all of course at Government expense.

I have attended a great many American Bar Association meetings myself through the years, and I can assure you that the lawyers and judges who attend are not quartered in barracks like those used by FBI trainees at Quantico. It is not a Spartan existence.

They occupy very comfortable and expensive hotels, but that is their business so long as they are paying their own expenses. But this bill is so loosely drawn that a good many of the people who are writing and urging that it be adopted will in due course wind up having their expenses to a wide variety of meetings, institutes, and conferences paid by the Federal Government. It may be useful but it will also be very expensive. But I suppose if I were a juvenile judge, I, too, might think it useful to be sent all over the country to meet with other judges and lawyers at the taxpayer's expense.

I think if we are going to put this additional money to work for judges, it would be more straightforward and effective to put it into improving judicial salaries rather than into these very attractive fringe benefits which are included here.

The FBI has provided the faculty for its Academy out of existing appropriations and out of FBI personnel, and the FBI Academy is under the supervision of the Department of Justice. But the Institute provided for in this bill will be wholly independent of the Justice and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments. Will it get the kind of cooperation from HEW and Justice that has characterized the FBI Law Enforcement Academy when it is being set up in opposition to and independent of these Departments? Do you think HEW and Justice will provide personnel for the new Institute? I do not.

We have enough demands on the taxpayers of this country not to set up a new \$2 million program to start with when responsible departments of this Government which are already dealing with juvenile problems are opposed to the bill. Depending on how the juvenile delinquency problem is defined, Mr. Chairman, there are already about 40 Federal programs with some direct or

indirect involvement in the juvenile delinquency area.

The Congress recognizing how much competition and overlapping there was among these programs, moved to coordinate them in the 1968 Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act. In that act we established an interdepartmental council to coordinate all Federal juvenile delinquency programs. That Council, now chaired by Jerris Leonard, Administrator of the LEAA, has been working hard to coordinate all these Federal, State and local programs.

But the Institute which this bill calls for will be still another body, wholly independent, which will be extremely hard to coordinate. It is going to work at cross purposes with existing programs.

As the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) has very ably pointed out, we already have enough programs in this critically important juvenile field. We do not need a proliferation of more programs. We need to make the ones we have work more effectively. I, therefore, intend to offer a motion to recommit the bill to the full Judiciary Committee for further consideration, and I ask all Members to join me in support of that motion.

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

I will not presume on the time of the committee to take the full 5 minutes, but I believe it is imperative that the record be set straight with respect to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE) in whose opinion I frequently respect and agree with as he is a valued colleague on the Judiciary Committee, but I cannot agree with him in this instance.

I was very personally impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL), who spoke of his visitations to juvenile centers. I know, from speaking with him often before on this subject, that he has a deep interest in the matter of the problem of juvenile crime.

I believe to characterize the men and women who work with respect to this most frustrating problem of how to solve juvenile crime on the day-to-day action level, such as the juvenile court judges, the juvenile court correction people, the probation officers, as supporting this legislation simply to take trips is unfair to the dignity of hundreds and hundreds of hard-working people in the criminal justice field.

The people who are at the action level, working as judges, know better than anybody else that the criminal justice system in the juvenile area is a failure. They are confronted not with just theoretically talking about the fact that it is a failure, but they are confronted on a day-to-day basis with trying to resolve individual cases, looking young people in the eye, knowing there is no real relief available for them yet struggling to dispose of these cases one after the other.

With respect to the cost involved here, I believe the cost in terms of possibilities for improvement is modest. We hear about taxes. Crime exacts its own tax. How many millions or billions of dollars are lost by society because of juvenile

crime? How much anguish, how much pain and suffering will occur today and tomorrow among the peaceable citizens of our country as a result of juvenile crime?

How much eagerness to work well waits in the minds, of the juvenile court forces, to apply real programs of true relief to the problem of juvenile crime?

This is so important that we need to get it coordinated by this kind of institute and this kind of legislation.

I wanted to get the record straight on those matters.

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

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

Mr. KYL. About how many people does the gentleman suppose could be trained under this legislation in the course of a year's time?

Mr. BIESTER. That would depend on the extent of the training involved. It could be as many as 1,000.

Mr. KYL. Would the gentleman be surprised to find out that today, this week, more than 500 members of the Metropolitan Police Force of Washington are going to college classes, learning police administration, juvenile jurisdiction, and so on in this one city?

Mr. BIESTER. No, I am not surprised by that figure at all. The point is that unless we get training to the personnel who work in probation, in the very tough and difficult juvenile field, we are not going to touch that field.

Of all its programs today, LEAA spends 16 percent of its resources in the juvenile field, yet 50 percent of the crimes committed in this country are committed by juveniles. That is a misallocation of resources and demonstrates less than a full awareness of the true extent of the problem.

Mr. KYL. Is the gentleman aware, if he will yield further, that in the Metropolitan Police Force, in the Juvenile Division, in Washington we have now a social agency working with police 24 hours a day every day of the week?

Mr. BIESTER. I am aware of that, and I think the men and women in those sections are searching as hard as they can to try to find a way in which they can positively address themselves to this problem. They will be the first to recognize that while they have made some progress in this field, they have not yet found a way in which to do it as successfully as they would like but they would hope in their efforts to find better facilities and better programs that they will be treated with something more than a statement that their interest in the institute if they have such interest is in trying to take a trip to some other city.

Mr. KYL. If the gentleman will yield further, what I am trying to get at here is we are talking about sending additional people to get training when we have thousands of such people taking training all over the country today.

Mr. BIESTER. But the training is not in a manner consistent with a fully coordinated arrangement, as was testified to before our committee. The whole problem is a lack of coordination. This is the

one thing that is not being done and is the one thing which needs to be done.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman bring in a bill shortly to do away with the coordinating council we now have established in the Federal Government to coordinate all juvenile delinquency efforts?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am sure every Member of this House wants to support any legislation which will make an effective contribution toward dealing with America's most serious problem, the problem of juvenile crime.

The legislation already approved by the House will be coming up for renewal very shortly, that is, the Juvenile Delinquency Act. It occurs to me perhaps—and I would like to ask the sponsors of this legislation—if there are deficiencies in the Juvenile Delinquency Act which is now on the books and the guidelines which have been established for it, would it not be wiser to offer this bill as an amendment to existing law?

I am the first to point out, as we did in our report last year when we brought up the bill, one reason why the Juvenile Delinquency Act did not work as well as it should have or could have is because there were some possible delays in implementing it. It was 18 months before a director was appointed. Guidelines were not issued for more than a year. So there were many things that had to be done to crank up the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act of 1971.

But that bill is now operating. It occurs to me if there are some shortcomings in that bill, the place to put this proviso, if there is some justification for an academy or some form of coordinating the activities of the juvenile delinquency research, then it ought to be offered as an amendment to the existing law rather than starting de novo with a whole new set of guidelines and a new director.

I say this because we have a letter which was sent to the Congress by Attorney General Mitchell, which is addressed to Secretary Richardson, who wrote as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1971.

HON. ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I share the view expressed in your letter of today that our Departments must work together to improve the national effort toward solving the problem of juvenile crime and delinquency. It is imperative that we effectively coordinate programs that are outside as well as those within the traditional juvenile justice system.

The Department of Justice, through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), will cooperate in making any administrative adjustments that are necessary to achieve the best overall effort in this field. LEAA will work with HEW and the States to develop procedures to enable each State to submit a single comprehensive criminal justice plan which will comply with the statutory requirements of both the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act and the Juvenile Prevention and Control Act. In addition, LEAA will encourage the State to include on their State and regional planning councils representatives of agencies with ex-

pertise and responsibilities in the area of juvenile delinquency prevention and control, including those aspects of the subject that are outside of the traditional criminal justice system.

Here you have the Department of Justice and HEW trying to combine their efforts and their resources to do a job which should have been done many, many years ago.

I am just wondering—and I just want the sponsors of this legislation to assure me—that with the passage of this legislation we are not going to derail the efforts that are now being made by LEAA and the juvenile delinquency people through the Department of HEW to come along with a comprehensive, meaningful program of dealing with this problem.

May I remind this House that in 1960 President Kennedy proposed to the Congress a proposal for a \$10 million research program for juvenile delinquency and the causes of juvenile delinquency.

We spent \$40 million on research into juvenile delinquency and its causes. There were Members of this House who spoke, one after the other in support of it, and as a result of this legislation we finally thought we would get the answers. We thought we would get the answers when we passed the Juvenile Prevention and Control Act of 1971.

I ask the gentleman, why not give this law a chance to work?

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Let me say to the gentleman that I do not think this institute is in any way going to derail what I think we can refer to as the bloc grant program, but I do want to say to the gentleman with reference to that legislation that there has been criticism of HEW and the Justice Department programs themselves. But let me say that in the year 1961 HEW spent 12.9 percent of its juvenile delinquency money on training programs at a time when 31 States had no training programs at all in the field of juvenile delinquency.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Surely, but the reason for that was that you do not need any more research. You can go into every single part of your congressional district and the police will tell you, the teachers will tell you, the religious leaders will tell you, the parents will tell you and the educators will tell you precisely what they need. What they need is money with which to develop effective programs. They know what the problems are. What we need is some help, and when we tried to provide that help with a \$70 million authorization in the juvenile delinquency bill, this Congress voted only a \$10 million appropriation.

If you really want to help deal with this problem, you do not need to build another building or to inaugurate a research program or another law. Give these people the money they need and they will show you how they can deal with juvenile delinquency crime. This is another instance of concentrating everything in research institutions in Washington.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I remember when I had the poverty program under consideration in my subcommittee and I remember testimony before that committee that there would be no more than 300 people involved in the administration of the poverty program, that its purpose was to coordinate existing programs.

I remember the Commission on the Aging and the same thing happened.

There are constantly proposals being made in this Congress to create new agencies and new programs instead of making the programs work.

That is why I am asking these questions. I will support the legislation if I am assured with all the criticisms that have been heaped upon HEW—that that program is not going to be derailed by the passage of this legislation and that there will not be added just another agency.

Mr. Chairman, the people of America are sick and tired of creating new agencies instead of making existing programs work.

For that reason, I would like to ask my colleague from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) or my colleague from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK) whether or not we can have some assurance that this is not going to derail existing programs?

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this additional time in order for one of the gentlemen to answer my question.

Mr. MIKVA. Let me assure my colleague from Illinois that this does not seek to replace any substantive grant programs that are in any of the other programs. This is not intended to gut those provisions of either LEAA or title II, but seeks to help the States help themselves. This is supplementary to and not replacement to the States.

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

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. As the gentleman knows, when we first passed the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act, I was very interested in it and discussed it with the gentleman and amended it on the floor.

I would be the last to try and sidetrack that program. I do not think this is duplicative. I hope, in fact, we will continue to work toward the solution of what has been a most serious problem, with which I know the gentleman agrees.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATSUNAGA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATSUNAGA: On page 2, line 13, after, "correctional personnel," insert "family counselors,".

On page 4, line 3, after "correctional personnel," insert "family counselors,".

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offer is a very simple one. It is intended merely to clarify the language now in the bill which was intended to include family counselors among those who will enjoy the benefits of the training programs.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Hawaii yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii does not provide for any additional member of any commission or any additional personnel; is that correct?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. That is correct.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. It merely tends to characterize that sort of expertise which can be used in the field?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. For training purposes, yes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. For devising and conducting training programs and the like. Is that correct?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to say that on our side we will be willing to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, we also on this side of the aisle are pleased to accept the amendment.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank both the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DORN, 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. 45) to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice, pursuant to House Resolution 897, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MAYNE

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MAYNE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAYNE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 45 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALL) there were—ayes 46, noes 35.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 133, nays 252, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]
YEAS—133

Abbott	Garmatz	Passman
Abernethy	Gaydos	Pelly
Alexander	Glaimo	Pike
Andrews, Ala.	Goldwater	Pirnie
Arends	Goodling	Powell
Ashbrook	Green, Oreg.	Price, Tex.
Baker	Gross	Purcell
Baring	Grover	Quillen
Bennett	Gubser	Rarick
Betts	Hagan	Rhodes
Blaggi	Haley	Roberts
Bow	Hall	Robinson, Va.
Brinkley	Hammer-	Rogers
Brown, Ohio	schmidt	Roussellot
Broyhill, Va.	Harsha	Runnels
Burke, Fla.	Hébert	Ruth
Burleson, Tex.	Henderson	Satterfield
Burlison, Mo.	Hicks, Wash.	Saylor
Cabell	Hull	Scherle
Camp	Hunt	Schmitz
Carlson	Hutchinson	Schneebeli
Carter	Ichord	Scott
Casey, Tex.	Jonas	Sebelius
Chappell	Jones, N.C.	Sikes
Clancy	King	Slack
Clark	Kyl	Snyder
Clawson, Del	Latta	Spence
Collier	Lennon	Steed
Colmer	Lent	Steiger, Ariz.
Conable	Lloyd	Talcott
Crane	McClure	Teagor
Daniel, Va.	McCollister	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Davis, S.C.	McEwen	Thompson, Ga.
Davis, Wis.	McKay	Veysey
Denholm	McMillan	Waggonner
Derwinski	Mahon	Wampler
Devine	Martin	Whalley
Dorn	Mathis, Ga.	Whitten
Downing	Mayne	Wyder
Evens, Tenn.	Miller, Ohio	Wyllie
Fisher	Mills, Md.	Wyman
Flynt	Minshall	Young, Fla.
Ford, Gerald R.	Mizell	Zion
Fuqua	Montgomery	

NAYS—252

Abourezk	Annunzio	Blanton
Abzug	Archer	Blatnik
Adams	Aspin	Boggs
Addabbo	Aspinall	Boland
Anderson,	Badillo	Bolling
Calif.	Begich	Brademas
Anderson, Ill.	Bell	Brasco
Anderson,	Bergland	Bray
Tenn.	Bevill	Brooks
Andrews,	Bieber	Broomfield
N. Dak.	Bingham	Brotzman

Broyhill, N.C.	Heckler, Mass.	Podell
Buchanan	Heinz	Poff
Burke, Mass.	Helstoski	Poyer, N.C.
Burton	Hicks, Mass.	Price, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.	Hillis	Pucinski
Byrnes, Wis.	Hogan	Quie
Byron	Holifield	Rallsback
Caffery	Horton	Randall
Carey, N.Y.	Hosmer	Rangel
Cederberg	Howard	Rees
Celler	Hungate	Reid
Chamberlain	Jacobs	Reuss
Chisholm	Jarman	Riegle
Cleveland	Johnson, Calif.	Robison, N.Y.
Collins, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Collins, Tex.	Karth	Roe
Conte	Kastenmeier	Roncalio
Conyers	Kazen	Rooney, N.Y.
Corman	Keating	Rooney, Pa.
Cotter	Keith	Rosenthal
Coughlin	Kemp	Rostenkowski
Daniels, N.J.	Kluczynski	Roush
Danielson	Koch	Roy
de la Garza	Kuykendall	Roybal
Delaney	Landgrebe	Ruppe
Dellenback	Leggett	Ryan
Dellums	Link	St Germain
Dennis	Long, Md.	Sandman
Dickinson	Lujan	Sarbanes
Diggs	McClary	Schwengel
Dingell	McCormack	Seiberling
Donohue	McDade	Shipley
Dow	McDonald,	Shoup
Drinan	Mich.	Shriver
Dulski	McFall	Sisk
Duncan	McKinney	Skubitz
du Pont	Madden	Smith, Iowa
Eckhardt	Mailiard	Smith, N.Y.
Edmondson	Mallory	Springer
Edwards, Ala.	Mann	Staggers
Edwards, Calif.	Mathias, Calif.	Steele
Eilberg	Matsunaga	Steiger, Wis.
Eisenborn	Mazzoli	Stratton
Esch	Meeds	Stuckey
Evans, Colo.	Melcher	Sullivan
Fascell	Metcalfe	Symington
Findley	Michel	Terry
Fish	Mikva	Thompson, N.J.
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Thomson, Wis.
Flowers	Minish	Thone
Foley	Mink	Tiernan
Forsythe	Mitchell	Udall
Fraser	Molohan	Ullman
Frelinghuysen	Monagan	Van Deerlin
Frenzel	Morgan	Vander Jagt
Frey	Morse	Vanik
Fulton	Mosher	Vigorito
Gibbons	Moss	Waldie
Gonzalez	Murphy, Ill.	Whalen
Grasso	Murphy, N.Y.	White
Gray	Myers	Whitehurst
Green, Pa.	Natcher	Widnall
Griffiths	Nedzi	Wiggins
Halpern	Nelsen	Williams
Hamilton	Nichols	Wilson, Bob
Hanley	Obey	Winn
Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara	Wolff
Hansen, Wash.	O'Konski	Wyatt
Harrington	O'Neill	Yates
Harvey	Patman	Yatron
Hastings	Patten	Young, Tex.
Hathaway	Perkins	Zablocki
Hawkins	Pettis	Zwach
Hays	Peyster	
Hechler, W. Va.	Pickle	

NOT VOTING—48

Ashley	Fountain	Moorhead
Barrett	Galifianakis	Nix
Belcher	Gallagher	Pepper
Blackburn	Gettys	Poage
Brown, Mich.	Griffin	Pryor, Ark.
Carney	Gude	Scheuer
Clausen,	Hanna	Smith, Calif.
Don H.	Johnson, Pa.	Stanton,
Clay	Jones, Tenn.	J. William
Culver	Kee	Stanton,
Curlin	Kyros	James V.
Dent	Landrum	Stephens
Dowdy	Long, La.	Stokes
Dwyer	McCloskey	Stubblefield
Edwards, La.	McKevitt	Ware
Eshleman	Macdonald,	Wilson,
Ford,	Mass.	Charles H.
William D.	Mills, Ark.	Wright

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Fountain for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. James V. Stanton against.

Mr. Davis of Georgia for, with Mr. Kyros against.

Mr. Dowdy for, with Mr. Stokes against.

Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. Moorhead against.

Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Gude against.

Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Eshleman against.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee for, with Mr. Brown of Michigan against.

Mr. Blackburn for, with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Carney against.

Mr. Smith of California for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. Stubblefield for, with Mr. Ware against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Pepper with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. McKevitt.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. J. William Stanton.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Curlew with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Clay.

MESSRS. PERKINS, RODINO, REID, DOW, FRASER, PATTEN, NELSEN, LANDGREBE, and CHAMBERLAIN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

MESSRS. McMILLAN and HARSHA changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 45.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR POW-MIA'S

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distressing things about the continuing problem of American POW-MIA's is the lack of accountability for Americans who are not listed as prisoners of war.

To date, the North Vietnamese have hold us they have over 400 Americans in POW camps. Yet, official U.S. lists indicate over 1,600 Americans either being held as POW's or who are missing in action.

The endless waiting and the harrowing uncertainty for the families of the 1,200 who are as yet unaccounted for is beyond the comprehension of most of us. There simply must be a better effort to learn the fate of these men.

Surely when a plane goes down there is some way of determining the fate of the crew. Those men who survive the crash are somewhere, Mr. Speaker. There are records and identification which would identify most of those who perished. The thoroughness with which the Communists operate would indicate that they have this information obtained from villagers or from the scene of the crash itself.

That the Communists have not released this information is further evidence of the perfidy and lack of humane consideration with which they have treated the entire question of American POW-MIA's. Whatever the situation we must exert a greater effort to find where 1,200 of our men now are and if they are alive or dead. The families of these men must not be kept hanging on faint shreds of hope.

Despite the rigors of the Vietnam war and despite the confusion which always surrounds combat operations, I just cannot believe these men have disappeared from the face of the earth without a trace.

It is possible that many of them are in the hands of the enemy—an enemy which, for reasons of its own, refuses to acknowledge their existence.

Every possible pressure, including world opinion, must be brought to bear in stronger measure on the enemy to fully disclose the names and condition of all Americans now held prisoner, and at the same time an accounting of those they know to be dead. We cannot overestimate the importance of providing in this way some small measure of comfort to the families of these men—families who have been called on to bear more heartache and pain for more time than any other group in our Nation's history.

SEVENTY DAYS, AND STILL NO WORD FROM PRESIDENT NIXON ON TAX REFORM

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 70 days since House Ways and Means Committee Chairman WILBUR MILLS wrote President Nixon asking for the tax reform proposals the President promised last September.

From the sound of Secretary of the Treasury Connally's testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, it is doubtful that the administration intends to make any commitment, beyond a rhetorical one, to tax reform.

The Chicago Sun-Times recently carried an editorial exposing once again how the 1969 Tax Reform Act has proved to be a farce in seeking to impose a minimum tax to prevent millionaires from escaping their fair share of the tax burden. A copy of that editorial is appended to my remarks.

The minimum tax is not the only gaping hole in our tax laws. I have a bill, the Fair School Funding Act (H.R. 13333), which lists seven major inequities in the

income tax structure and proposes to seal them off. That alone would generate more than \$12 billion a year for the Federal Treasury, funds which could then be available to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education as provided in title I of the same bill.

The social problems of the Nation are growing, not shrinking. But the middle-income wage earners, who have for so long borne the brunt of an inequitable income tax system will not stand still for increased taxes to find solutions to those problems. A taxpayer revolt is brewing, but the news does not yet seem to have reached the White House.

ESCAPING THE TAX COLLECTOR

The big reform of the 1969 Tax Reform Act was intended to prevent individuals with large incomes from escaping all federal income taxes. The reform resulted in the collection last year of nearly \$117 million from 18,646 wealthy individuals which they otherwise would have kept. But this amounted to an estimated 6.7 per cent of their 1970 incomes as compared to 13.8 per cent paid by all Americans. And 3,314 persons with incomes over \$30,000 a year paid no tax at all. Obviously the "minimum tax" reform is not working as the public was led to believe it would.

Many persons with large incomes are able to show no adjusted gross income because of deductions allowable under the law. The intention of the "minimum tax" provision was to insure that everyone pays something, even after the legal deductions. It provides a special tax at a flat rate of 10 per cent on certain income that is tax free under other provisions of the law, provided that the tax-free income exceeds \$30,000.

A quick glance at the provision might leave the impression that Congress intended wealthy persons to pay a tax on at least \$30,000 of income. But in setting the rate at only 10 per cent it permits a payment less than many persons in the \$30,000 bracket pay. As Rep. Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.) points out the estimate of 6.76 per cent paid by the 18,646 is less than the 7 per cent paid by a worker who earns \$6,500 a year. These statistics shoot holes in the concept that payment be based on ability to pay.

And then there's the 3,314 who paid no tax at all; included in these were 22 who had incomes over \$500,000. Apparently they had no incomes from sources covered by the "minimum tax" law.

Congress obviously needs another go at the minimum pay concept. We do not suggest, as some have, that all "loopholes" be abolished. The word is misleading. Many exemptions serve a useful purpose, such as encouraging capital investment to promote business and industry. And, of course, deductions for charity and the arts deserve encouragement. A quick way to make the minimum law pay a bigger minimum would be to increase the 10 per cent figure, but this would not affect the nonpayers. A study of nonpayers' returns might suggest reforms.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND SPACE

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days the NASA authorization bill for the 1973 fiscal year will come before the House for our consideration. This year the Science and Astronautics Com-

mittee will report out a NASA space bill which is the second lowest budget level in the last decade. But in spite of the severe financial constraints under which our space program must operate, the American taxpayer continues to see a strong return of many times on his investment in space.

The public is now more aware than ever before of the many benefits which have come out of the space program including new scientific information about our earth and universe, better communications, more accurate weather forecasting, and more effective pollution detection and control, not to mention the space byproducts in such diverse fields as medicine, education, transportation, and many other nonaerospace fields.

Another indirect byproduct of the space program which the American public fails to recognize is its contribution to our national security. Toward this end, much of NASA's research has contributed to providing our armed forces with better communications, improved navigation systems, higher precision reconnaissance, and better early warning. The vast majority of this work is not so much in the form of a threat to the security of other nations, but rather limited to assisting our own armed services in maintaining a more effective deterrent force.

I, therefore, feel that examination of this relationship between NASA space work and that of the Department of Defense is necessary to permit a more thorough understanding of the Nation's civilian space activity. All too often this subject is avoided—sometimes due to a lack of understanding of the relationship between the programs, but perhaps more often because it is considered politically expedient to ignore the support NASA provides to this country's military space program.

Unquestionably, the mission of NASA is dedicated to the peaceful pursuit of space for the benefit of all mankind. But we as a nation cannot turn our back on the usefulness of NASA work to the national defense and the importance of superiority in space to our national security.

Nor can it be denied that NASA's activities are now taking on an even greater significance. This is due in particular to the recent cutbacks in the U.S. military space budget and the continued increases in Soviet space spending.

During the NASA authorization hearings last fiscal year, I brought to the attention of my colleagues the sharp disparity between the annual outlays for space by the Soviet Union and the United States. The NASA outlay which is presently at a figure of \$3.4 billion per year, ranks a poor second to that of the Soviet civilian space program which is operating at over \$5 billion per year. Furthermore, in the area of military space, for 1971 we spent \$1.5 billion while the Soviets spent almost \$3 billion. In terms of total dollars spent, the U.S. space budget of \$4.5 billion represents less than 60 per cent of the \$8 billion total Soviet space budget.

But what should also be emphasized is that as the U.S. space budget continues to decline, the budget of the Soviet Union shows a history of steady growth. In fact, Soviet space spending for last year represented an increase of approximately 11 percent over spending in 1971.

The disparity between the space budgets for the United States and U.S.S.R. clearly gives cause for concern—not only because of the existing dollar gap but because of the worsening trend. At a time when dollar support for the U.S. space program is being withdrawn, the Soviet Union is accelerating its investment, undoubtedly the result of their realizing significant benefits directly in proportion to their investment.

Many NASA programs are being canceled outright; programs which have been underway are being drastically cut back; and virtually no new essential programs are being approved. Even the shuttle—the key to our manned and unmanned future in space—is not free from the threat.

In contrast, the Soviet Union last year exceeded its record launch rate of 81 set in 1970. Much of this activity by the U.S.S.R. is felt to represent precursor missions for the large-scale development of both major defensive and offensive space systems. The actual number of launches of the United States and U.S.S.R. follows:

Soviet Union:	
1966	44
1967	66
1968	74
1969	70
1970	81
1971	83
March 1972	2
1972	8
Total	558
United States:	
1966	73
1967	58
1968	45
1969	40
1970	29
1971	31
March 1972	3
1972	6
Total	555

But the numbers tell only part of the story; it is perhaps more meaningful to analyze the philosophical approach of both countries to space. This, in part, accounts for the wide statistical disparity.

The Russians in years past had recognized their distinct lack of technical strength. But the U.S.S.R. met this handicap with a firm determination and a dedicated drive to achieve parity with even the most technically developed nations of the world. Their successes in space have therefore been a matter of great national pride—a pride shared by the vast majority of the population.

The Soviet space feats have served to demonstrate to the world that the U.S.S.R. should not be placed second to anyone in the field of modern science and technology. And today there is no question but that the prestige of the Soviet Union has grown immeasurably as a result of their many space successes. The U.S.S.R. has taken great pride in space accomplishments and the country

has not been reluctant to exploit the attention it has been accorded with each of its triumphs.

Another point should also be made regarding Soviet support for their space program. Philosophically, the Soviet concern with space goes well beyond matters of national pride and prestige, and even the desirability or necessity of civilian and military applications. Within the U.S.S.R. there is a solid historical tradition of interest in basic science. This interest is no less intense in the present Soviet state.

An example of this is the unique position of power enjoyed by the U.S.S.R. Academy of Science. The Academy clearly operates from a special position of influence which far exceeds the peripheral and advisory role of our U.S. National Academy. Stemming from the Soviet Academy's interest in space is much of the continued support in the basic geophysical, solar, and cosmological areas as well as work in space biology and medicine.

A further important factor is that the leadership of the U.S.S.R., which is often technically educated, recognizes the economic benefit, and in fact necessity, in pursuing an expanded program of space exploration and application.

What we must recognize, therefore, is that while the U.S.S.R. continues to disavow any interest in the "space race" or in engaging in direct competition with the United States in space achievements, it has in no way slackened its support of a strong and aggressive space program. Admittedly, no one can be sure of the future course of Soviet achievements, but there is presently every indication of a firm Soviet commitment to maintain a high level of activity in space science and technology.

The reaction of this country, however, has been mystifying. I will not deny that we have "kept an eye" on the situation; but I will insist that we seem to have ignored the implications.

The Soviet space effort continues to be pursued in an orderly fashion in meeting major goals with the support of a substantial investment. In contrast, as U.S. decisionmakers waver, our space program continues to flounder.

The situation is well summed up by considering the recent words of the President's Science Adviser. In a magazine interview in October of 1971, he pointed out that:

We as a society have not been willing or able to face up to what the future of the space program will be . . . and at this point in time your guess is as good as mine.

He further emphasized that although space activity has been very worthwhile, the situation is now changing. He stressed that:

Priorities are changing and just exactly where we want to go and what we want to do in space is something that is going to have to be decided in this larger social context.

It is surely a poor situation when the best the President's Science Adviser can say is that even he does not know.

Let us look further at what some of

the major implications are if the United States further downgrades its space effort. This very same point has been touched upon a number of times by Dr. James Fletcher, the new Administrator of NASA. He has periodically warned that the United States is now on the brink of losing its technological lead. He has further predicted that it will only be a matter of time before this country will once again be forced to regroup its space industry team and outrace another Sputnik. His arguments are persuasive and firmly documented in pointing out the shortsightedness and costliness in having to reinstate a massive space program mobilization in comparison to continuing in a logically conceived and well-balanced plan.

I would further emphasize that the technological lead to which Dr. Fletcher refers has impact in areas far greater than merely science and technology. In fact, it vitally affects areas concerned with virtually every segment of our national society—science, commerce, industry, education, agriculture, aviation, communications, medicine, and national security. All are closely tied to and strongly influenced by our space achievements. But let me limit my discussion to the national security or military implications of our space work and comment further on the NASA-DOD activity.

The relationship between the NASA effort and our national security can best be demonstrated by examination of the current U.S. defense posture. Within the next decade, this Nation will be faced with the prospect of an ever-increasing vulnerability of earth-based strategic systems. This includes land, sea, and air based systems. Vulnerability is not the case with the spaceborne system, however, and for this reason the United States is now seeing it as imperative to move forward in developing a spaceborne defense posture as rapidly as possible.

To stipulate the precise configuration of a spaceborne defense would be very difficult and perhaps somewhat academic. But it is possible to define the general scope and character of such a system. Accordingly, a number of major developmental efforts must be successfully pursued including:

First, perfection of a suitable weapon—that is, nuclear bomb, giant laser, et cetera.

Second, development of a spaceborne delivery/intercept system for use against satellites and missiles.

Third, development of a spaceborne detection/command and control system.

Fourth, development of space support vehicles including a reusable booster stage, space shuttle, space tug, and taxi.

Fifth, development of semipermanent space stations capable of supporting extended manned operations.

Sixth, development of manned space operations expertise.

From an examination of the system elements listed above it is immediately evident that the work of NASA could be further developed by our defense community if so desired, especially with items 3, 4, 5, and 6.

This illustrative discussion of our future space posture emphasizes my point—the NASA mission must be evaluated in terms of the Nation's total space capability and space needs. The entire NASA complex of industries, Government operations, facilities, and procedures, as it has displayed to the world a technological excellence without equal, is as vital to our future security as the American foot soldier. It must also be emphasized that this relationship is only indirect; in no way should or will NASA violate its direction to stay out of the military arena.

But now this same complex is dying a lingering death due in part to a general lack of recognition of the relationship between the civilian space program and the overall defense posture of this Nation.

As we witnessed in the Apollo program, merely setting the initial goal is a minuscule portion of the total task. And just as it took an entire decade to achieve our objective, it may very well take a full 10 years to achieve a superior spaceborne military system. I feel I am quite safe in predicting that such a system will never be developed if the civilian space program is not permitted to continue to contribute. Viewed from another angle, the military simply does not have the budget, the expertise, and, in fact, even the charter, to develop the total system. Clearly, by cutting back the NASA program we are relegating such an essential system to the status of a pipedream.

A spaceborne defense system is achievable in terms of current technology and presently foreseeable advances. The first nation that seriously undertakes to develop and put into operation such a system will undoubtedly bring about a shift in the entire balance of global power. The nation with such a capability at its command could conceivably represent the single major international power for the next decade if not through the rest of the century.

I emphasize that the sufficiency of our investment in space cannot be determined merely in terms of domestic priorities but, as my discussion illustrates, by such major considerations as global power relationships. We must keep in mind that we cannot operate in the vacuum which takes into account only internal needs. In the real world, this Nation's priorities must be established not only in terms of domestic priorities but with regard to achieving an effective foreign policy—a major ingredient of which is our military strength and capability. Without our military strength, and it goes without saying, a superior capability in space, this country will reach the point where we will no longer be able to emerge from a political confrontation with our foreign policy objectives intact. It is immaterial whether the confrontation be in the Middle East or Western Europe or the Caribbean.

These factors have long been appreciated by the Soviet Union. We have seen it in the sustained drive by the U.S.S.R. to truly increase and modernize her technological and scientific capability. And most assuredly we have seen it in the Soviet dedication to space. Where

our strategic military posture has been one of defense in order to assure the necessary balance and capability, the Soviet Union has continued in a driving pursuit of not only defensive systems but major offensive systems—not the least of which have included some highly sophisticated and advanced spaceborne systems.

Although the Soviet Union continues to claim that its space effort is scientific in character, it is clear that many of the missions pursued carry military applications. Soviet work in two fields, communications and meteorology, comes immediately to mind. Specifically, the Soviet Union was the first nation in the world to put into operation a domestic communications satellite system. The system has now been functioning since 1965. While in the field of meteorology, the Soviets have achieved international recognition for their work in sensor technology. In fact, many of the Russian weather pictures originally exchanged between the United States and the Soviet Union contained pictures of higher resolution than the U.S. meteorological satellites were able to produce.

By integrating the meteorological and communications satellite systems, the Soviet Union now has available a weather reporting and prediction system as advanced as any throughout the rest of the world. Furthermore, the next generation of sensors which are now under development in the U.S.S.R. are thought to be aimed at measuring temperatures and moisture at various altitudes in addition to permitting the complete depiction of ground features through cloud cover. We must recognize that accurate weather data is absolutely vital to the optimum utilization of military forces. It is no secret in fact that weather service is as essential to army, navy, and air force movements as it is to the agricultural industries. Clearly, this activity, although represented in a commercial or civilian vein, has heavy carryover into military applications.

The military value of Soviet work in the fields of navigation, traffic control, geodesy, and mapping is no less evident. Again, effort on these systems is not specifically labeled as military, but this activity certainly relates to the military mission. As an example, work on geodesy could contribute directly to developing the data base for precision missile targeting. And it is no secret that military operations are large volume users of highly accurate maps.

It is also of major consequence that the Soviet's military observation satellite activity under the Kosmos program represents the largest single element in Soviet space operations. These photographic reconnaissance missions fly throughout most of the year and provide the U.S.S.R. with virtually continuous global coverage. Although the Kosmos program flies unmanned or automated satellites, there continues to be speculation that even the manned Soviet spacecraft carry extensive mission work associated with military observation research and development tasks. The point is worth reemphasizing—the Soviet

Union flies the largest number of photographic payloads of any world nation and there is every reason to suspect, given the high priority these satellites continue to enjoy, that the Russians are receiving a sizable "dividend" on their investment.

Two of the Soviet space systems, however, have thrust the U.S.S.R. far beyond this country in terms of U.S. capability: the Soviet Union has both an orbital bombardment system and a space-based interceptor/destroy system for which there are no U.S. counterpart systems. The fractional orbital bombardment system—FOBS—has been flown in the Soviet Union since 1966 with a total of 16 flights being recorded through last year. Although U.S. experts have doubted the cost-effectiveness of the FOBS system, its presence in the Soviet inventory greatly complicates U.S. planning. The advantage of these vehicles is that they are able to fly multiple routes including using a depressed trajectory. This advantage both reduces early warning, and complicates detection system operation and location.

The same large launch vehicle which puts up the FOBS is also used to launch satellites capable of making a close pass by another satellite, presumably for purposes of flight inspection and potentially for destruction. The Soviet Union has undertaken several of these intercept missions on its own spacecraft. The threat of such a capability is to be able to deny the use of space to other nations. And what must be recognized is that the United States has no capability comparable to either the FOBS or interceptor/destroy system. Furthermore, the Russians can be expected to continue to fully exploit these two concepts.

But the Soviet Union is also expected to pursue the development of space systems and space technology on a much wider basis than the FOBS and interceptor/destroy satellite series. The work will be aimed at further enhancing the military usefulness of space in a number of ways which are nonaggressive and in complete accord with existing space treaties. There is, therefore, strong likelihood that the Soviet space capability will be greatly expanded through introduction of the use of high-energy fuels, nuclear propulsion systems, reusable shuttle vehicles, and permanent orbiting stations.

In fact, one of the most urgent questions of the future direction of the Soviet program relates to the pace of their development of reusable ferry vehicles equivalent to the American space shuttle. The U.S.S.R. is repeatedly on record to the effect that single-use rockets are obsolescent and that ultimate economies in space lie in the reuse of booster vehicles. The question of their developing a space shuttle is thus one of timing. But considering the large dimensions of the Soviet space program, there is excellent justification for the early investment in this type of a reusable vehicle.

In all the preceding discussion, I have tended to ignore the major emphasis the Soviet Union has placed, and will continue to place, on manned space flight. In

spite of the setback in the Soyuz program with the death of the three Russian cosmonauts, the U.S.S.R. has stated that the Soyuz/Salyut effort has in no sense reached its limit of usefulness in the Soviet manned program. There are additional indications that these two vehicles will continue to serve as both an experimental test bed and a preoperational manned station. These vehicles are expected to pave the way toward the construction of a permanent manned station in the mid-1970's. Furthermore, the long-term support of manned operations which will be required should provide additional impetus to the early development of the fully reusable space shuttle.

I emphasize, therefore, that manned planetary flight consistently remains the avowed Soviet goal year after year. I can only speculate that the ultimate purpose in such activity is to make the solar system a Soviet domain and any potentially habitable bodies Soviet outposts.

A number of points should be emphasized in summary.

The Soviet Union has now built up a complex of industry, experience, and manpower talent which is fully capable of supporting their present high level of space activity. There is also no reason to expect that the Soviet Union has any plans for retrenchment in this field. In fact, even further growth should be expected considering that over the 15-year lifetime of the Soviet space program each subsequent year has seen greater activity than the year preceding.

We should also recognize that to a considerable degree, the U.S. and U.S.S.R. space programs have interacted, and will continue to interact, very closely with one another. As a result, there is speculation that the current debates within this country on space stations, space shuttles, unmanned application flights, military space, and deep space exploration have been raised as points for major debate within the Soviet Union.

But beyond these points, much of the similarity ends. In terms of the number of flights, the Soviet Union has surpassed the United States in annual missions in both civilian and military space flights every year for the past 6 years. And with regard to dollars budgeted, the continuing reduction in space investment in this Nation contrasts sharply with the budget increases the U.S.S.R. has enjoyed every year since their program's inception.

In some respects, the primary difference between the United States and U.S.S.R. pursuit of space is one of spirit and attitude. In total, the space achievements of the United States have been by far the more prestigious, spectacular, and socially useful. And this does not even begin to take into account the technology the NASA program has injected into the DOD space effort. Yet the United States continues to waver in its commitment to space with the resultant deterioration of our technical and scientific capability.

In contrast, and in spite of the Soyuz 11 deaths, the U.S.S.R. continues with its comprehensive space research addressed

to a broad number of manned and unmanned mission goals. In fact, at the very time when the U.S. manned space program will be winding down in 1973, the Soviet manned program is expected to resume once again in a comprehensive research effort encompassing earth resources, space phenomena, spacecraft systems development and biomedical studies.

Unless the full consequences of the U.S. space program cutbacks are recognized, this country will be faced with the most severe of consequences. In terms of peaceful economic competition in high technology industries this country will relinquish its leadership. The disadvantage the United States is now experiencing in the field of aviation will soon characterize its conduct in space as well. But potentially the most tragic outgrowth of space cutbacks could be the ultimate threat to our national security.

It will matter little that priorities were reordered or domestic injustices redressed if the balance of global power is no longer controlled by this Nation. In some respects we have already chosen a path destined to imperil our national security. But through fuller realization of the facts, I am confident the course can be reversed.

AMERICAN MILITARY SYSTEM RE-INTRODUCING U.S. CARCASS BEEF IN MILITARY COMMISSARIES

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time supporter of "Buy American," I have been extremely concerned to learn that our own American military purchasing system has at times been derelict in this field. During a visit with other members of the House Committee on Armed Services last summer when we toured military commissaries, we were amazed and alarmed to find that an extremely small quantity of American beef was being offered for sale to our own American military servicemen and their dependents.

Looking further into this matter, I requested from our military purchasing authorities the exact quantities of U.S. procured beef versus the quantities of offshore procured beef sold in our military commissaries over the past year. I was distressed to learn that during the period, we purchased from the countries of Ireland, Denmark, Germany, Austria, the United Kingdom, and Yugoslavia, over 23,253,000 pounds of beef compared with only 2,257,626 pounds of beef grown by the American cattle farmer.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are buying more than 90 percent of the beef sold in American military commissaries to our American troops stationed in Europe from sources other than the United States. Something is definitely wrong here, for it is the American cattleman who pays the taxes to operate this Government and—I might add—support our military throughout the world.

I was pleased to receive a letter today from Lt. Gen. Charles W. Eifler, commanding general, U.S. Theater, Army Support Command, Europe, advising me that the military is in the process of reintroducing U.S. carcass beef in some military commissaries. This action will be in addition to the present quantities of U.S. beef which are currently offered for sale as primal cuts. General Eifler has assured me that, if prices of U.S. beef and in-country beef remain comparable, U.S. carcass beef will be extended to all military commissaries.

This is a step in the right direction; I commend the Army and other agencies responsible for rectifying a situation which, in my judgment, was badly out of balance.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FLOWERS).

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, for his long-time interest in this subject. Indeed, the beef and cattlemen of America are fortunate to have his attention and representation in this body.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

PRESIDENT IS EXCEEDING POWERS OF HIS OFFICE

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to oppose, in the strongest manner possible, the current reescalation of the war in Southeast Asia by both North Vietnam as well as the United States. We cannot exert any power of decision over the North Vietnamese, however, we are empowered to exercise control over the decision-making of the United States. The United States is currently committed, by the Executive, to a new course of action in this war that no longer has the sanction of the Congress, which passed and rescinded—under legislation which I introduced in March of 1968—the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Furthermore, the President has ignored the provisions of the Mansfield amendment, passed by both the Senate and the House and thereby ignored the expressed direction of this body.

The President has conducted this adventure in a dictatorial fashion, acting on his own without prior consultation with the Congress, which violates the constitutional powers of the Congress which has the sole right to "declare war" and "to make rules for the regulation of the land and naval forces" of the United States. Unless the President comes before the Congress to seek specific legislative authorization for the continued prosecution of the war, he has exceeded the powers of his office. We in the Congress must undertake steps to prevent the further erosion of our constitutional duties and powers.

Mr. Speaker, all wars have their horrors and shocks. However, in this war

which Americans have watched and read about in their homes every night for the past 10 years, we have had to endure one cruel shock after another. The Gulf of Tonkin incident, the Tet offensive, the My Lai massacre, the Cambodian invasion, the clandestine war in Laos, the drug abuse problem, the Pentagon papers, and now this latest reescalation have all profoundly shocked the American people. The Nation has been divided by the war, national priorities have been altered drastically, our deficit balance of payments has increased dangerously and even the sacred balance between the branches of the Federal Government has been damaged by this war. The Indochina war has caused the United States to lose its preeminent position of moral leadership in the family of nations and has caused a serious lack of trust in the American people for their public officials.

I need not review at this late date the scaling down of our objectives in Vietnam. The record shows that it has been a long process necessitated as much by our failure on the battlefield as by our failure at the negotiating table. Our Government is supposedly committed to a prompt withdrawal, yet we are now involved in a massive air war which can only mean that our involvement is changing the arena from one on the ground to one in the air. We are continuing to fight a war that, if fought at all, should be fought by the Vietnamese. All the studies which I have read indicate that the kind of heavy bombing which we are doing at this very moment is of questionable strategic value at best.

The President is apparently willing to jeopardize the lives of additional Americans, jeopardize the lives of the growing ranks of our POW's and MIA's, and risk the involvement of other nations in this conflict in the hope of achieving the elusive goal of winning the war. We cannot afford these risks. The ultimate outcome of this ill-fated war will be the same whether we stay 1 more day or 1 more year. The best way for us to protect our remaining troops is to get them out now.

More than 25 years ago an American statesman said:

Older men declare war. But it is the youth that must fight and die and it is the youth who must inherit the tribulations, the sorrows and the triumphs that are the aftermath of war.

A generation of young Americans has fought and died in this war; we have already inherited the bitterness and the divisiveness of this cruel war. The suffering can only be deepened by the President's prolonging of the war.

During the past 2 weeks I have spent the majority of my time working to develop methods that we, the representatives of the American people, could utilize to alter the current policies of the Executive. The American people, according to every sampling of opinion, want develop methods that we, the Representatives we must totally involve ourselves with this important task. It is time, high time, for the Congress to reassert its role in the field of foreign affairs and to be

responsive to the will of its electorate. It is time for us to say enough and to end this war and to end it now.

TRIBUTES TO THE HONORABLE F. BRADFORD MORSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SEIBERLING). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained this special order to attempt to do the impossible—to give adequate recognition to the accomplishments of our friend and colleague, F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts. How can we sum up in 1 hour his 11 years in the Congress and his long and distinguished career of public service?

As you know, BRAD MORSE will leave this Chamber in a few days to accept the position of Undersecretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs at the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, only one man has held this position in the past—the late Dr. Ralph Bunche. We all know the record of commitment to peace and human understanding which distinguished that great American. I believe there could be no better choice to fill those spacious shoes than BRAD MORSE.

BRAD has been a conscientious and effective legislator and representative of the people during his tenure in the Congress. As a fellow member of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, I know firsthand the hard work and dedication which has characterized his every endeavor.

Early in his career, BRAD singled out the area of foreign affairs as one of primary importance—and one which desperately needed the logic and clearheaded analysis which BRAD brought to every issue. The combination of objectivity and commonsense we saw every day in the Congress will, I believe, insure his success in his new and crucially important position at the United Nations.

BRAD MORSE's overriding concern in the Congress has been the quest for peace. First elected to the Congress in 1960, BRAD has been an early and ardent advocate of a settlement of the tragic conflict in Southeast Asia. He was widely credited as the principle architect of the deescalation strategy for lessening our involvement in Vietnam, with which President Johnson drew the North Vietnamese into negotiations in the spring of 1968. During the 91st Congress, he was the chairman of Members of Congress for Peace Through Law. BRAD also served as a congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation at the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, and has contributed valuable time as a member of the Council of Foreign Relations, as director of the Pan American Development Foundation, and as a delegate to many U.S. interparliamentary conferences.

But above all, BRAD MORSE is a man of character. Born in the mill town of Lowell, Mass., BRAD grew up to serve his country in the infantry during the Second World War. After the war, he grad-

uated from Boston University Law School, and taught at BU for 4 years.

BRAD came to Washington as counsel for the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee and later was chief assistant to Massachusetts Senator Leverett Saltonstall. In 1958, he was appointed by President Eisenhower as Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

The expertise he gained in these positions earned him the respect and esteem of the voters, as demonstrated by his election to the Congress in 1960. Since then, that esteem has grown as the Fifth Massachusetts District returned him consistently to the Congress.

We in the Congress have benefited from the wisdom of the voters of the Fifth District. BRAD's thoughtful and well-articulated arguments have always carried great weight in this body and throughout the Nation.

BRAD's departure will diminish the luster of the House of Representatives, but cannot help but increase the stature of the United Nations. BRAD, on behalf of all of our colleagues, godspeed in this most recent stage of your illustrious career.

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD a statement from George Bush, and other material, as follows:

STATEMENT OF AMBASSADOR GEORGE BUSH

I am very pleased to learn of Secretary General Kurt Waldheim's selection of Representative Bradford Morse as Under Secretary General of the United Nations.

As a former colleague in the House of Representatives, I know him as an extremely able, dynamic and personable individual. His strong and decisive nature and a long-time interest in foreign affairs should get him off to a good start in carrying out the best traditions of international civil service. With a rich background in the legal, academic and legislative fields, Brad Morse will work well with the Secretary General and his other executive appointees. I wish him well in his new career.

[From the New York Times]

"NEW LIFE" AT THE U.N.

The appointment of Representative F. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts to be an Under Secretary General of the United Nations arouses mixed feelings. As top-ranking American in the U.N. Secretariat, Mr. Morse will be replacing the late Ralph J. Bunche, though his duties will not be identical with Mr. Bunche's. Many at Turtle Bay and elsewhere will regret that President Nixon did not designate an experienced diplomat for the post.

Another cause for regret at home will be the further depletion of the ranks of liberal, internationalist Republicans in the House, where Mr. Morse had built an impressive record and twelve years of seniority. The qualities that made him an able and useful member of the House and of its Foreign Affairs Committee will serve Mr. Morse well as Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs.

Mr. Morse will be joining the Secretariat under the new Secretary General, Kurt Waldheim, who says he wishes to "breathe new life" into the organization. Mr. Waldheim has offered to the People's Republic of China the job of Under Secretary General for Political Affairs and Decolonization and has named the U.N.'s first woman Assistant Secretary General—Mrs. Helvi Sipilä of Finland.

With experience, Mr. Morse no doubt will

discharge his U.N. duties with distinction but he will be missed on Capitol Hill.

EDITORIAL

Subject: Brad Morse of the U.N.

Republican Congressman F. Bradford Morse is leaving the Massachusetts Congressional delegation. On May 1st, the veteran lawmaker will become the highest ranking American within the framework of the United Nations.

WEEI congratulates Brad Morse on his appointment to the post of Undersecretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs and thinks President Nixon did well in recommending Morse for the important job. The outgoing Congressman's achievements have been recognized by WEEI in the past. On a number of occasions, we found Brad Morse in the vanguard of thought on important international issues.

It was January 16, 1969, and Washington and Peking seemed worlds apart. Face to face diplomacy was out of the question, but not to Brad Morse. Speaking in Haverhill, the Congressman called for opening conversations with the Chinese. Morse said he was sure his proposals would raise some eyebrows, but that he still felt the talks "would be good for the United States and for the cause of world peace." As they say, the rest is history.

Fully a year before President Johnson limited American bombing of North Vietnam as a means of getting the Paris peace talks underway, Congressman Morse had already proposed offering a gradual lessening of the air raids provided negotiations got underway.

Forward looking proposals like these and an all-round progressive philosophy made Brad Morse a very good Congressman. Now he moves on to U.N. headquarters in New York to fill the position left vacant by the death of Dr. Ralph Bunche. Replacing the late Dr. Bunche is a large task, but WEEI feels F. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts is up to the job.

MAN IN THE NEWS: F. BRADFORD MORSE—A MORE WORLDLY VIEW
(By Michael J. Berlin)

WASHINGTON.—Why would a 50-year-old Congressman with pleasure in the role, pride in the craft and a super-safe district want to exchange all that for the serpentine upper reaches of the United Nations bureaucracy?

Ask F. Bradford Morse, a liberal Republican moving to New York on May 1 to become UN Undersecretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs. He tells you of his conviction that "international relations have a greater effect on the lives of Americans—or Ghanaians, for that matter—than anything else," and goes on to explain that while he feels he has left his mark "in a modest way" on the House, "this job will be a job of a different sort . . . and clearly larger."

Ask a colleague, and you learn that after 11 years as the Representative from Lowell, Mass., Morse was bored. Put the same question to still another tenant of the lower chamber, and you are also instructed that not every ambitious, hard-working liberal Republican can find happiness in a House run by Democrats—a frustration compounded by the fearful passage of time.

"At 50, you tend to stop being the House's bright young man," a neighboring legislator says.

At 50, Frank Bradford Morse seems a bright middle-aged man, friendly, open, plump, and bearing an uncanny resemblance to the comedian, Jonathan Winters. The major wall decoration of his office here testifies to Morse's consuming concern with foreign affairs: an immense map, perhaps 8 by

20 feet, of the world, which will travel with Morse to his new quarters on the 38th floor of the UN.

The office—the rank, if not the precise place—last belonged to the late, celebrated Ralph Bunche, and Morse got it because he asked for it. And because three other candidates reportedly turned it down, apparently discouraged by the vagueness of the duties.

The State Dept. had proposed two former UN Ambassadors, William Buftum, now our envoy to Lebanon, and Richard Pedersen, now State's counsel. UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim himself, asked Christopher Phillips, the No. 2 man in the U.S. delegation, to take the job.

President Nixon finally proposed Morse for it, but the post is formally Waldheim's to bestow, and that is what he did on Monday after the two men had their first extended talk in New York the week before.

Back in his office here the next day, Morse seemed hazy about much of his role, did not expect to know more "until I talk further with the Secretary-General. We talked of the job only in broad brush strokes."

But the Congressman exuded a quiet confidence about the qualities he feels he will carry with him to New York, speaking of his "peculiar talent" for finding areas of agreement among representatives of widely divergent views.

Another gain for the world organization will be Morse's splendid energy, the sort of capacity for overwork that often carries poor struggling upwardly mobile boys to the seats of power.

Bradford Morse's first name suggest the usual important old family connections, and people often assume, without even asking, that he is descended from the Mayflower Bradfords. Actually, he is a third-generation American named after the Bradford House apartments in his native Lowell. "My mother liked the name."

His father, Frank, died when Morse was 9, and he and an older brother were reared by their mother Inez. "We weren't poor, we weren't rich," Morse related. Nevertheless, economic necessity sent him to work at the age of 15. "I was an usher for a while."

In his late teens, Morse, a product of a wholly apolitical family and upbringing, made a critical discovery. "I decided that public affairs had importance. Vanity was part of it, I guess. Any politician who doesn't admit vanity is kidding himself."

The Army got him before the electorate, however. During World War II, Morse progressed from infantry private to lieutenant. Afterwards, he went to Boston University and then to its law school, graduating in 1949. He taught law there, as well as practicing it, for the next three years.

Early in the 1940s, Morse had registered as a Republican, the quickest way up for a young Protestant politician in that time and in that place. In 1952, he won his first election to the Lowell City Council. The next year, Morse came to Washington as counsel to the Senate Armed Services Committee, later moving into the office of Sen. Leverett Saltonstall to become the Massachusetts Republican's chief assistant. Morse's predecessor in the job was Eliot Richardson, now HEW Secretary.

(Richardson was and remains a friend and mentor; it was he who is said to have pushed Morse's name to the White House for the UN post.)

From the Senate job, Morse moved over to the Dept. of Veteran Affairs to become deputy administrator for two years. In 1960, he went home to run for Congress, seeking election in a district that was largely Catholic and Democratic. Lowell has sent him back to Congress five more times with generous pluralities. In 1968, for example, he got 60

per cent of the vote while Richard M. Nixon could muster no more than 33 per cent.

There are many reasons for this. For one thing he is a happy-natured, friendly man who openly relishes the incessant camaraderie of politicking. For another, Morse never loses sight of his constituents; he has always gone back to Lowell on regular visits to tend to their needs.

"I'm the itinerant politician from Massachusetts," is a favorite Morse line. Itinerant, says a colleague, describes his verve and animation: "Brad loves to roam and talk and shake hands."

There is a contrasting side to his character, however. Colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and State Dept. people who deal with him there know him as a legislator who always does his homework. He has earned respect for an ability to come up with "good, solid proposals" in executive sessions and as an able, careful engineer of compromise.

Early in his career, Morse was a founder of the Wednesday Group, a collection of liberal House Republicans; he is the last surviving founder. "There are not many liberal Republicans left," says Rep. Jonathan Bingham (D-Bronx), a friend and admirer. "We're gonna miss him."

Foreign affairs attracted Morse from the beginning of his House career. He has attended international conferences as a legislative delegate, worked with groups involved in African and Latin American affairs and played a leading role in stimulating the debate on defense spending—"my proudest achievement"—and against American involvement in Vietnam.

There is no legislation bearing Morse's name, but it is generally agreed that he was an important figure in mobilizing Congressional opposition to the war. He led the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, and drafted the 1967 proposal for a partial bombing halt which President Johnson put into effect in April, 1968. And he was a supporter of the unsuccessful McGovern-Hatfield Amendment which would have set a date for withdrawal of American forces.

It came as a surprise to many of his friends, therefore, when Morse turned up as a strong Nixon man early in 1968. Morse, himself, admits he felt pretty lonely in Massachusetts GOP circles for a while. But he argues that Nixon was the only candidate who could persuade conservatives that America must withdraw from Vietnam.

After the convention, Morse became New England coordinator for the Nixon campaign. Early in the new administration, his colleagues thought they detected a shift away from his liberal foreign policy position, particularly on the question of Vietnam—"sort of smoothing off the sharp edges," says one Democrat.

Then, the word was out that Morse was hoping for a State Dept. office as an Assistant Secretary. He failed there, but perseverance paid off with the UN post, one that leaves him free to exercise his liberal inclinations. Morse's contract runs for three years and it will be up to Waldheim to decide whether to renew it.

The job Morse has in the UN does not encompass the duties assigned to Bunche, who was chief political adviser and troubleshooter in special charge of UN peacekeeping operations.

Morse will be just one of several advisers the American one—as there is a Russian one, and others. He will run the fall General Assembly session. Other "political work" will be added to his assignments, Waldheim has said, without specifying its nature.

Whatever has to be done, a number of important people seem to feel that Morse, despite a lack of diplomatic experience can do it.

Says Andrew Cordier, president emeritus

of Columbia University, who was the most powerful American on the staff of the UN in its early years, "Brad's intelligent enough to pick up the necessary expertise."

Bingham, a diplomat at the UN a decade ago, thinks it is significant that Morse's "knowledge of foreign affairs is wide, and (that) he has a deep belief in the UN and its importance."

In that role, Bunche was effective as an international civil servant who happened to be American. Morse comes to the office in the same costume, but as an old Washington hand who can cue Waldheim on how Washington might react to controversial UN moves.

"I'm not going there as State's man or as Nixon's man," Morse says insistently. "My own conscience dictates—and this is the only service that the U.S. should or would want—that I be my own man. There is no ambiguity. The Secretary-General gives the assignments."

Morse, who is "cordially" separated from the former Vera Francesca Cassilly, whom he married in 1955, looks forward to living in Manhattan. "I never have enough time when I'm visiting." (But, he says, the money—a base of \$43,750 a year—"will be tight.") He will, of course, continue to see his daughter, Susanna, 10, and son Anthony, 10, frequently. And then there's his music.

"I write music—melodies, you know. I've been doing it for 25 years for my own enjoyment—and this is without being able to read or write notes—but now I've just finished the score for a musical. It's totally first-rate. But you can't say what it's about. . . . the man who writes the words gets kinda nervous about that. We hope to get it produced. I'm afraid I won't have time now, though. What are the hours over there? Nine-to-midnight, I guess."

He faces it all without fear. "I have no apprehension. I hope I can do a job according to standards I'll set which will be pretty high. I've reasonable intellectual equipment that will enable me to grasp the essentials. And it's a job I'll do as long as I'm convinced I can make a worthwhile contribution."

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

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) for yielding. First, I wish to commend the gentleman in the well for taking this time to commend our colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. F. BRADFORD MORSE. I have worked closely with Mr. MORSE since I have been in Congress, and this is my 10th year.

He has been a stalwart, one of our leaders, and a very close personal friend of mine. I want to take this time to laud him for the service that he has rendered to his Nation and to his district.

I have been fortunate to work closely with BRAD MORSE, not only in the formal structures of Congress but in various informal organizations to which we both belong. I can truthfully say that I have never known a Member of Congress who has possessed or expended more energy in behalf of his constituents and the causes in which he believes.

Whenever BRAD MORSE became involved in something, his mere presence was a unifying agent. He refused to accept the attitude that it cannot be done and he succeeded in accomplishing what few men would even try. As a result, he earned the admiration and respect of

all who knew him, regardless of party identification or ideological persuasion.

BRAD will soon assume a post of high leadership at the United Nations. Certainly his expertise in foreign affairs and his committee work within Congress make him ideally suited for this challenging position. I take great comfort in knowing that BRAD MORSE will be giving to the United Nations what he has given us—an amazing capacity to solve differences of opinion and get things done.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to put into words how much I think of BRAD MORSE—as a statesman and as a friend. He ranks among the finest men ever to serve in this body and we will miss him very deeply. But BRAD MORSE taught us to think positive, to look forward. Though we hate to see him go, let us thank him for so much and wish him continued success.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have come to know Mr. MORSE very well. I have been associated with him closely since he began his service here in Washington, and I mean by that his service in Washington even prior to the time that he became a Member of Congress. I have come to have the highest respect for his capabilities. I am quite sure he will be missed here in the House, and particularly on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

At the same time I cannot help but take a certain pride in the fact that a Member of this body is going to a position of very considerable responsibility at the United Nations. His service will be different, but I am sure it is going to be substantial. He will have an opportunity to contribute in a significant way to his country. I would like to wish him well.

I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) for giving us this opportunity to express our best wishes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY).

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest sense of pride that I join in this special order today to honor my very good friend and colleague, F. BRADFORD MORSE. In his appointment as Under Secretary General of the United Nations for Political and General Assembly Affairs, Brad has been given the highest rank held by an American in this international organization. By naming him to replace the late and extremely able Dr. Ralph Bunche, President Nixon has recognized BRAD's hard work, undying energy and commitment to his Nation and to his fellow man.

When BRAD and I first came to Congress almost 12 years ago, the House of Representatives was a much different place. Today, 12 years later, the House has changed dramatically, and I would not be exaggerating if I attributed at least some of that change to BRAD. With untiring energy and devotion, BRAD has charged into the thick of almost every major piece of foreign affairs legislation to be considered by the Congress since 1961. His great knowledge of foreign affairs and his great mind have impressed everyone that has ever worked with him in this area, and he has established himself as one of the House's leading experts not only on Latin America, but on foreign affairs in general. He was one of the first to suggest and therefore must be considered primarily responsible for the de-escalation strategy for lessening American involvement in Vietnam which, of course, resulted in the beginning of the Paris Peace Talks in 1968.

BRAD has not confined his energies to the House. He has found the time to serve on almost a score of extracurricular activities of significance to both the House and the Nation, and he has brought the same brilliance and dedication to all of these organizations. I have been privileged to serve with him on the Canada-United States interparliamentary meetings, the Mexican-United States interparliamentary meetings, and the Anglo-American Study Group on African Affairs. I can say without hesitation that he has been a primary force in the success of these groups.

Above everything else, BRAD is a gentleman and a friend. It has been said of him that he could never take a leisurely vacation because if he stayed in one spot long enough, he probably would be elected mayor. His warmth and charm are well known, and when he greeted you on the way to the floor with his "hi ya, good friend," you knew that these were not just hollow words.

As BRAD steps into the leadership of the United Nations, I will miss him as a friend. The House will be giving up one of its most hard-working and knowledgeable Members. The people of Massachusetts' Fifth District will be losing a dedicated and able Congressman. The world, however, will be gaining an outstanding leader.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for offering us this opportunity to express our gratitude for the service of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE), in this House. I have worked with him closely on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I have found him to be one of the most imaginative and creative Members with whom I have had the pleasure of working in my 10 years of service. He has evidenced a bipartisan approach to the problems of our Nation. The talent and judgment he has dis-

played in the House perhaps explains why he has been selected for this most important and sensitive assignment at the United Nations. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts will serve the United Nations very well. His will be an excellent voice, not as a U.S. representative, but as an international civil servant. He will represent the finest qualities in the American tradition of selfless public service.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join with my colleagues to thank the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) for giving us the opportunity to express the affection and approbation which all of us feel toward our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE).

I share with all of his friends here as well as friends at the United Nations the joy at the judgment that is reflected in the appointment of this outstanding human being, a man who has served his country in the Halls of Congress nobly and well, and a man who all of us are certain will serve mankind nobly and well in this new and most important assignment.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

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

In my opinion, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE) is one of the finest Members of this body. He is imaginative, he is creative, he is a spur, and he is a stimulus. We are sorry he is leaving and we are going to miss the gentleman here.

There is no one in this body with whom any one of us will agree 100 percent of the time, but even on those occasions when I found myself substantively in disagreement with BRAD, there was never an occasion in my mind about his integrity or about the fact that he had reached his conclusions for reasons that were, as he saw it, in the best interest of the people whom he represented. This meant not only the people of his district of Massachusetts, but also the people in the rest of Massachusetts and in the United States and in the world.

The breadth of knowledge he has brought to this body is going to be sorely missed, because we can never have too many able men—I think unfortunately we are losing one of the best. We can always console ourselves, as we do in this type of situation, with the fact that we are not mourning his death, but we are merely regretting the fact that he goes from this job to another one, and in this other job he will have a chance to bring to bear the same capacities which I and other Members today have noted. We are sure the job on a world-

wide basis at the United Nations will be better handled because BRAD MORSE is joining that organization. So, we are saying not goodbye but we are saying with regret as he leaves us, *au revoir*.

Mr. CONTE. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Oregon, for his comments.

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding and for giving us an opportunity to express our admiration and a well-deserved tribute to our good friend and most honorable colleague, the distinguished Representative of the Fifth District of Massachusetts, the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE.

I have known and worked with BRAD MORSE since he first came to this House and took his oath of office in the 87th Congress on January 3, 1961. I was then just beginning my second term and felt like an old hand.

During my first year in Congress, I was one of the 16 Members of a bipartisan, bicameral group which founded Members of Congress for Peace through Law on July 15, 1959, in the Senate wing of the Capitol.

I mention this event because BRAD MORSE joined this group shortly after coming to the House and our mutual activity in MCPL has been my primary association with BRAD MORSE during the past 11 years. While I served as chairman of this group during its formative years, it was under BRAD MORSE's chairmanship during the 91st Congress that Members of Congress for Peace through Law recorded its greatest growth and won wide respect.

The steering committee which BRAD chaired included Senators MARK O. HATFIELD and GEORGE S. McGOVERN, vice chairmen, myself as secretary-treasurer, Senators EDWARD W. BROOKE, PHILIP A. HART, WALTER F. MONDALE, RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, and Congressman BROCK ADAMS, JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, JOHN DELLENBACK, PAUL FINDLEY, PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR., BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, MORRIS K. UDALL, and CHARLES W. WHALLEN, JR.

Under BRAD MORSE' leadership this bipartisan, bicameral group of Members of Congress grew from 62 to 105 members. During his administration, the group also moved from a study group to an action group focusing on legislation and set up committees on aspects of foreign policy on which members serve voluntarily because of their interest and concern.

On this occasion, as he departs our ranks to take up his new and prestigious post as Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs of the United Nations, it is relevant to recall that it was BRAD MORSE, who, as chairman of MCPL, hosted a historic luncheon on Capitol Hill honoring the distinguished Secretary General of the United Nations, His Excellency U Thant. This luncheon was held in the New Senate Office Building on July 10, 1970. It

was attended by Members of Congress, the executive branch, the foreign press, and the United Nations Secretariat. It may well have been the last visit of the late beloved Ralph J. Bunche to this Capitol. That evening, the President of the United States entertained the Secretary General at a black tie dinner at the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE's welcome to the Secretary General of the United Nations on that occasion and the text of the letter of thanks that BRAD MORSE received from U Thant.

It has been a genuine privilege for me to know and work with BRAD MORSE. He is a man of vision, imagination, patience, and wisdom. He has brought the finest in diplomacy to this body, often playing the mediator and the harmonizer in bringing diverse views and factions together for the greater good. He has displayed immense energy and has given generously of his time and wisdom to the causes in which he believed. And, despite all the pressures which we know so well, he has always maintained a warm, human, personal interest in the people around him and in their lives and fortunes.

He will be sorely missed in this body, in the Congress, and in this Capitol. Our loss, however, will be the world's gain as BRAD MORSE assumes his high post as an international civil servant of the family of man. His qualities of mind and spirit, to which we here can bear witness, will henceforth serve a higher cause and a far wider constituency—world peace through law for all the people of the world. I, for one, have every confidence that that cause and that constituency will be well, faithfully, and diligently served by BRAD MORSE, and I wish him Godspeed.

The remarks and letter follow:

REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN BRADFORD MORSE

On behalf of Members of Congress for peace Through Law, I welcome all of you to this historic luncheon. Never before has a Secretary-General of the United Nations so honored Members of the Congress. It is our very great pleasure to have you with us, Mr. Secretary-General.

Members of Congress for Peace Through Law have arranged this luncheon to pay honor to you, Mr. Secretary-General, for your long, patient, and effective efforts in your high office. We wish not only to honor you, sir, but to demonstrate our desire, as American lawmakers, to work with you to raise the United Nations to a position of accepted power and authority.

1970 marks the 25th anniversary of the United Nations. Two weeks ago today, in San Francisco, the 25th Anniversary of the signing of the Charter of the United Nations was commemorated.

The world of 1970 is very different from the world of 1945. Too many of the high hopes of San Francisco, too many of the solemn commitments of the Charter have yet to be fulfilled.

It is the purpose of MCPL, as friends of the United Nations, to focus on the future potential of the U.N., rather than laud its past accomplishments or bemoan its past failures.

Some of us are inclined to believe that

U.N. supporters have been too protective of the United Nations. Too often, excuses have been devised for not using the machinery of the U.N. and for not honoring both the spirit and the letter of the Charter. Machinery which is not used rusts and characters which are not used atrophy.

We Members of Congress for Peace Through Law number 28 members of the Senate and 70 members of the House of Representatives. We are unique in that we are both bipartisan and bicameral. We work through a number of committees, devoted to the study of foreign policy issues, on which members serve voluntarily.

We believe in the United Nations, Mr. Secretary-General, and we pray that this occasion may bring new understanding and greater cooperation which will help advance your important work.

THE SECRETARY-GENERAL,
July 24, 1970.

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE,
Chairman, Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORSE: I thank you for your kind letter of July 16. In fact it was a rare privilege for me to be invited to address such a distinguished gathering of Congressmen, and I am most grateful to you for having initiated that invitation. I shall always retain happy memories of my visit with you and sharing some of my thoughts with you.

For me it is most gratifying to know that many distinguished Americans genuinely believe in peace through law and in the need for an effective and authoritative United Nations. You, Mr. Morse, and your dedicated colleagues are a real source of inspiration to me in the discharge of my responsibilities. Let me look forward to a period of continuing contact and co-operation.

With warm regards and best wishes,
Very sincerely,

U THANT.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH).

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, and I appreciate his suggesting that BRAD MORSE's colleagues take this time to reflect upon his contribution in the Congress and his future contribution to the international body.

BRAD's departure from Congress comes at a time when there has been continual doubt as to the very nature, function and structure of this body; and a suggestion that perhaps the events of the time, and indeed time itself, may overwhelm us.

BRAD MORSE's qualities are those which are most needed in reasserting a vital role for this body in solving those critical national problems which face our Nation. His ability to reach out to those pressure points, which all of us need to recognize; his ability to have perception where others may lack perceptivity; his ability to work quietly, directly but intensely on the major problems that face our country and the world. It is this quality more than any other, perhaps, that will be missed in the Halls of Congress.

Personable though he may be, persistent though he may be, it is the quality of perception that will be missed as BRAD MORSE leaves for the United Nations.

I would suggest to my colleagues here, that is the very quality which is so sorely needed likewise at the United Nations, at

a time, too, when the United Nations will be on trial, during this next decade. There is so much to be done by a man who has the vision and perception of our colleague from Massachusetts, BRAD MORSE.

So we wish him well, fellow colleagues in the House of Representatives, but more significantly we wish well the United Nations as he goes into a position of new responsibility, always keeping his persistence, his dedication, his recognition of pressure points, his ability to perceive when others lack perception, and his persistence then to act when others merely wait.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, BRAD MORSE will be leaving the House soon, and I know all of us who have served with him will miss this very capable and dedicated legislator. His appointment as U.N. Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs is an indication of the very high regard felt for him not only by the President, but by his House colleagues as well.

It has been my privilege to observe the dedication and conscientious effort put forth by BRAD since he came to the House in 1960, during which time he has become one of the most knowledgeable and highly respected Members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

BRAD and I first worked closely together when the concept of a "Great White Fleet" was originally proposed—a concept which included establishment of a fleet of naval vessels painted white and designed and equipped to render prompt emergency aid and assistance to people of other nations upon the occurrence of famine, epidemics, earthquakes, floods and other natural disasters. BRAD was quick to recognize the tremendous potential for such a fleet, and the many peaceful and beneficial projects which could be accomplished through just such an effort. From the beginning, he has been a strong and consistent supporter of the "Great White Fleet" concept, and I feel sure he will continue to advocate the project from his new position at the United Nations.

BRAD's hard work and long hours in behalf of his Fifth District has been the key to the very effective and successful representation his Massachusetts constituents have consistently received during his 11 years here in the House, and I for one feel sure that this same hard work and dedication will be the mark of our next Under Secretary General for Political Affairs at the United Nations.

BRAD has been a good friend, and I know he will continue to be looked upon as one of the finest Members the House could have. He will be missed by all of us who have relied so heavily on his thorough analysis and evaluation of matters under the jurisdiction of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and yet we all wish him well in his new endeavor. His outstanding record thus far leaves little doubt the United Nations will be receiving an equally outstanding new Under Secretary General in BRAD MORSE.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

Mr. WHALEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE is a good friend and a great Congressman. I feel fortunate indeed to have been his colleague these past 5 years.

For over 11 years, he has served the Fifth District of Massachusetts with distinction. The attention which he has given to his constituents has been matched only by the interest and active participation which he has exhibited in carrying out his responsibilities to the Nation.

Massachusetts and the House of Representatives are losing a servant whose every undertaking is accompanied by an inexhaustible drive and energy. Over and above the usual congressional duties, which for BRAD have included the ranking minority position on the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, he has served as Chairman of Members of Congress for Peace Through Law. He also has represented Congress and the Nation at innumerable international conferences.

Despite his many and varied interests, BRAD always has been unstinting in "lending a hand" to his colleagues.

Let me cite three personal examples.

In January 1971, I served as program chairman of the International Seminar sponsored by the Dayton Council on World Affairs. Aware that this meeting would be enhanced by BRAD's background and articulateness, I invited him to serve as one of the program's speakers. He accepted with alacrity. Despite his hectic schedule, he took 2 days of his time to come to Dayton, Ohio, to help a friend.

Last fall I arranged for a group of Dayton businessmen to come to the Hill to discuss economic issues with Government officials. At the conclusion of the day, I asked several colleagues to meet with my constituents. BRAD again went out of his way to cooperate. He introduced himself to every member of the group and then, upon departing, addressed each guest by name as he made his farewells. This feat of total recall, coupled with his cordiality, enthusiasm, and thoughtfulness, won by BRAD, warm spot in the hearts of the visiting Daytonians.

On that same day, I was appointed a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Since that time, I have besieged BRAD with requests for information and advice. He has never failed to respond.

Incidentally, this great humanity also is evidenced in his relations with staff personnel. When BRAD enters the office of a colleague, he invariably acknowledges the presence of every member of the staff. This quality has made "Morse fans" out of all of the members of my staff.

His associates at the United Nations immediately will realize that their new colleague is not only an extremely

capable individual but a very gracious and warm human being.

BRAD, I again wish you much success and happiness as you begin your service as Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs. Congratulations and Godspeed.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

I now yield to my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my esteemed colleague from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks being made on the floor of the House today about BRAD MORSE.

BRAD MORSE has had a very distinguished career to date: A career in the Veterans' Administration where he did outstanding work as a staff member; a career on the Hill where he distinguished himself in the service of a distinguished Senator, our good friend, Leverett Saltonstall. He came to Congress in 1960 uniquely equipped to represent the people of his district.

I found him very easy to work with. He was very cooperative and a man who could disagree with you without being disagreeable.

BRAD is a dedicated and devoted public servant. He represented his district very well and, in fact, served the whole Commonwealth of Massachusetts with great dignity.

I know I speak on behalf of all of his colleagues from Massachusetts when I say we will miss him here in the House. He is going to leave a void in the House's delegation from our area of the country.

New England, as you perhaps know, is one of the older regions of the country and has many, many problems. BRAD MORSE always gave unstintingly of his time to try to solve those problems and he helped solve many of them.

We will miss him, but take comfort in the knowledge that he is going on to another brilliant career. I know he will do outstanding work with the United Nations, and in behalf not only of the entire Nation but in behalf of the whole world.

I wish to congratulate him and wish him well and Godspeed.

We, individually and as a group, are going to miss you, BRAD. You are one of the greatest.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks and the accolades for BRAD MORSE that have been made here this afternoon.

I would say perhaps it will be a long time before we have another gentleman from Massachusetts by the name of BRADFORD, an old Massachusetts name that comes ringing down the highways of time, but I think BRAD MORSE's perception which has been noted here today, his sensitivity and his ability to compromise and his ability to move forward and get action are qualities that will be sorely missed. While they will be missed here where we have appreciated them,

they will now be for the benefit of the world at large in his new position at the United Nations.

BRAD, we all wish you well and we congratulate the United Nations and the world for having your services.

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

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it is reassuring that notwithstanding the effusiveness of all these remarks, our good friend is alive and well and is going on to a new career. That is the most reassuring part of all of it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with all of the remarks which have been made by my colleagues in tribute to BRAD MORSE.

I had the good fortune of coming into the House when BRAD was a Member. I gratefully recall the number of times he took the time and effort to help a newcomer learn some of the things that needed to be learned.

I was also impressed that I have never seen BRAD MORSE lose his temper. I know he feels very deeply and passionately about matters, but he has always kept an even disposition and manner about him. That quality will stand him in good stead in his new assignment.

BRAD MORSE has been a good legislator, a tireless and effective worker for the good of all, and I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate him upon his appointment.

Mr. CONTE. I thank my distinguished colleague from Illinois.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I, of course, share the sentiments that have been expressed here today by our colleagues about BRAD MORSE.

He has, in fact, always had a worldwide constituency.

I remember one time, while walking with BRAD back to the Old House Office Building, when we were asked for directions by a couple of visitors to the Capitol. They were wondering where they should go next, and BRAD stopped to give them instructions and spent, perhaps, 20 minutes describing to them the features of this glorious Capitol of ours. They came from some far-off land, and I am sure they will always remember him for his courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, I remember another occasion when my daughter had to prepare a term paper on the United Nations bond issue. She asked me what I thought she should say and I confessed, "Well, I really do not know. Call BRAD MORSE." She called him and BRAD talked to her for 25 minutes over the phone that night. In the midst of his very busy life he has always been willing to help people, regardless of their age, nationality, or station in life.

Mr. Speaker, it is this kind of spirit that we must have on the world scene. President Nixon has made a very wise choice in selecting BRAD MORSE for this most important position. I am very glad for him, for our country, and for his new colleagues in the U.N.

Mr. CONTE. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I would like to join in paying my respect to Congressman BRAD MORSE on the occasion of his promotion from the House of Representatives to the United Nations.

I do not serve on any committee with BRAD and, therefore, I do not have any reason to work closely with him. However, BRAD MORSE is the kind of man on whom one instinctively homes in for advice and counsel because of respect, admiration, and trust in him.

This is what happened to me, as a freshman coming into this body, and without having the opportunity to meet all of the Members and become as well acquainted with them as I would like to be.

I find myself repeatedly observing how much I admire him, and how I appreciate the advice and counsel he has given to me. I know many other Members of both parties share my feelings. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I congratulate BRAD MORSE on his promotion to the United Nations.

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

Mr. CONTE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the remarks of commendation and good wishes for our distinguished colleague, BRAD MORSE. He has served his people well in the Congress, and he is now to assume a very important responsibility in the United Nations. He will do a good job for the United States and I wish him a great abundance of happiness in his important work.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER).

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I have learned, even in the short time I have been a Member of this body, that the quality of our system and the quality of our work product and the quality of our institution is not determined by abstractions, but is determined by and is defined by the quality of the men and women who make up our House of Representatives, and the quality of our work product together. BRAD MORSE's contribution to that quality has been enormous. I have always respected him. I have a great deal of affection for him. And I congratulate the United Nations upon having his services in the future. The world will gain from his creativity, his commonsense, and his energetic devotion to peace.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my good friend and colleague, our majority whip, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, for 11 years BRAD MORSE has served in the Massachusetts delegation as a dedicated and able legislator, a highly respected and admired colleague, and a servant of the

people of the fifth district of Massachusetts. Everyone is familiar with BRAD's affable and good-natured manner, and of course, we will all remember him for his friendly demeanor. But, BRAD's contribution to the Congress goes beyond his fine personal qualities. It was a pleasure and a privilege to work with BRAD on the many problems facing the State. For in him the people of Massachusetts had a tireless champion, and a man who understood the needs of the workingman as well as the white collar worker; the professional as well as the trade unionist. In all areas of domestic concern, whether it was the problem of unemployment, the energy crisis, or the import quota, BRAD devoted himself to the task at hand with an enthusiasm and fervor that is rare even among the most energetic public servants. While his departure from Congress will leave this Chamber diminished in stature and ability, BRAD is moving on to a job for which he is supremely qualified.

Foreign policy and foreign affairs have been his forte, his expertise, and his specialty. As everyone is aware, BRAD has been appointed Under Secretary of State at the United Nations, becoming the highest ranking American in the Secretariat. This is a position of importance not only to the United States, but to the entire world community of nations.

I know that BRAD MORSE will make an outstanding contribution to the United Nations, for after serving in Congress for these past 11 years, he has demonstrated his ability to extract the basic issues, to examine and evaluate the pros and cons, and to make a decision based on sound judgment and thorough consideration. The United Nations is fortunate to receive the benefit of his talents and his experience. I want to express my sincere and deep appreciation for the opportunity to serve with such an extraordinary individual, and at the same time offer my congratulations to BRAD on his new post as Under Secretary.

BRAD possesses that rare determination which will serve him well in the coming months, as he faces the new and exacting challenges of his job in the United Nations.

I am sure that everyone here today joins me when I say best wishes and thanks for your great friendship.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for taking this time in order that Members who have served with BRAD MORSE may join in paying tribute to him.

I received the news of BRAD's elevation with, I am sure, the same mixed emotions experienced by other Members who have had the pleasure of serving with him.

While we rejoice in the good fortune of the United Nations, we acknowledge a sense of deep personal loss. I want to acknowledge the debt all Americans owe the people of his district for making BRAD's exceptional talents available to serve the Nation. Much has been said about BRAD's skill as a lawmaker. It has

been characterized by a creativity, a positive and constructive approach to real problems.

When he speaks and acts as a legislator, it always reflects sincere convictions and high purpose. But we have also come to know, to love, and respect BRAD MORSE—the man. His actions and service are characterized by a kindness and a compassion and understanding, and a sensitivity to human problems. But perhaps among the memories that will linger longest is the freshness and good humor, and a sense of optimism for which there is a great need in a troubled world.

I think BRAD has proved the value of a smile and its therapeutic effect on all of us. He leaves a legacy of distinguished service in the House of Representatives. He embarks upon a new career which I am confident will create another legacy of even greater service.

In his new career we wish him well. He will have an opportunity to put his extraordinary talents to good use in the service of a wider constituency, the service of all mankind.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS).

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) because I wondered if our colleague, Mr. MORSE, might recall the words of Will Rogers, when the great Will Rogers had been in the hospital for a couple of weeks and recovered and was back on the job again and he said:

People could not have been any nicer to me if I had died.

The truth is it is impossible to be nice enough to so distinguished and so refined and, above all, so civil a human being as BRAD MORSE.

The President has chosen precisely the right person at the right time at the right place to advance humanity's unfinished objective toward peace and progress for all. I congratulate the President, I congratulate our colleague, Mr. MORSE, and, as Tiny Tim might have said, I congratulate us all.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my friend from Indiana (Mr. BRAY).

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I was acquainted with BRAD before he came to Congress and since that time we have become close friends. During all the time I have known BRAD MORSE I have never known him to say or do an unkind thing toward anyone. Yet he has always been a tower of strength for those things in which he believes.

We are going to miss BRAD here in Congress. We do not have enough like him. He was capable, sincere, energetic, and friendly. He is a great guy. The gain of the United Nations is our loss in Congress.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER).

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), for taking the initiative in giving us a forum for expressing our point of view and our feelings of regret and joy and good wishes to our friend and colleague, BRAD MORSE, who goes on to larger responsibilities.

While my predominant emotion at this point is one of a begrudging sense of loss that we should be without the wise counsel and unfailing friendship of one of the kindest men I have ever met, I also feel quite frankly that our loss is indeed the United Nation's gain. I would hope that the remarks made today, as genuine as they are, from so many different Members from many different States, will be forwarded to Mr. Wadlheim, the Secretary General of the United Nations.

It seems to me that BRAD MORSE offers more to that forum than even he could offer to us, primarily because there is such a need in the United Nations for his unique ability, his personal characteristics and strengths, his understanding of foreign affairs, his sense of diplomacy, his understanding of the need for giving consideration to differing and divergent points of view in pursuing the path of peace in the world, which is indeed the principal function of the United Nations.

No one in this House has pursued the path of peace more diligently, creatively, or innovatively, than has BRAD MORSE through his many initiatives in the last few stormy years. Consequently, it seems to me that he is choosing another forum at a very appropriate time, for the interests of the United Nations are the interests of the United States as well. While I personally will deeply miss him as a friend, I feel that this step is not only a wise one, but it is perhaps a necessary one. If any Member of this body wonders now whether or not the United Nations will survive, they will have to reassess their present position in view of the fact that we will have such an effective spokesman for the American point of view, for an international sense of understanding in the person of our distinguished colleague.

BRAD MORSE has been several men here. He has been a valued colleague of mine, representing a neighboring district effectively, and, in so doing, serving the State of Massachusetts and the United States with distinction.

He has been a conscientious and wise legislator and statesman, leaving his mark on the issues in committee rooms and on this floor, contributing immeasurably to the interests and advancement of this country and its people.

And to me he has been a warm and close friend. I value his advice and counsel, his assistance and his encouragement. He has been a help in need, a listening post, a counselor. It is this side of him I will miss the most.

BRAD MORSE is not just intellectually committed to this or whatever course commands his attention. He is also prepared to finish what he starts, to follow through on promises, to make both practicality and brilliance a part of the U.N. process.

He is a part of the House and the House is a part of him. So as he goes to the larger stage, he does not leave us. We go with him.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today it is indeed an honor for me to rise and pay tribute to the distinguished Representative from the Massachusetts Fifth Congressional District—the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE.

Mr. MORSE has been appointed to the post of United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs by the President of the United States. With a responsibility for political affairs in the General Assembly—and a direct responsibility to the Secretary General of the United Nations—he will find his political talents, his legislative skills, and his ability to bring together those with often conflicting viewpoints, put fully to the test.

BRAD MORSE is equal to the challenge. I have known and respected him for many years, and his record in the Congress of the United States is a testament to his devotion to principle. He has never wavered in voting his convictions, nor has he ever failed to place the emphasis of his legislative activities upon the bedrock of principle. Indeed, if there is any one thread that we have seen running through the fabric of BRAD MORSE's record since he arrived in the House in 1962, it is that of principle. I can think of no more important quality for him to take to the United Nations.

In addition, his service on the Foreign Affairs Committee—including the time he has spent as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs—will bring to the United Nations a wealth of expertise in foreign relations.

We wish BRAD MORSE the best in his new post and trust that the future will see him making the same significant contributions that he has made during his years in the House of Representatives.

The President has made a splendid choice in the person of the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE—good luck BRAD, our prayers go with you.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Massachusetts delegation and those other Members of Congress who are today paying tribute to BRAD MORSE for his long years of service in the House.

I have had the great privilege of serving with BRAD for the 12 years that he has been in Congress, but I can recall the earlier years as well. BRAD was active in politics in his home city of Lowell. He served as a member of the Lowell City Council for 2 years before coming to Washington as a staff member on the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I remember well the years that BRAD MORSE served as the chief aide to one of Massachusetts' most distinguished statesmen, Senator Leverett Saltonstall. And BRAD has carried on in the Saltonstall tradition here in the House. BRAD also served as the deputy administrator of the Veterans' Administration before being elected to Congress for the first time in 1960.

His reputation here in the House over the past decade is well known. He has represented his constituents well and at the same time developed tremendous expertise in the field of foreign affairs. I have served beside BRAD in two senses—first, here in this Chamber, and second, as the Congressman from the neighboring congressional district in Massachusetts. It has been both a privilege and a pleasure.

I feel certain that when BRAD assumes his new responsibilities next month as Under Secretary General of the United Nations he will bring the same enthusiasm, initiative, and expertise to bear on his duties in New York as he has to his duties in Washington.

Those of us who pay him tribute today will be among those who will feel his loss in the most personal sense. However, this body as a whole will suffer from his departure. He has left his marks here, and I am confident he will be just as successful in his new endeavor. My best wishes for that success go with him.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, today I join with our colleagues in expressing to Congressman BRAD MORSE warmest wishes for great success in his new position as United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs.

BRAD brings to his new responsibilities broad and deep experience in foreign affairs. His work here in the House over the last 11 years has demonstrated a deep and real commitment to the concept of world order and international understanding.

All of us agree that the United Nations has a potentiality for effectiveness in resolving international disputes and uplifting the human condition which has not been realized. In BRAD MORSE, the U.N. is receiving a tremendous asset and a new hope for realizing that potential.

The work of Dr. Ralph Bunche, BRAD's predecessor at the United Nations, is internationally known and acclaimed. I hope that all of us will soon have the occasion to congratulate my colleague and friend, Congressman BRAD MORSE of Massachusetts, with the same accolades which his distinguished predecessor has received.

Godspeed, BRAD.

Mr. ADDABO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this tribute to our colleague and friend, Congressman BRAD MORSE, who leaves this Chamber for service as United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs.

For the past 11 years, I have had the privilege of serving in the House with BRAD MORSE. In counting him as a friend, I have been fortunate and now I am confident the United Nations will be equally fortunate in receiving the services of so fine a man. BRAD has been a conscientious and dedicated Member of the House, earning the respect of Members on both sides of the aisle for his ability as a legislator. In the field of foreign affairs, BRAD has developed his expertise to the point where he will be a great asset to the world body.

We honor BRAD today for his past service, for his friendship, and for the future

service which we know he will give to his country. We will miss you here in Washington but your work at the United Nations will keep us in close contact. We wish you success in your new career and in the goal of world peace which we share with you.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, my feeling of pleasure over the appointment of our colleague, BRAD MORSE, as United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs is offset by a sense of loss.

All of us regret the departure of BRAD MORSE from this Chamber because certainly he is one of the most outstanding Members of the House, a most capable legislator who has made many valuable contributions to the overall performance of the House of Representatives during the more than 11 years that he has served in this body.

We are all familiar with BRAD's capabilities. We know him to be intelligent and articulate, keen and aware, sensible and sensitive, probing and perceptive, solid but willing to experiment. In short, he is the kind of man we need in the Congress, and his absence will be deeply felt.

BRAD MORSE takes with him to the U.N. a rich background. An attorney, he has served successively as law clerk to a Massachusetts Supreme Court chief justice, a Boston University Law School faculty member, a Lowell, Mass., city council member, attorney to the Senate Armed Services Committee, executive secretary and chief assistant to former Senator Leverett Saltonstall, U.S. Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

We are all sorry to see BRAD go. To employ a cliché, our loss is the U.N.'s gain. We know BRAD will do well in his new post. He enters upon his new responsibilities with the well wishes and the blessing of every Member of this House.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, it is an honor to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Representative MORSE. His appointment as United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs comes as a great personal honor and speaks eloquently for his fine career in this body.

BRAD will be missed here in the House of Representatives, but he will leave behind a great legacy of the work he carried on for the people of Massachusetts and of the United States.

BRAD has served in the U.S. House of Representatives for 11 years. As a freshman Member, I have had the opportunity to work with him for only a small portion of his legislative career. But in that short time, I have come to know and admire BRAD as a hard-working, knowledgeable, and popular Representative.

I will especially remember BRAD for his warmth and friendliness in greeting me by my first name shortly after my election to Congress. This concern for others marked BRAD's career as a U.S. Representative.

As the seventh-ranking Republican on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, BRAD is a highly respected expert in the

international field. His knowledge and judgment in this area have been valuable to me and to other less experienced Members.

Always helpful and cooperative, BRAD is well liked and admired by his colleagues here. He is equally popular with the voters back home. The people of Massachusetts' Fifth Congressional District, who have returned BRAD to the U.S. Congress in five successive elections, re-elected him in 1970 by a 2 to 1 margin.

Former professor at the Boston University School of Law; attorney to the Massachusetts Supreme Court and Senate Committee on Armed Services; and executive assistant to former U.S. Senator Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts, BRAD brings a high degree of legal expertise to his new post. This, coupled with his extensive background in foreign affairs, makes BRAD an excellent choice for the United Nations position.

The shoes vacated at the United Nations by the late Dr. Ralph Bunche will be large ones to fill. But I am confident that BRAD will carry on his work in the same dedicated, competent manner he has displayed in Congress.

I wish BRAD MORSE continued success as he enters this new chapter in his career of public service.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to extend a reluctant farewell to our dear friend and distinguished colleague, BRAD MORSE. The record of 11 years commends BRAD highly as an outstanding legislator of conviction, dedication, and sound judgment. He will be as sorely missed in this Chamber as in the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts which he so ably represented.

Through the years BRAD has maintained a high interest and effective role in the area of foreign affairs—service which well qualifies him for his new position as Under Secretary General of the United Nations. Because of his experience, BRAD will be an industrious and effective catalyst for constructive action. Our loss is indeed a monumental gain for that organization which John Kennedy called the "last best hope" of mankind.

This is a vital position for the activities—indeed, the future—of the U.N., and will demand that measure of service which we, in the House, have had the good fortune to recognize as typical of this amazing man. The void left by the passing of a great American statesman, Ralph Bunche, has loomed large for many months. However, with the appointment of BRAD, we have been assured that the tradition of excellence in that office will be carried on.

Today, we review BRAD MORSE's 11 outstanding years in the House, as well as his earlier role as serviceman, attorney, and educator. His courage in assuming a new and challenging position which will further tap his energies and talents—and, no doubt, further tax his good nature—is to be commended.

It is my hope that BRAD's life will always be rich with meaning and happiness. A man who has given so much of himself to his work and the people around him deserves no less.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is a bittersweet moment for many of us—saying hail and farewell to our respected and able colleague, F. BRADFORD MORSE, who has rendered distinguished service to the people of the Fifth District of Massachusetts for the past dozen years.

In effect, however, BRAD has been serving since he was a very young man, in the infantry in the Second World War, in the Lowell County City Council, as a senatorial aide, in the Veterans' Administration, and in this House.

He now continues that tradition of service—but now his sphere of service is the world. As Deputy Under Secretary General of the United Nations, he will be the highest ranking American in the Secretariat. His duties will be worldwide.

He is not moving into a sinecure; in fact his will be a most sensitive position in a highly volatile body representing a world beset by conflict—conflict of purposes and conflict of ideals.

But I have nothing but confidence in his ability to handle these almost insoluble problems. We know he takes with him a wealth of experience, ability, and idealism.

We shall miss him and I know we all admire him for his courage in accepting this gargantuan challenge.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I am pleased to join with my colleagues here in the House in paying tribute to my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE, for his outstanding service in the House for the past 12 years.

It has been a privilege and an honor to serve with BRAD. He has been most active in the efforts of the New England congressional delegation to help solve some of our regional problems such as the fuel shortage and the shoe import crisis.

BRAD is a dedicated servant of the people, and he takes this dedication to the United Nations where he will have an excellent opportunity to continue in service to the people of this country as well as to our foreign neighbors. BRAD's experience on the Foreign Affairs Committee will prove useful to him in carrying out his new duties. I have no doubt that BRAD will perform in the United Nations with the same enthusiasm and vigor which has won him the respect and admiration of his colleagues in the House.

I wish him every success in his new position.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, as our colleague, the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE, leaves the Congress to serve in the sensitive position of a U.S. Minister at the United Nations, one cannot but reflect that here is an ideal choice.

Mr. MORSE is a forthright and positive person who impresses you at once with his hearty good will. Of course, all his colleagues know that he is a most capable legislator, and his jovial exterior should not lead anyone to suppose that BRADFORD MORSE is not a skilled lawyer and statesman.

Mr. MORSE is particularly notable, because he is especially admired on the

other side of the aisle by us of the opposite political persuasion. It is not only that he quite often embraces the progressive views which are more characteristic of Democrats than of Republicans, but his high standing across the aisle is due also to our perception that he is a broad-gauge thinker, and one well able to judge all facets of an issue.

This quality of understanding was responsible for Mr. MORSE's elevation to the leadership of the "Members of Congress for Peace through Law." For me it was a pleasure to work in the ranks under Mr. MORSE's guidance. I know full well that his special capacity for understanding leadership assures that he will exert effective leadership in the United Nations. It will be perceptive as well as progressive and will enlist support from many quarters that may not characteristically follow the U.S. lead.

We will be sorry that BRAD is leaving us, but happy that he can work greatly for a splendid purpose.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Representative BRAD MORSE and I were first elected the same day and have been close friends throughout the 12 years of our service in the House. During that time I have come to respect him for many fine qualities, the greatest of which is his genuine friendship. He has been a help, as well as an inspiration, to me on many an occasion. I have always admired his superb courage, his willingness to stand alone if need be for a point of conviction.

He has demonstrated over and over his tremendous energy and I have also been highly impressed with the quality of staff that has been attracted to his service. Many a fine young person has received training in his office and then gone on to even greater achievements.

I know he will bring the same qualities to his new position as Under Secretary General at the United Nations. In fact, his appointment to that position is one of the most promising developments in many years at that institution.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pleasant parts of my decade here in the House of Representatives has been my friendship with Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts. His indefatigable efforts for international cooperation and for world peace have been a constant inspiration to me.

I will miss—every Member of Congress will miss—BRAD MORSE. He is honored by appointment as United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs replacing Dr. Ralph Bunche.

I am sure that BRAD will bring even more honor and distinction to this important position.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, when the President chose BRAD MORSE to succeed the late Dr. Ralph Bunche as Under Secretary General of the United Nations, it was good news for the U.N., but sorry news for the House of Representatives.

In more than a decade of service in the House, Mr. MORSE has made his mark in the area of international affairs. He has distinguished himself as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and

as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.

His background—one which includes leadership of the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, service with the U.S. delegation to the Geneva disarmament talks and, notably, his advocacy of deescalation in Vietnam—has suited him well for his post with the great peacekeeping body which he now joins. He has shown the imagination and enthusiasm so necessary if the goal of world stability is to be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I add my commendation of BRAD MORSE for a job well done in Congress and, for all our sakes, I wish him all possible success in his new U.N. assignment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I will miss Congressman MORSE of Massachusetts when he leaves this Chamber at the end of the month to assume his important responsibilities as Under Secretary General for Political Affairs of the United Nations where he will replace the late Dr. Ralph Bunche.

I will miss him as an idealistic but pragmatic—if that combination is possible, Congressman MORSE has achieved it—colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He always took an intense interest in the work of the committee. He was forever asking why should this be so, and does that policy make sense, in the process acting as a useful spur to us all.

A particular concern of his was that title of the Foreign Assistance Act that deals with political development. Always the realist he recognized that economic development does not proceed in a vacuum but instead its very pace and character is determined at bottom by the political institutions of the country. So he set about and succeeded in making the officials at AID more aware of the need for grassroots political development—for the agricultural cooperatives, workers banks, credit unions, and agrarian reform that forge important links between the little people of the developing countries and so make them a potent political force whose needs and aspirations can no longer be ignored.

But it would be wrong to talk of the loss represented by the departure of Congressman MORSE strictly in terms of his high caliber of performance as a lawmaker. Of equal weight to all who had the pleasure of knowing him were his great human qualities. He was never too busy to stop and chat and give of his boundless well of good cheer and simple decency to his colleagues, but also to secretaries, guards, students, indeed almost anyone who crossed his path.

I do not want to make this into a sob story. The House will go on without Congressman MORSE, as it always does.

But I do want to let him know as a friend and colleague from the opposite side of the aisle how very much we think of him and how much he will be missed. I hope he will come back and visit with us from time to time as his responsibilities at the United Nations permit.

I wish him the best of luck and am confident that he will pour his considerable talents into his new job and prove an altogether worthy successor to Dr. Bunche.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to join in tribute to my good friend and colleague, BRAD MORSE, as he leaves us to become Under Secretary General of the United Nations.

During his 11 years of service in this House, BRAD has been a conscientious and hard-working legislator and one who was able to articulate his foreign policy views with clarity and force.

His appointment to one of the highest posts in the United Nations, a post which has been occupied by only one other man, the late Dr. Ralph Bunche, marks a turning point that began as a city councilman in Lowell, Mass., 20 years ago. During the intervening years BRAD served as a staff attorney for the Senate Armed Services Committee, as chief assistant to Massachusetts Senator Leverett Saltonstall, and as deputy administrator of the Veterans' Administration, until his first election to the House of Representatives in 1960.

BRAD MORSE, throughout his career, has worked capably and with dedication to the principles he holds dear. We regret losing him as a Member of this body and congratulate the United Nations on his new role as an international public servant.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) for yielding. We are all proud to see BRAD MORSE move up to this responsibility in the United Nations.

BRAD has one of the best backgrounds in Congress on international affairs. His years of service have given him the broad picture of the needs and challenges facing our neighbors.

And he puts his heart and spirit into it. My daughter lives down in South America. When I visited her in Medellin, Colombia, the city leaders asked me if I knew Congressman BRAD MORSE. They spoke of his interest and work in helping Colombia build stronger education and more progressive medical facilities. Many in Congress are talkers, but BRAD is a man of action.

His tolerance and understanding will be a great asset to the United Nations. I am proud of the United Nations in choosing the best man for this political and general assembly affairs leadership assignment.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, BRAD MORSE is a colleague for whom I have great respect and he is a dynamo in getting accomplished many of the things on which he holds strong convictions regarding this country's welfare. BRAD is a strong and continuing influence in trying to promote the "moderate" position of the Republican Party on the Hill, and he has taken and stated his positions firmly, even at the cost of strong criticism from some of his Republican colleagues. For this forthright expression, you certainly must admire and respect his high purpose.

The respect for which the people in his district hold him is most evident, since he wins by large majorities despite the fact the registration in his district is overwhelmingly against his party affiliation. The people back home know the

strength of BRAD's convictions and are happy to support his sense of independence, which they feel is a good influence in the Congress.

Many of us here in the House will miss BRAD's counsel and advice and honestly stated convictions, but we realize he will be serving our country more importantly in his newly appointed position as United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs. I feel I am losing a good friend, but I wish him increasing success in a position in which I know he is going to be very happy as well as immeasurably more productive.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that we meet today to say goodbye to one of our most distinguished colleagues, BRAD MORSE. BRAD is leaving us to take up his new duties as the Under Secretary General of the United Nations.

Our loss is the U.N.'s gain.

Although I have had the opportunity to work with BRAD for only a year, I have been impressed with his legislative and analytic abilities. These skills will be sorely missed by the House of Representatives, but I am confident that the U.N. will be a better place because of BRAD MORSE. For 11 years, BRAD has served with distinction the Fifth District of Massachusetts and his expertise in foreign affairs has won him bipartisan admiration.

I join with the other Members in wishing BRAD well in his new and challenging assignment. I know that he will share with his colleagues the insights he gains in the United Nations.

Good luck, BRAD, we will miss you.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join in this tribute to my friend and distinguished New England colleague, Congressman BRAD MORSE, who will soon be leaving us to take an important post at the United Nations. At the outset, may I say that the Congress will suffer a very great loss by his departure. I only hope that the United Nations will benefit as much by its very significant gain.

Mr. Speaker, as we in this Chamber know so well, BRAD MORSE has proved himself, in his six terms in the House, an able and exceedingly conscientious legislator. His acute intelligence and insight into the problems of our times have caused him to be recognized as a truly outstanding Congressman—not only by the people of his congressional district but also, and perhaps more significantly, by his own colleagues and peers. Both in the field of foreign affairs, for which he is nationally known and respected, and in domestic matters as well, BRAD has consistently demonstrated the highest quality of progressive and enlightened leadership.

The people of Massachusetts' Fifth Congressional District are losing an outstanding Representative. But the qualities which have enabled BRAD to excel here in the House will follow him to his new and important position at the United Nations. As Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs, he will have ample opportunity to make good use of his very considerable gifts in the field of international rela-

tions. I know that BRAD is pleased by his new appointment, and we are certainly pleased for him.

We wish him well.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to extend my best wishes—and, I am sure, the best wishes of the entire House—to the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE, the distinguished Representative from the Fifth District of Massachusetts.

BRAD, as many of us have come to know him, will soon be taking up his new duties as United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs. The President of the United States has chosen BRAD for this important position, and we wish him well at the U.N.

He brings to his new office a record of interest and accomplishment in international affairs. We have come to know and respect his knowledge, and to appreciate his abilities while we have seen him engaged in the substance of foreign affairs deliberation as he served on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He also has been the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, a position that has been enhanced by his analytical ability and willingness to work long and hard on the problems before him.

Much as we feel a loss at the departure of our distinguished colleague, we know that BRAD will be taking on duties that are of great importance to the United Nations. He will be in personal touch with the Secretary General of that world organization and his actions will contribute to its effectiveness as a forum for the community of nations.

The President of the United States has placed great trust in F. BRADFORD MORSE, and we in the House are gratified to see one of our own so recognized. To you, BRAD, we wish good luck and a full measure of success at the United Nations.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in this deserving tribute to our friend and able colleague, F. BRADFORD MORSE of Massachusetts. Our warmest congratulations and best wishes go out to him on his appointment as United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs. He is highly qualified to assume this position of international responsibility. We shall miss him very much in the House, however.

BRAD and I came to the Congress at the same time. I have deep respect for his knowledge of foreign affairs. He has been a leader, too, in the effort to redirect defense-oriented industries to peacetime endeavors. He has been an effective legislator. The people of his congressional district in Massachusetts have been well represented by BRAD MORSE; and now he is prepared to serve the people of the world in the pursuit of peace. We wish him the best of luck.

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding me time to add my few words of appreciation for the service of our highly regarded colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE) and to wish him well as he prepares to take up his new

duties as Under Secretary General of the United Nations for Political and General Assembly Affairs.

When I came to the House last year, he extended to me his friendship and counsel, and I have had recurring reason to be grateful for his generous assistance and advice. His kindness to a new Member, was characteristic, of course, and reflected the high order of human concern which has marked his service here.

His well-deserved reputation here is as an expert on international affairs, but always evident has been his conscientious attention to the problems and needs of his Massachusetts constituency. His moving on to broader responsibilities represents a particular loss to the Fifth District of Massachusetts which, recognizing ability and dedication, has elected him six times as its Representative in Congress.

Because of his helpfulness to me, I acknowledge a personal regret that he has been called to another assignment by the President. On reflection, however, I take comfort from his acceptance of the call, because I know he has in full measure the capacity to deal diplomatically and effectively with the diverse administrative and policy decisions with which he will be confronted in the United Nations.

I have no doubt that his intelligence, integrity, and energy—together with his earnest commitment to world peace and the uplifting of human dignity—will combine to make an important imprint on the day-to-day operations of the United Nations establishment.

Within the limitations imposed by his new responsibilities, this House will hope to have the benefit of the continuing counsel of a trusted alumnus.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I join our colleague, SILVIO CONTE, in paying tribute to our good friend F. BRADFORD MORSE and add my congratulations on his appointment to the position of United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs.

It has been my pleasure to serve with BRAD MORSE on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and specifically on the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee where he is the ranking minority member. Congressman MORSE has consistently demonstrated his keen interest in the very vital problems of inter-American relations, actively participating in the formulation of legislation, and bringing to the attention of the administration the problems of the hemisphere.

He has, indeed, distinguished himself as a leader in the field of foreign affairs. Through the years he has demonstrated his exceptional ability to analyze problems, to formulate legislative and policy solutions to those problems, and to follow through to insure implementation. We will certainly miss his contributions both on the subcommittee and in the full Foreign Affairs Committee.

I know BRAD MORSE's enthusiasm and dedication on the committee are indicative of the outstanding representation he has given the people of the Fifth District of Massachusetts during the 11 years he has served in the House of Representatives. While I am sure his consti-

tuents joint in commending him on his appointment to the United Nations, they too will miss his able assistance as their voice in Washington.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I see this dedicated, effective legislator leave the House of Representatives. As the top U.S. official in the U.N. Secretariat, we can be confident, however, that his enthusiasm and ability will continue to be directed toward the solution of international problems.

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join this afternoon in paying tribute to our colleague from Massachusetts, F. BRADFORD MORSE, who has been appointed as U.N. Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs, a position held most recently by the late Dr. Ralph Bunche.

This appointment is most encouraging—as it gives assurance that a well-informed and highly motivated public official will be serving in this critical post in the United Nations.

Congressman BRAD MORSE's long and distinguished service on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, his active participation in numerous international conferences, including meetings of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the Inter-American Parliamentary Organization as well as his attendance at several conferences sponsored by the Ditchley Foundation, are but samples of his experienced and prominent activities in the complex and critical arena of international affairs.

It is well known that BRAD MORSE is first of all a student of foreign policy and international relations. Beyond that, he is a forthright spokesman for the educated views which he holds and which he articulates so ably.

Mr. Speaker, in the loss of Congressman MORSE to the U.S. House of Representatives, the United Nations is experiencing a corresponding gain. As one of his longtime colleagues in this Chamber, I extend to BRAD MORSE every good wish for rewarding and meaningful service and for good health and success in his new and important U.N. post. In this expression I wish also to include his faithful Francesca who will be at Congressman MORSE's side in many of the exciting and dramatic days of international debate and diplomacy in which he will be involved.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable regret that I rise to note the imminent departure from this body of our esteemed friend and colleague, BRAD MORSE.

We can all, however, take consolation in his new appointment as Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs, in the United Nations.

In this post, he will be a worthy successor to the late, great Ralph Bunche. In fact, at a time when the United Nations is under heavy fire from a great variety of critics, the world body can only be strengthened by the addition of men of the stature and competence of BRAD MORSE to the top staff positions.

My friendship with BRAD dates back to the beginning of my own congressional service, nearly 10 years ago. In 1968, I was honored to be a delegate at the an-

nual Anglo-American Ditchley Foundation conference, in England, an event, drawing parliamentarians from both nations, which BRAD helped establish.

Our colleague is, of course, justly renowned for his expertise in foreign affairs. He is a senior and most valuable member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—background that should serve him, the Nation and the world well as he embarks on his new career.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this month, we will lose the services of the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts. BRAD is leaving the House to assume his new assignment as Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs of the United Nations.

As a colleague of Congressman MORSE, I can only say that I will miss his friendship and contribution to our mutual legislative goals. On the other hand, I know that the United Nations will benefit greatly from his wide knowledge and experience.

I have worked closely with BRAD as a member of the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, an unofficial organization of persons from both political parties working jointly toward the goal of world peace. Certainly, his efforts within this organization have been both energetic and productive.

Through our participation in this organization and in the general business of the House, I have admired BRAD's expertise in foreign relations and international diplomacy. I know he is an outstanding advocate of the goal of international peace.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs BRAD has worked to implement his belief in a peaceful world, and his contribution will long stand as an example for others to emulate.

I am happy to join the many friends and colleagues of BRAD MORSE who wish him well at his new position.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to testify that I am indebted to BRAD MORSE, more than any other individual colleague of mine in the Congress, for most frequently stimulating my thinking on matters of national policy and legislation in positive, progressive ways.

I feel tremendously grateful to BRAD for the remarkable warmth of his personal friendship, his constant helpfulness and inspiration, the many, many times he has gone beyond the call of duty in assisting me and so many of our other colleagues in welcome ways.

I believe it is true that BRAD MORSE, more than anyone else, is responsible for founding and energizing the informal organization of minority Members which we know as the Wednesday Group, and I can testify that my own privilege in participating in that group has been very valuable and enjoyable. The Wednesday Group, frequently under BRAD's leadership, has made a series of very important contributions.

Similarly, BRAD's leadership in the organization known as Members of Congress for Peace Through Law represents a notably innovative contribution on his part, a benefit to the Congress and to the

Nation, and of individual benefit to so many of us as his colleagues.

The Wednesday Group and Members of Congress for Peace Through Law are only two of numerous examples that can be cited of BRAD's creative energy.

It was my good fortune to arrive in the House of Representatives at the same time with BRAD, in January 1961, and throughout these almost 12 years we have served together I have increasingly and more profoundly appreciated his extraordinary qualities as a human being, an excellent legislator, as a great patriot in the very best sense.

Therefore, personally, I view with mixed emotions his decision to become an international civil servant. I understand his impatient desire to make a broader use of his tremendous energies and innovativeness, his skills in negotiating with others for positive accomplishment of benefit to all mankind. I enthusiastically wish him well in such new endeavors.

However, it is with personal sadness that I see him about to leave our midst.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, for 11 years BRAD MORSE has served in the Massachusetts delegation as a dedicated and able legislator, a highly respected and admired colleague, and a servant of the people of the Fifth District of Massachusetts. Everyone is familiar with BRAD's affable and good-natured manner and, of course, we will all remember him for his friendly demeanor. But BRAD's contribution to the Congress goes beyond his fine personal qualities. It was a pleasure and a privilege to work with BRAD on the many problems facing the State. For in him the people of Massachusetts had a tireless champion, and a man who understood the needs of the workingman as well as the white-collar worker, the professional as well as the trade unionist. In all areas of domestic concern, whether it was the problem of unemployment, the energy crisis, or the import quota. BRAD devoted himself to the task at hand with an enthusiasm and fervor that is rare even among the most energetic public servants. While his departure from Congress will leave this Chamber diminished in stature and ability, BRAD is moving on to a job for which he is supremely qualified.

Foreign policy and foreign affairs have been his forte, his expertise, and his specialty. As everyone is aware, BRAD has been appointed Under Secretary of State at the United Nations, becoming the highest ranking American in the Secretariat. This is a position of importance not only to the United States, but to the entire world community of nations.

I know that BRAD MORSE will make an outstanding contribution to the United Nations, for after serving in Congress for these past 11 years, he has demonstrated his ability to extract the basic issues, to examine and evaluate the pros and cons, and to make a decision based on sound judgment and thorough consideration. The United Nations is fortunate to receive the benefit of his talents and his experience. I want to express my sincere and deep appreciation for the opportunity to serve with such an extraordinary individual, and at the same time

offer my congratulations to BRAD on his new post as Under Secretary.

BRAD possesses that rare determination which will serve him well in the coming months, as he faces the new and exacting challenges on his job in the United Nations.

I am sure that everyone here today joins me when I say best wishes and thanks go with him.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has been honored by having had one of our most distinguished colleagues, the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts, named by the President of the United States to a position of great trust at the United Nations.

BRAD MORSE will be the new Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs. He will have a responsibility for many political affairs personally referred to him by the Secretary General of the U.N.

We may feel justly proud that the President has chosen a Member of the House for this high honor. Those of us who have known BRAD these many years are not surprised, however, that he was so honored. BRAD has brought to the House a combination of qualities so outstanding that recognition in the form of his new office was almost inevitable.

His background in matters of foreign policy is extensive, and his service on the Foreign Affairs Committee has given him a firm grasp of the problems he will encounter at the United Nations.

We regret that BRAD must leave us, but we are pleased that a man of such well-considered abilities should be chosen by the President. And we feel especially pleased that the honor fell upon a Member of the House of Representatives.

We wish you well, BRAD, and hope that the years you were with us are as significant a part of your memories as they are of ours.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE).

I am delighted that he has been selected as our United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs, but I am sorry that we in the House, and particularly on the Foreign Affairs Committee where it has been my distant pleasure to work with him, are losing a good Congressman.

In both the committee and on the floor of the House, he has proven himself to be a man of high ability, possessing both integrity and diplomatic skill. This rare combination makes him most highly qualified for this important post.

The position as a Representative to the United Nations will undoubtedly prove a challenge, but BRAD MORSE, in my judgment, has the ability and unimpeachable integrity to serve the United Nations and his country well.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those of my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE).

I have counted myself privileged to have served in this Chamber with BRAD MORSE during his 11 years as a Repre-

sentative of the Fifth District of Massachusetts. During this period I have found him to be not only a personable and thoughtful man, but also a conscientious and hard-working legislator. He has served here ably, and like my colleagues, I shall miss his presence in the House.

BRAD MORSE takes on an assignment of enormous magnitude as he assumes his new post as Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs of the United Nations. His expertise in the field of foreign affairs, as demonstrated so ably in this body, will stand him in good stead as he joins the great deliberative body of the world.

All of us wish BRAD MORSE much success in his new undertaking and I, for one, feel that the future of the United Nations will be a little more secure, for having a man of BRAD MORSE's stature in the post of Under Secretary General.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, in this time of increased international tension and escalation of the terrible conflict in Indochina, it is unfortunate that the House is losing BRAD MORSE, who has been a great fighter for peace in his 11 years here. And now for the good news—he is leaving us to take up the post of United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs. With his great compassion and his expertise in the field of foreign affairs, I am certain that he will be an important figure in the United Nations quest for world peace.

We will miss him here, and we all wish him the best of luck in his new job.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a particular personal pleasure to join with my fellow Members here this afternoon in extending congratulations to Congressman BRAD MORSE, my very dear friend, distinguished associate and esteemed colleague from the Fifth Congressional District in Massachusetts for the additional honor conferred on him through the President's selection of him for Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs at the United Nations.

Naturally, we as his fellow Members here, obviously feel that we had observed and found superlative the courageous character and eminent ability of our colleague long before the President formally confirmed our collective opinion by appointing him to this position of the highest global trust.

For nearly 12 years we have seen first hand the continuously growing legislative stature of BRAD MORSE as he has steadily climbed to a position of leadership on the all important House Foreign Affairs Committee. In a relatively brief period he has shown himself to be one of the Nation's most learned foreign affairs experts and outstanding lawmakers.

For those of us who have known BRAD through the years, this is by no means a surprising development. As a student, law clerk, teacher, city council member, attorney, administrator and Member of Congress, he has consistently demonstrated his extraordinary talents and unlimited commitment to public service.

Happily for his community, his State,

his country, and now the global community, his people instinctively recognized their great fortune in having such a gifted man in their service. In return for their confidence, BRAD MORSE has dedicated himself to the fullest discharge of his legislative challenges with a sincerity, an energy, a vigor and a determination that is unsurpassed by any Member of this House.

He is a man who conducts his life in the truest traditions of a gentleman, scholar, diplomat and patriot.

Mr. Speaker, the most urgent priority on earth is the pursuit and attainment of peace. In joining that mission I am certain that BRAD MORSE will exhaustively devote the fullest concentration of his great mind, great heart, and great energy toward its earliest possible success for the benefit of his fellow Americans and fellow men everywhere.

I know all of you share in my prayer that the Lord will continue to bless BRAD and his family with good health and fortune throughout his new responsibility and all future endeavors.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) for reserving this time to pay tribute to our good friend and colleague, BRAD MORSE.

As a Member of the House and a friend to all who worked with him, BRAD will be sorely missed. His ebullience and enthusiasm were matched by his judgment, and will, I know, be irreplaceable in the halls of the Congress.

BRAD's distinguished service on the Foreign Affairs Committee, his close personal involvement with Members of Congress for Peace Through Law and the Africa Group, and his service as a member of President Eisenhower's cabinet eminently qualifies him for the position to which he has so justly been nominated: As Under Secretary General of the United Nations for Political and General Assembly Affairs. His faith in the United Nations has been unswerving, and I am certain it will be equalled by his performance.

In addition, as the foremost founder of the Wednesday Group, BRAD MORSE stood in the vanguard of the progressive wing of the Republican Party, while at the same time he worked closely with the White House whenever possible.

Personally, I want very much to add that BRAD was and will remain a wonderful friend. I wish him the very best, and I feel certain that the United Nations will be a better place for his presence there. Moreover I am sure Ralph Bunche would be particularly happy over his successor.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an excellent piece by former U.N. Ambassador Charles W. Yost on BRAD's appointment, and also an editorial:

NEW MAN AT THE UNITED NATIONS

The present era is characterized by a certain foreboding sense that things don't work as well as they used to. Among other devices of convenience and salvation, that judgment is applied by most people to the United Nations. The view may be somewhat of an oversimplification, but there is no doubt that, with age, the United Nations secretariat has tended to choke on its own sense of conven-

tion. It has dyed itself in the pale grey of international conformity proscribed by the outer limits of the great powers' conflicting views.

Whether that is a permanent condition of the UN secretariat is something about to be tested. President Nixon has nominated as the new Undersecretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs an energetic, brilliant and aggressively optimistic Republican Congressman from Massachusetts named F. Bradford Morse. News reports of Mr. Morse's appointment have stressed over and over again a warning that he will not have the full dimension of powers enjoyed by the late Ralph Bunche whom Morse succeeds. That, however, is a tentative judgment. Dr. Bunche came upon the United Nations scene in the morning of the organization's years. He forged his own concept of the job and exercised it largely through the force of his own character and skills.

What we really want to know about institutions as they grow old is whether human character can reverse the turgidity of their ways. Congressman Morse is a formidable man whose intellect matches his adrenalin—and the latter is in a constant state of overflow. If there is still room for will to maneuver in the civil service-calcified corridors of the secretariat, his is the sort of will that can maneuver. Mr. Morse has had a distinguished career so far; in the House he tended more and more to specialize in foreign affairs. He is good at many things but sitting still and keeping passively quiet aren't among them.

It has been a long time since the UN pulled off such virtues of activism as mediating for 1949 Arab-Israeli negotiations and mounting peace-keeping operations in Kashmir, Jerusalem and Cyprus. What is missing is a sense of initiative in the secretariat which makes the activism plausible. Aside from pleasing people who have known and watched Congressman Morse over the years, his appointment may represent the last best opportunity for force of character to revitalize the convention-atrophied will of the UN secretariat. Whether character can manifest itself in those cloisters of caution on the east river in New York may be a measure of the United Nations itself as things stand now.

This is Rod MacLeish in Washington.

A TOP GUY FOR A SENSITIVE JOB

(By Charles W. Yost)

Few appointments could give more encouragement to those concerned for the future of the United Nations than that of Rep. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts as undersecretary general for political and general assembly affairs, the senior post occupied by a United States citizen in the UN Secretariat. President Nixon is to be congratulated for nominating, and Secretary General Kurt Waldheim for appointing, so able and well-qualified a man to this important post.

The new secretary general confronted immediately upon taking office a series of difficult decisions in regard to his senior staff. Each of the five permanent members of the Security Council feels entitled to and has usually held an important undersecretaryship.

The entry of the People's Republic of China and the death of Ralph Bunche at the end of last year upset arrangements and balances which had grown up over the years. On the one hand, Peking no doubt expects to play more of a role and hold a more significant senior post than did Nationalist China. On the other hand, no American could expect to wield the influence which Dr. Bunche, a Nobel Peace Prize winner in his own right, had built up over the quarter century of his tenure.

The fact was that, while a Soviet citizen has always been undersecretary for political and security affairs, and this post has been

filled by such distinguished Soviet diplomats as Arkady Soboltv and Anatoly Dobrynin, Bunche nevertheless was, under the rather nebulous designation of undersecretary for special political affairs, a more trusted and influential adviser of the first three secretaries general than was any of his Soviet counterparts.

The reason was not only Bunche's outstanding personal qualities, but the fact that the secretaries general soon found that Bunche was more scrupulous in observing the cardinal UN Charter prescription regarding its officials—that they “shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any authority external to the Organization”—than any of the Soviet undersecretaries was permitted by his own government to be.

By virtue of these two qualities—competence and impartiality—responsibility gravitated to Bunche over the years. He came to be responsible in fact, under the secretary general, for the UN's most important political activities—those in the field of peacekeeping in the Middle East, the Congo and elsewhere.

Presumably these responsibilities will now be more widely shared. The incumbent and able undersecretary for special political affairs, Roberto Guyer, an Argentinian who also takes most seriously his obligations as an international civil servant, is likely to continue to be the Secretary General's chief adviser in the peacekeeping field, as he has been since Bunche was incapacitated by illness a year ago.

It is to be hoped that Brian Urquhart, an Englishman who has been with the UN since 1945, who was for years Bunche's principal most perceptive and most dedicated assistant, will be given increased status and responsibilities, particularly in regard to the Middle East which he knows so well.

No doubt other senior appointments, including that of a Chinese undersecretary, will be announced shortly. The secretary general's most ticklish task, however, will be to determine how to obtain political advice from his American, Soviet and Chinese undersecretaries in a manner which will both preserve an appropriate balance among them and at the same time will have none of the flavor of a “Troika” which would seek to monopolize power to the exclusion of the other 129 member states.

This task will challenge the new Secretary General to display to the fullest the diplomatic qualities and the indefatigable energies for which he has long been notable.

The new United States undersecretary is therefore moving onto a shifting scene marked by both pitfalls and opportunities. Fortunately no better man to avoid the former and seize the latter could have been found.

His 12 years in Congress, his service in the Interparliamentary Union, his devotion to the principle of the United Nations as demonstrated by his leadership of the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, will all stand him in good stead.

While he will be primarily in charge of the organization of the annual meetings of the General Assembly, the full scope of his responsibilities will depend in the longer run on his personal qualities, his usefulness to the secretary general, the confidence he generates among all the member states and, perhaps most of all, on the leadership which his own government chooses to exercise or not to exercise in and through the United Nations.

If the United States administration chooses to bypass the UN in its handling of the great international political issues of our time, if the Congress chooses while voting billions for armaments to be niggardly in providing for the very modest needs of the world's chief peacekeeping organization, then

neither the United Nations nor its American undersecretary is likely to play the significant role in the world our troubled times demand.

Fortunately the nomination to this post by the administration of a Republican member of Congress who deeply believes in the United Nations is a happy augury that henceforth both the executive and legislative branches of our government may be induced to resume that United States leadership in the UN which contributed so much in its earlier successes and which remains so profoundly in our national interest and in the interests of the world community.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise in honor of a distinguished colleague, Congressman BRAD MORSE, of Massachusetts, who will be leaving us at the end of the month.

As a Member of Congress, Mr. MORSE has made notable contributions in both domestic and international affairs. He was a congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation to the 18-nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva and a member of the U.S. delegation to both the Mexican-United States and the Canada-United States Interparliamentary meetings.

He first entered public service as a member of the Lowell City Council in Massachusetts, later to serve as counsel to the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee, and in 1958, President Eisenhower named him Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the United States. He has been a strong advocate of civil rights and served as chairman of Anglo-American Study Group on African Affairs. He is also a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

As an advocate of world peace through law, Mr. MORSE is widely credited as the principal architect of the deescalation strategy for lessening U.S. involvement in Vietnam, with which President Johnson drew the North Vietnamese to the negotiating tables.

Congressman MORSE leaves with us a lasting impression of loyalty, devotion, and service, and carries with him to his new position in the United Nations, the talents of an informed and effective public servant.

I wish him the best of luck and every success in his new position. I am sure the everlasting mark he has left on the Congress will follow him throughout his endeavors.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, for over a decade, a most distinguished and able Member from Massachusetts, F. BRADFORD MORSE, has contributed great expertise in the difficult and often frustrating area of international relations to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to the Congress.

As United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs, he will have the opportunity to utilize his immense talents on an even grander scale. I know that he will serve the United Nations with the excellence that has marked his career.

Although we in the Congress will miss the benefit of his counsel, I believe his presence in the United Nations will enhance the interest of the United States, and I wish him the best in that most challenging task.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my dear friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good and close friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. SILVIO CONTE, for taking this time today, and I thank all of my colleagues for the gracious and generous things they have said this afternoon.

As Adlai Stevenson used to say, a little flattery will not do any harm provided you do not inhale. Mr. Speaker, I promise that I shall not inhale.

But, Mr. Speaker, I will leave this Chamber with a feeling of deep regret. The experience I have had here has enriched my life.

To all of my colleagues with whom I have been privileged to serve, to the members of the House staff who have been so cooperative day after day, to my own loyal staff, some of whom are in the gallery this afternoon, whose tireless effort on my behalf have made my work in the House so much more effective, and to the members of the press with whom I have worked so long, my deep appreciation. I shall be forever grateful for the friendship which all of you have given me.

MORE SUPPORT FOR “JOBS NOW” PROGRAM

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on December 2, 1971, I introduced a bill, H.R. 12011, which would create vitally needed public service jobs for 500,000 Americans. This “Jobs Now” bill has 62 Democratic cosponsors. It was introduced in the Senate on January 31, 1972, by Senator WALTER MONDALE and 20 other Democratic cosponsors.

Sixty-two House cosponsors are:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

James Abourezk (S. Dak.), Brook Adams (Wash.), Les Aspin (Wis.), Herman Badillo (N.Y.), Nick Begich (Alaska), Jonathan B. Bingham (N.Y.), Edward P. Boland (Mass.), John Brademas (Ind.), Frank J. Brasco (N.Y.), Phillip Burton (Calif.), Hugh L. Carey (N.Y.), Charles J. Carney (Ohio), Frank M. Clark (Pa.), George W. Collins (Ill.), William R. Cotter (Conn.), George E. Danielson (Calif.), Ronald V. Dellums (Calif.), Robert F. Drinan (Mass.), Thaddeus J. Dulski (N.Y.), Don Edwards (Calif.), Joshua Ellberg (Pa.), Walter E. Fauntroy (D.C.),

William D. Ford (Mich.), Donald M. Fraser (Minn.), Sam Gibbons (Fla.), Ella T. Grasso (Conn.), William J. Green (Pa.), Richard T. Hanna (Calif.), Michael Harrington (Mass.),

William D. Hathaway (Maine), Ken Hechler (W. Va.), Henry Helstoski (N.J.).

Joseph E. Karth (Minn.), Peter N. Kyros (Maine), Robert L. Leggett (Calif.) Romano L. Mazzoli (Ky.), Lloyd Meeds (Wash.), Ralph H. Metcalfe (Ill.), Abner J. Mikva (Ill.), Parren J. Mitchell (Md.), Morgan F. Murphy (Ill.), David R. Obey (Wis.).

Edward J. Patten (N.J.), Claude Pepper (Fla.), Bertram L. Podell (N.Y.), Melvin Price (Ill.), Charles B. Rangel (N.Y.), Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (N.J.), Robert A. Roe (N.J.), Benjamin S. Rosenthal (N.Y.), Edward R. Roybal (Calif.), William F. Ryan (N.Y.).

Fernand J. St Germain (R.I.), Paul S. Sarbanes (Md.), John F. Seiberling (Ohio), B. F. Sisk (Calif.), Louis Stokes (Ohio), Frank Thompson, Jr. (N.J.), Robert O. Tiernan (R.I.), Charles A. Vanik (Ohio), Jerome R. Waldie (Calif.), Lester L. Wolff (N.Y.).

The 21 Senate sponsors of S. 3092 are:

LIST OF SENATE SPONSORS

Walter Mondale (Minn.), Alan Cranston (Calif.), Birch Bayh (Ind.), Quentin Burdick (N. Dak.), Fred Harris (Okla.), Philip Hart (Mich.), Vance Hartke (Ind.), Harold Hughes (Iowa), Hubert Humphrey (Minn.), Henry Jackson (Wash.), Edward Kennedy (Mass.), George McGovern (S. Dak.), Lee Metcalf (Mont.), Frank Moss (Utah), Edmund Muskie (Maine), Gaylord Nelson (Wis.), Claiborne Pell (R.I.), Jennings Randolph (W. Va.), Adlai Stevenson (Ill.), John Tunney (Calif.), and Harrison Williams (N.J.).

I have been gratified by the extremely positive response the "Jobs Now" proposal has received from many of the Nation's leading economists, public officials and newspapers. I have just received the text of an excellent address by Mr. Andrew Brimmer, a member of the Federal Reserve Board, delivered at Memphis, Tenn., on April 13, 1972, to the Joint Boards of Directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis in which Mr. Brimmer calls for a greatly expanded public employment program to attack the national unemployment rate which remains at more than 5 percent. A fine editorial column, "Was the WPA Really So Awful," by Paul Lancaster also appeared in the Wall Street Journal on April 18. And my article comparing the direct "Jobs Now" approach to the administration's "trickle-down" economics appeared in the Washington Star on April 16, 1972.

The Wall Street Journal and Washington Star articles and excerpts from the Brimmer address follow:

WAS THE WPA REALLY SO AWFUL?

(By Paul Lancaster)

NEW YORK.—Through a program that gives local governments money to add workers, Washington is moving gingerly into the business of combating unemployment directly by creating jobs. But proposals for broader job programs, including public works, still trip up on a ghost from the 1930s, the WPA.

Implicit in warnings against "another WPA"—the initials stand for Works Progress Administration—is the notion that when a government program is motivated by the desire to make work, the participants won't make anything useful. But a glance around this city, where an army of WPA workers labored in the Depression, shows that's not necessarily the case.

The businessman arriving in town at LaGuardia Airport is making use of a major WPA project. So is the visitors arriving at Newark Airport, which the WPA expanded and modernized. The Wall Street executive who takes a cab from midtown Manhattan to

his office travels down the East River drive, another undertaking in which the WPA had a hand.

Sports-minded New Yorkers enjoy golf courses and tennis courts built by workers employed by the WPA and earlier New Deal job programs. Residents who frequent Central Park have such workers to thank for the playgrounds around the edge of the park, the delightful little zoo, the bridge path, the red brick boathouse where they rent rowboats—even the concrete benches. Besides these visible reminders of federal "make-work" programs, there is much that is less obvious now but that kept the city from falling apart during the Depression, such as new sewers and sidewalks and repairs to museums, libraries and other public buildings.

DESPERATE WORKERS

Today's unemployment rate of under 6% looks insignificant by the standards of the 30s, when as many as a quarter of all workers were jobless. Nevertheless, a substantial number of the five million Americans now classed as unemployed are growing just about as desperate as their Depression counterparts—perhaps more so in some cases because they see so much affluence around them.

Many have been out of work for long stretches and seemingly have little prospect of landing a job in industry soon even if the pace of business continues to pick up. Their ranks include unskilled urban blacks as well as highly trained engineers and technicians displaced by defense and aerospace cutbacks. For some of the hard-core unemployed, public employment may offer the only hope.

So far, Washington's efforts to create public jobs have been sharply limited. The bill enacted last summer to expand local government payrolls by providing federal funds for the hiring of new teachers' aides, policemen and the like creates only 150,000 jobs all told, and critics say many of these aren't going to the people who need them most. Before accepting this relatively modest program, President Nixon twice vetoed bills that would have created many more jobs. One veto message assailed "WPA-type jobs."

It's not hard to find grounds for criticizing the WPA. Some of the \$10 billion that agency cost the federal government between its launching in 1935 and the closing of its books in 1943 went for such questionable items as the wages of local politicians' household help. In a number of instances WPA funds financed the construction of facilities that wound up in private hands. There were also frequent complaints that the Democrats used WPA jobs to buy support in elections.

Nor is there any denying the waste and inefficiency that gave rise to the term "boondoggle." A final government report on WPA activities conceded that some of the agency's airport and dam construction had proved "ill-advised" and "overdone." The same report notes that the WPA built 2,309,000 public privies, raising the question of whether privy building might not have been overdone, too.

The cartoons depicting WPA workers leaning on their shovels had a basis in fact. Indeed, in 1938 a crew of WPA ditch-diggers here in New York walked off the job because the foreman wouldn't let them lean on shovels. The men had been in the habit of working in pairs, one with a pick and one with a shovel. When the pick man was working, the shovel man rested, and vice versa. The foreman ordered each man to use pick and shovel interchangeably to speed the work. The workers called the order "inhuman" and struck before eventually complying.

Given the immense scale of its operations, however, perhaps the remarkable thing is that the WPA managed as well as it did. At one time or another, 8.5 million Americans were on its payroll, earning an average of \$54

a month. And the list of their accomplishments is impressive.

WPA workers built 67,000 miles of urban streets and built or improved 572,000 miles of rural roads. They built or improved 8,000 parks and 12,800 playgrounds. They erected 5,900 schools and renovated 31,000 others, and they built or improved more than 1,000 libraries.

Some of their efforts at least moderated the environmental problems that concern Americans so much today. WPA crews built or modernized more than 1,500 sewage treatment plants. Unemployed miners on the WPA rolls in West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Kentucky sealed thousands of abandoned coal mines, thereby reducing the stream pollution caused by acid drainage from the mines. Other conservation projects included the reseeded of depleted oyster beds and the planting of 177 million trees.

No section of the country failed to benefit. Jersey City got a 22,000-seat stadium, and Whitley County, Ind., got a new cemetery. Los Angeles got golf courses and swimming pools, and Cumberland, Ky., got a new city hall. Chicago got help with its lakefront park, and Oregon got a ski lodge atop Mount Hood.

Construction accounted for the bulk of WPA employment, but the agency showed considerable imagination in putting jobless professionals and white-collar types to work in fields where they could use their talents. Laid-off teachers set up adult education programs. WPA clerical workers helped streamline record-keeping in municipal tax offices.

Best remembered are the projects in creative fields. WPA writers turned out the celebrated series of state guidebooks still prized as reference works today. WPA artists covered the walls of public buildings with 2,500 murals. Many of the murals have long since disappeared, but some of the painters employed by the art project went on to fame—Jackson Pollock and Willem De Kooning, to mention a couple.

The programs for writers and artists, as well as others for musicians and actors, were directed from Washington, but most of the WPA's construction and maintenance projects resulted from proposals made by local governments. A town said it needed a park. If the WPA approved, it issued tools and a tool shed from its supply section, and the jobless went to work.

THE NEEDS OF TODAY

Some cities' needs are as great today as they were in the '30s. Just as a starter, much of the work the WPA did needs to be redone; the parks it built are a mess and the public buildings it constructed or refurbished have become shabby. A major urban rehabilitation effort would be one way to employ many of the unskilled jobless profitably.

Finding jobs for the idle engineers and technicians might require imagination of the sort the WPA displayed in putting unemployed professionals to work. But men ingenious enough to build moon rockets could surely make a contribution somewhere. One likely possibility is in helping cities cope with the rising tide of waste through recycling programs and other means.

Today's conditions are not the same as those of the depths of the depression, of course, and there are questions as to whether the money for a major job-creating effort is available. A proposal by Rep. Henry Reuss, a Wisconsin Democrat, to create 500,000 public service jobs over two years carries a price tag of \$6 billion, compared with \$2.25 billion over the same span for the current program. But the achievements of the WPA, coupled with the glaring needs of the cities today, do suggest that money spent to make jobs would yield the nation at least some return in the form of concrete benefits. And aside from such tangible benefits, a larger public jobs program could hope to lift the spirit of some of those who

have come to feel that society has no useful role for them to play.

THE "JOBS NOW" PROPOSAL VERSUS "TRICKLE-DOWN" APPROACH

(By Representative HENRY S. REUSS)

The national unemployment rate has been at or near 6 percent for almost a year and a half—since November 1970. More than 5 million people across the country are out of work and looking for jobs.

Throughout, the Nixon Administration has been predicting a decline in the unemployment rate. A year ago, the President's Council of Economic Advisers foresaw a decline to the 4½ percent "zone" by the end of 1971. It didn't happen.

Last January the Council predicted that unemployment would fall to the "neighborhood" of 5 percent by 1972's end. Council Chairman Herbert Stein has continued to stick by this prediction, despite the March figures showing the unemployment rate back up at 5.9 percent after a small one-month decline.

As Samuel Johnson once said of second marriages, such continued optimism suggests the triumph of hope over experience.

What is needed to reduce unemployment is a program that will create jobs now—not a year from now or two years from now. A "Jobs Now" bill to do just this has been introduced in the House by 63 Democrats (H.R. 12011), and in the Senate by Sen. Walter Mondale and 20 other Democrats (S. 3092). It would create 500,000 federally-funded public service jobs in state and local governments by amending and expanding the Emergency Employment Act of 1971.

The existing public service jobs program—the Emergency Employment Act—has put nearly 150,000 people to work since President Nixon reluctantly signed it last July. They are working as hospital orderlies and nurses, teachers and teachers' aides, policemen, firemen, gardeners, museum guards, sanitation men, state foresters, and in a host of other state and local government positions. They are performing the vital, everyday services that governments are expected to provide, but often can't because the money isn't there. And instead of drawing unemployment or welfare checks, they are working and paying taxes.

But 150,000 jobs don't go very far when there are more than 5 million unemployed people looking for jobs. The "Jobs Now" bill would more than triple the existing public service jobs program. This would create a total of 500,000 jobs directly and immediately.

In addition, there is a "multiplier" effect with programs such as this, which leads to two or three more jobs for every job directly funded. This multiplier effect comes about because those who receive jobs under the "Jobs Now" program will quickly spend all, or more than all, their earnings right away for the goods and services they need to support themselves and their families. This spending means higher consumer demand, more business spending to meet that demand, and more jobs at every step.

And as consumer and business spending goes upward and joblessness heads downward, consumer confidence is likely to be bolstered. Instead of saving 8 percent of their income, as they are now doing, consumers will worry less and spend more.

Reducing the saving rate somewhat would give another boost to consumer demand, leading again to more business spending and more jobs.

Taking this multiplier effect into account, the 500,000 jobs in the "Jobs Now" program could lead to a total of 2 million new jobs, reducing national unemployment below 4 percent.

The response of the Administration to this proposal, I regret to say, has been disappointing. I was heartened initially by the Presi-

dent's Economic Report and that of his Council of Economic Advisers. The President in his Report spoke kindly of the present public service jobs program, and seemed to have overcome his earlier distaste for "WPA-type jobs" and "dead-end jobs in the public sector." The Report of the CEA was even more encouraging, calling the Emergency Employment Act "a major step forward."

But then Administration witnesses began coming up to appear before the Joint Economic Committee, and it became clear that their taste for creating jobs has been sated by the present meager and inadequate 150,000-job program.

Herbert Stein, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, opposed the "Jobs Now" program in his appearance before the JEC on Feb. 7. The next day, warming to his task, he went before the National Press Club to denounce the program as "rediscovering the WPA."

Treasury Secretary John Connally, in his appearance on Feb. 16, was just as emphatic. He did not like the idea of an expanded public service jobs program: "We are not proposing that. We are not going to propose it. We are not going to support it."

The Administration has a philosophical objection to such things, Secretary Connally said:

"It is the philosophy of this Administration that it is the primary responsibility of the private sector to provide jobs in the United States, and that this Government ought not to adopt the attitude that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to hire all the people who don't have jobs in this country."

Labor Secretary James Hodgson, appearing on Feb. 17, continued the pattern. When asked whether he would favor an expanded public service jobs program, Secretary Hodgson said: "I would not support at this time going beyond where we are on public employment under the concept that we have now."

The Administration obviously does not think much of direct methods of job creation. But what, then, is their program for reducing unemployment?

As far as I can tell, it consists almost entirely of running gargantuan deficits in the Federal budget. CEA Chairman Stein positively gloried in this year's projected \$38.8 billion deficit in his Feb. 8 speech to the National Press Club.

"We are running the biggest budget deficit ever, except for World War II," Mr. Stein boasted.

But John Maynard Keynes never said that huge budget deficits, just because they are huge, would take care of the problem of unemployment. The crucial issue is not the size of the deficit, but its composition—the kind of tax and expenditure policies which produce it. The Nixon Administration, a recent convert to Keynesianism, tends to miss subtleties of this sort.

The purpose of large deficits is to stimulate the economy and to create jobs. Accordingly, the taxing and spending policies that create the deficit should zero in on job-creating. But the Administration budget does not do this.

Instead, to take one example, it grants some \$6 billion in tax reductions to business in fiscal 1973 in the form of the investment tax credit and rapid depreciation in the hope that businesses will thereby be induced to buy capital equipment which they otherwise would not. This does a good job of creating budget deficits for the Federal government and higher profits for corporations, but it is not much help in creating jobs for our 5 million unemployed.

Compare this indirect, trickle-down method of job-creating with the direct and immediate "Jobs Now" program. In order for trickle-down tax breaks to create jobs, they

must first induce businessmen to invest more money in plant and equipment than they normally would.

But with businessmen only using 74 percent of the plant and equipment they already have, this is not likely to happen. Even if it does, the plant and equipment makers must then be induced to hire more workers to build the capital equipment before any new jobs will result.

But the workers in the capital equipment industry are not the kind of workers who are now having trouble getting jobs—young people, women, the less-skilled, the less-educated, and the less-motivated. Instead, they are highly-skilled workers who are often in short supply. Thus, stimulating demand in the capital goods industries at some point leads to labor bottlenecks, where the demand for labor exceeds the supply.

You end up not with more jobs, but with bid-up wages and more inflationary pressures.

Even if trickle-down methods do lead to a few more jobs in the long run, this is small consolation to the 5 million unemployed who need jobs now.

"Jobs Now" legislation is supported by leading economists across the country—Walter Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson; Gardner Ackley, who succeeded Heller as CEA Chairman; former CEA members James Tobin and Otto Eckstein; Paul Samuelson of MIT; Professor R. A. Gordon of the University of California at Berkeley; George Perry of the Brookings Institution; Robert Elser of Northwestern; Lester Thurow and Robert Solow of MIT; Dean Seymour Wolfbein of Temple University School of Business Administration; Robert Nathan; Irving Siegel; V. Lewis Bassie, director of the Bureau of Economic and Business Research at the University of Illinois; and Sar Levitan and Garth Mangum, both of the Center for Manpower Policy Studies at George Washington University.

I still hope that President Nixon will join their ranks.

A NEW AMERICAN DILEMMA—THE TASK OF RECONCILING GROWTH IN PRODUCTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT

(Remarks by Andrew F. Brimmer)

At this juncture in our history, we are confronted with a vital question involving multiple choices: how can we increase the rate of real growth in the economy, reduce the persistently high rate of unemployment, and—simultaneously—press on with the campaign to check inflation? That we find an answer to the question is imperative. In its Annual Report for 1972, the Council of Economic Advisers anticipates that—although real output is expected to increase by about 6 per cent—the unemployment rate probably will still be in the neighborhood of 5 per cent as the year draws to a close. At the same time, the target set for the price stabilization program visualizes that the rate of inflation will decline to a range of 2-3 per cent by the end of 1972—compared with a rise in prices of 4.3 per cent in 1971.

Thus, achievement of the goal set with respect to the rate of increase in prices would represent a significant accomplishment in the fight against inflation. So too would the reduction in the unemployment rate represent genuine progress. In March, those without jobs but looking for work totaled 5.2 million, and unemployment has lingered in the neighborhood of 5 million for more than a year. And if the jobless rate should still be around 5 per cent at the end of the current year, it would mean that perhaps more than 4½ million people would be unemployed.

Why might we be facing that prospect? In searching for an answer to that question, I reached the following conclusion: the

growth in employment this year may be greatly dampened by the rise in output per manhour (productivity) as the economy expands. Since the civilian labor force may also expand more rapidly, the level of unemployment can be expected to decline only moderately.

These conclusions were reached on the basis of a fairly detailed analysis of the interrelations among the growth in output, productivity, and employment during the last two decades. The highlights of the examination can be summarized here:

"Productivity in the private nonfarm economy rose at an annual average rate of 2.6 per cent during the period 1948-1971. However, while the rate of increase was just over 1.0 per cent in the years 1967-70, it jumped to 3.4 per cent last year.

"The dampening effect of reduced growth and declines in output on wage increases and unit labor costs during the recession phase of post World War II business cycles has been noticeable. But this impact was far less evident in the case of the 1970-71 cycle. Thus, employers have been counting heavily on increased productivity in the current recovery to help restrain upward pressure on labor costs.

"Consequently, last year, when the economy was achieving some expansion in output, a large share of the rise in production was accounted for by higher output per manhour, and only minor benefits accrued in the form of higher employment.

"The outlook is for a further large rise in productivity in 1972—perhaps in the neighborhood of $3\frac{1}{2}$ –4 per cent. The net results might be an increase in employment only moderately more than the growth in the labor force—and thus only a modest reduction in unemployment."

Since the nation definitely cannot afford to call a halt to improvements in productivity, we must search for alternative ways to stimulate employment—if we are to cut substantially into the persistently high level of unemployment. Among several alternatives which might be considered, an expansion of the Public Employment Program appears to be especially promising.

CYCICAL BEHAVIOR OF PRODUCTIVITY

The behavior of productivity is greatly influenced by the phase of the business cycle through which the economy might be passing at a particular time.

In the construction phase of the cycle, growth in productivity typically slows down—and sometimes there is a decline. Several factors help to explain this pattern: these include the intentional and accidental hoarding of labor (especially white-collar labor), the time that lapses after the cyclical peak is reached in the economy and individual employers recognize this fact in their own businesses, and shifts in the industrial mix of output from high productivity sectors (which tend to be sensitive to cyclical variations) toward the more stable but relatively low productivity sectors. Employers need to maintain a minimum labor force to meet future production needs. Consequently, they tend to maintain employment even after the growth of output begins to moderate, and they persist in doing so until they are convinced that the economic slowdown is not temporary. Moreover, even after it is evident that a contraction is in process, employers have often been reluctant to reduce overhead labor—such as administrative and professional staff.

In the early recovery phase of a business cycle productivity growth tends to accelerate as overhead and other relatively fixed labor costs decline per unit of output. Having adopted cost-cutting programs to trim excess personnel during the recession, employers hesitate to add non-production employees when new orders and output begin to pick up, and there is little need for addi-

tional overhead personnel. This pattern of behavior is clearly evident in the statistical record. For example, in the 1958 recovery, employment of production workers in manufacturing rose by 8.8 per cent during the first four quarters after the cyclical trough was reached while employment of non-production workers increased by only 2.9 per cent. Similarly, in the recovery from the most recent recession, employment of factory production workers grew by 0.4 per cent between the fourth quarter of 1970 and the fourth quarter of 1971. Yet, over the same period, jobs held by non-production workers declined by a further 2.7 per cent.

The extent to which increases in productivity can be achieved during the recovery from a recession depends significantly on the rate of growth of real output. In general, the sharper the upturn in output during a recovery the larger the jump in output per manhour. However, the relationship has varied somewhat in each postwar recovery.

The magnitude of productivity increases achieved during the sluggish 1970-71 recovery was not typical of that recorded in other recovery periods. During the four quarters following the cyclical trough (which occurred in the last quarter of 1970), real output rose by only 3.5 per cent (substantially less than in earlier periods). Productivity rose by 4.1 per cent, and manhours rose by 1.2 per cent. Moreover, the growth of output and productivity during this period (1971) was stimulated by the recovery from the General Motors strike. After correcting the data to allow for this factor, the slower growth of productivity than in previous recoveries is more evident.

Another aspect of the cyclical behavior of productivity should be noted. During the second year of recovery, the rate of growth of output, productivity, and manhours slowed down appreciably in the three earlier periods. However, the typical second-year behavior may be different as the current recovery progresses: rather than a moderation in the rate of growth of productivity, we may witness an acceleration in output per manhour. This may come about because of the anticipated faster growth in real output this year—in contrast to the slowing in growth in the second year in each of the other periods. The implications of such an outcome for employment will be discussed at a later point in these remarks.

PRODUCTIVITY AND UNIT LABOR COSTS

Productivity growth is a key element in checking inflation. This is true because the relationship of the increase in output per manhour to compensation per manhour determines unit labor costs. The typical cyclical pattern has been for unit labor cost pressures to ease during the recession phase of the cycle as slack labor markets dampen the rise in compensation per manhour. During the recovery phase of the cycle, it has been the above-average productivity gains which have tended to offset rises in compensation and to limit unit labor cost increases.

However, the experience during the 1970-71 recession and recovery so far has not conformed to that typical pattern. Compensation per manhour continued to rise at a rapid pace throughout 1970 and into early 1971. This occurred even as unemployment rose. In addition, productivity showed little change in 1970, and it did not grow nearly as fast as is usually the case during the 1971 recovery period. As a result, unit labor costs continued to advance fairly rapidly prior to the imposition of the Wage-Price Freeze in August of last year.

PRODUCTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT

As indicated earlier, the drive to improve productivity poses a dilemma: while productivity growth helps to dampen cost pressures, it also has a retarding impact on employment gains. The source of this dilemma

is easily understood. For a given amount of expansion in production, the larger the increase in labor productivity the smaller the increase in manhours required. In a recovery period, strong productivity growth and increases in the workweek tend to limit employment gains.

In recovery periods, private nonfarm output tends to grow rapidly in the first few quarters after the cyclical trough is reached; but so does output per manhour. During the first half-year following the low point in output, productivity gains and increased hours tend to account for much of the output growth. But for a variety of reasons which need to be catalogued here, there is a limit to the increased production that can be obtained through higher productivity and overtime work. At some point, as the demand for output continues to expand, additional workers must be added to the payroll.

In general, one can visualize changes in productivity, hours of work, and employment at three sources of inputs required to generate the observed growth in output. The specific share of each in the increased output varied substantially, but several clear tendencies are observable. Among the three, increased productivity appears to take the lead, accounting for half or more of the output gain in the first six months of recovery. Increased employment was of somewhat less importance, and longer working hours accounted for the smaller proportion. As the recovery progresses, the share of output growth attributable to productivity and longer work weeks tends to diminish and the share contributed by increased employment climbs.

Again, however, the experience during the 1971 recovery varied significantly from the typical pattern sketched above. In the first six months following the trough of the 1970 recession, the rise in output per manhour accounted for three-quarters of the advance in output, and the proportion rose further over the next half year. The share attributable to longer working hours fluctuated considerably, but on balance the net results were a positive contribution of about one-sixth of the output gain in the first six months and an offset of roughly the same magnitude in the next half year. Higher employment provided less than one-tenth of the net rise in output in the first six months and just over one-fifth in the succeeding half year. Thus, from an analysis of the data presented here, one overriding conclusion emerges: last year, when the economy made only moderate progress in recovering from the 1970-71 recession, a disproportionate share of the rise in output was accounted for by higher productivity, and only minor benefits accrued in the form of higher employment.

OUTLOOK FOR PRODUCTIVITY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR 1972

Given these recent trends in productivity and employment, we ought to raise questions about the prospects for the future. I have raised some of these questions, and the answers I obtained can be summarized here. In undertaking this task, my purpose was not to make an independent assessment of the outlook for the economy as a whole. Rather, I took as a point of departure the general economic outlook contained in the Economic Report of the Council of Economic Advisers (CEA). That forecast is for an acceleration of real economic growth during 1972 to somewhere in the neighborhood of 6 per cent, compared to the 2.7 per cent rate of growth achieved in 1971. In particular, the expected strengthening of activity in the manufacturing sector (in which productivity growth is particularly high) is of special interest. Thus, the question to which I wish to address myself at this point is this: How will this outlook for the national economy as a whole affect productivity and employment?

In seeking an answer to this question, I pursued several avenues. First, on the basis of informal soundings among businessmen, I have gotten a clear impression that many manufacturing firms are moving cautiously in expanding their payrolls. Among other factors, a strong desire to control costs by meeting increased output demands through higher productivity rather than higher employment appears to have moderated the pace at which factory jobs grew throughout 1971 and into the early months of the year.

These qualitative impressions are reinforced by the statistics relating to employment. In March, 18.8 million people were employed in manufacturing industries. This was an increase of 310,000 from the low point reached in August, 1971. Yet, this was about the same number as a year earlier and still nearly 1.6 million below the peak set in the third quarter of 1969.

For the economy as a whole, the outlook this year is for considerable improvement in the job situation. However, the civilian labor force is also expected to rise appreciably, and the net effect on unemployment is cloudy. In March, the civilian labor force (seasonally adjusted) totaled 86.3 million. This was an increase of 2.4 million above the level a year ago. Total employment amounted to 81.2 million. This was also a year-to-year gain of 2.4 million in the number of people with jobs. The number of unemployed persons totaled 5.2 million in March, an increase of about 40,000 since March, 1971.

To look beyond the employment experiences during the early months of 1972 to the rest of the year is necessarily difficult. In their *Annual Report*, CEA noted that:

"Our estimate implies an increase of 6 per cent in real GNP between 1971 and 1972. This is about the rate of increase achieved in the fourth quarter of 1971. There is no easy way to separate the forecast rate of real growth into employment and productivity gains. Clearly, it should yield substantial increases in both. The extent to which the employment gains will reduce the unemployment rate depends on the size of the increase in the labor force. It is estimated that the unemployment rate should decline from the 6 percent level of December 1971 to the neighborhood of 5 per cent by the end of 1972." (*Report*, 1972, p. 108).

I agree that it is difficult to unravel the effects of gains in output, employment, and productivity. However, as shown above, the behavior of productivity has a significant bearing on the amount of employment we should expect to result from a given increase in real GNP. Thus, if we are to form a reasonable idea of the prospects for employment in 1972, we must search for even rough clues to the probable trend of productivity in the current year.

To aid in this search, I made use of computer-based econometric techniques which are becoming increasingly useful tools of economic analysis. The results of the analysis provide an insight into the productivity-employment contour which might be expected for 1972.

The statistical analysis took as a point of departure the CEA forecast of a 6 per cent increase in real GNP during 1972. Past experience suggests a 3½-4 per cent productivity growth consistent with a 6 per cent increase in real output. In using this estimate, I must emphasize that it is only a rough approximation. But it does seem to be broadly consistent with the growth of real output expected this year.

Using the 4 per cent figure for productivity it was estimated that nonfarm payroll employment might rise by about 2 per cent in 1972. This would mean an increase in jobs of roughly 1.5 million. Under these conditions, the growth of total employment would be greater than 1.5 million—because of increases in the number of self-employed workers, private household workers, and other

workers not on nonfarm payrolls. In rough terms the rise in these categories might amount to 0.5 million. Thus, the increase in total employment implied by a 6 per cent growth in real GNP in 1972 might be in the neighborhood of 2 million.

What does this mean for the unemployment rate? Normal labor force growth of about 1½ million per year is currently estimated as a result of population growth and other demographic and economic factors. But labor force participation rates were relatively depressed in 1971—especially among adult males—due to slack labor market conditions. Consequently, a rebound in participation rates would lead to a somewhat larger than normal labor force growth. In addition, the Defense Department estimates some further reductions in the armed forces which would add an additional 100,000 to the civilian labor force. In total, the civilian labor force could be expected to grow by about 1¾ million in 1972. Thus, an increase in total employment of 2 million would mean a decline in unemployment of about 250,000. A decline of this magnitude might still leave the unemployment rate somewhat above 5 per cent.

The conclusion I reach from the foregoing analysis can be stated succinctly: the substantial growth in output expected for 1972 should also lead to a sizable expansion in employment. However, the significant increase in productivity which is also expected will dampen the growth of jobs, and only a moderate impact can be expected on the level of unemployment.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO EXPANDING EMPLOYMENT

Given this prospect, I asked myself whether anything could be done to quicken the growth of jobs. In posing the question, I obviously had to keep in mind the conflict that might emerge between additional efforts to stimulate employment and the continuing campaign to reduce inflation. Moreover, the substantial changes that have occurred in the structure of the labor force in recent years (i.e., proportionately more women and teenagers in the labor force) make the task of generating more employment even more difficult.

Nevertheless, I am personally convinced that we cannot simply take note of these difficulties; we should also be prepared to pursue alternative approaches which show promise of helping us reconcile our competing objectives. One such approach is to expand the public employment program.

The Emergency Employment Act of 1971 (EEA) established a two-year manpower program which is designed to provide transitional public service jobs in State or local governments for unemployed and underemployed persons. The Public Employment Program (PEP) is authorized by the EEA to make available up to 90 per cent Federal funding for a variety of temporary jobs to go into effect when the national unemployment rate equals or exceeds 4.5 per cent for a three-month period. A special program for local areas with jobless rates of 6 per cent or above for three consecutive months is also provided.

All unemployed and underemployed persons are eligible for the public service employment with priority consideration accorded to Vietnam veterans and low-income groups. Jobs created under this program must be transitional—that is, they must lead to permanent jobs in public service or in private industry, and they must provide prospects for skill development and advancement. The program incorporates safeguards which attempt to insure that funds are used to create new jobs that would not have been otherwise financed by local revenues or existing Federal programs.

The Federal funds are apportioned among the states by a formula which takes into account number of unemployed and the sever-

ity of unemployment in a given area. States and localities (acting as agents under the program) contribute 10 per cent matching funds.

Funding provides a total Federal outlay of \$2.25 billion over a two-year period ending June 30, 1973, as follows:

(1) *General funds* are triggered by a national unemployment rate of 4.5 or above. A total of \$1.75 billion has been appropriated: \$750 million for fiscal 1972 and \$1 billion during fiscal 1973.

(2) *Special funds* of \$250 million in each of the two years are available for areas with particularly severe unemployment. According to data supplied by the Manpower Administration in the Department of Labor, \$981 million (of total Federal funds) have been allocated. Agents' shares account for an additional \$105 million.

In January of this year, there were a total of 134,374 funded job openings approved under the program. In the same month, current enrollment (people actually at work) under the program amounted to 102,858. There have been about 8,000 terminations to date. The Manpower Administration estimates that a total of 145,000 jobs will be created in fiscal 1972 at an average annual salary of \$7,200.

A study of the first 45,000 people hired under the PEP indicated that 30 per cent were Vietnam veterans, and about 30 per cent were disadvantaged—including 10 per cent who were welfare recipients. Altogether, about 30 per cent of the newly hired were minorities, and about 88 per cent of the jobs were filled by unemployed persons who had never worked for the local government hiring them.

The jobs created reflect a wide spectrum of public service employment, although State and local agents must give highest priority to creating jobs in areas where the need for additional service is the greatest.

In order to maximize the number of jobs created, 90 per cent of the allocated Federal funds must be used for wages and benefits, so funds for training and supportive services are limited. However, the Manpower Administration estimates that about 16,000 participants will receive some training under the program. In addition, many more may receive training and supportive services through linkages between the PEP and other manpower programs.

Given this favorable experience with the PEP, I asked myself what impact on total employment might one expect if the amount of funds being spent on the program were increased significantly. As indicated above, the EEA is currently funded for \$750 million in fiscal 1972 and at \$1 billion in fiscal 1973—with an extra \$500 million for exceptionally depressed areas.

To assess the consequences of such an expansion, I again made use of the computer-based econometric techniques available to us. In this case, the behavior of the economy was simulated on the assumption that Federal outlays would be raised by \$1 billion above those already anticipated in the budget. This would represent an approximate doubling of the amounts currently available under the EEA. The simulations were made on the assumption that \$1.0 billion were added to the existing level of Federal outlays for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973. Thus, the task was to estimate the differential effects on the economy of using the funds in several alternative ways. To start the simulations, a Base Projection was made by applying the GNP assumptions in the CEA Report for 1972. The effects of alternative policies could then be calculated by comparing the results of each successive simulation with the Base Projection. Four alternatives were studied: (1) a reduction in Federal personal income tax rates; (2) an increase in Federal procurement; (3) an increase in regular Federal grants-in-aid to

State and local governments, and (4) an increase in amounts available for the public employment program.

Several conclusions stand out in the results. The largest and most rapid, short-run impact on employment would be produced by the PEP. The number of additional jobs provided would approximate 200,000—twice the number generated by each of the other alternatives at the end of one year. The PEP would also have the largest and most rapid impact on unemployment. By following this route, the unemployment rate might be reduced by 0.2 percentage point after one year; an increase in Federal procurement or an expansion in regular grants-in-aid might reduce the unemployment rate by 0.1 percentage point—while a cut in personal income tax rates would probably have little if any effect on unemployment.

However, the expansion in the PEP might also eventually exert relatively more upward pressure on prices. The fact that the unemployment rate declines earlier and falls farther under the PEP approach implies that the margin of unused capacity would be shaved earlier in the process. Consequently, as the process continues, available resources would eventually come under pressure. With a given availability of funds, interest rates would tend to rise—thus increasing the cost of investment. If permitted to continue long enough, the rate of growth in real GNP would be moderated. But in the near-term, given the substantial amounts of unused resources that actually exist, the main results of an expansion in the PEP would be an increase in employment and a decline in unemployment.

An increase of \$1.0 billion in Federal grants-in-aid to States and localities would also produce a sizable rise in GNP (\$1.9 billion vs. \$2.4 billion for the PEP). However, the effects on employment would be much less (0.1 million vs. 0.2 million). The observed differences seem to be explained by the fact that—under the regular Federal grants-in-aid programs—States and localities would probably use the additional funds for less labor-intensive projects than under PEP. As indicated above, the PEP has provisions designed to limit this possibility. In practice, however, these limitations might not be completely effective, and the actual outcome might lie between the two alternatives involving larger Federal grants.

Under all of the alternative policies, the deficit in the Federal budget would be increased—but in no case by as much as the rise in Federal outlays. The expansion in the deficit would be about the same (\$0.7 billion) for a tax reduction and an increase in the PEP; it would also be roughly the same (\$0.4 billion) for a rise in Federal procurement and an increase in regular Federal grants-in-aid. The size of the increase in the deficit related to the tax reduction can be traced to the fairly small rise produced in the GNP as well as to the lower tax rates on a given level of personal income. Under the PEP, the ultimate expenditures by State and local governments would represent primarily wages and salaries paid to lower-income earners. Among these, effective tax rates would probably be lower than those applicable to those who would receive payments under either the regular Federal grants-in-aid programs or through increased Federal procurement of goods and services.

From the foregoing analysis, it is clear that an enlargement of the PEP would be a preferable route to travel—if the nation is searching for rapid progress in stimulating employment and making a further reduction in unemployment.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

As I stressed at the outset, we definitely need to foster a substantial increase in productivity. If we fail in that goal, we are unlikely to make much progress in checking in-

flation in the short-run and in improving our standard of living in the years ahead. On the other hand, the considerable rise in productivity expected this year may dampen the growth of employment. Thus, the major task immediately ahead of us is to assure—as a minimum—that we achieve the rate of real growth projected by CEA for the current year. But—if we want to make a larger dent in the persistently high level of unemployment—the PEP appears to offer a promising approach.

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS, GREAT CRIPPLER OF YOUNG ADULTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on March 21 I introduced legislation which will assist in the fight against multiple sclerosis, known as the "great crippler of young adults." My bill, H.R. 13978, establishes a National Commission on Multiple Sclerosis which would act as a clearinghouse to inventory current efforts in the field of multiple sclerosis and related neurological diseases.

At this time, there is no known cause or cure for this disease. There is reason for hope now though that concerted efforts at this moment would be helpful. Breakthroughs have been made by members of the research community working under the auspices of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society and other private foundations, as well as the National Institutes of Health. Research has been scattered, however, and there is need to coordinate and evaluate efforts.

The commission is not a billion dollar institute nor is it intended to be the vehicle for unlimited Government spending. The commission would be charged with making a thorough study of current research with the hopes of identifying the most productive avenues of approach toward finding causes, cures, and treatments. It would then be required to report back to the President and the Congress concerning the need for enactment of new legislation with emphasis on funding needs and the levels and means by which the Federal Government can best participate in this effort.

I am today reintroducing this legislation with 46 cosponsors. They are: BELLA ABZUG, WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, NICK BEGICH, FRANK BRASCO, WILLIAM G. BRAY, EDWARD P. BOLAND, JOHN BUCHANAN, DON H. CLAUSEN, JAMES CLEVELAND, THADDEUS DULSKI, ED EDMONDSON, DON EDWARDS, EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, CHARLES GRIFFIN, GILBERT GUDE, LEE HAMILTON, KEN HECKLER, HENRY HELSTOSKI, LOUISE DAY HICKS, ANDREW J. JACOBS, JACK F. KEMP, JOHN J. McFALL, RAY MADDEN, ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, JOHN MELCHER, RALPH METCALFE, ABNER MIKVA, JOSEPH G. MINISH, PARREN J. MITCHELL, WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, BERTRAM L. POBELL, CHARLES B. RANGEL, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, J. EDWARD ROUSH, WILLIAM R. ROY, PAUL S. SARBANES, JAMES H. SCHEUER, WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT, W. S. "BILL" STUCKEY, JAMES W. SYMINGTON, ROBERT O. TIERNAN, CHARLES W. WHALEN, WILLIAM WIDNALL, LARRY WINN, WENDALL WYATT, and JOHN DAVIS.

Mr. Speaker, for too long the MS victims have borne their burden with dignity, but alone. With so many possibilities for success, we must be willing now to take the steps necessary to give direction and hope to the fight being waged by MS patients and their families. I am hopeful that the Congress will take this step during the 92d Congress.

ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, I introduced a bill, the Uniformed Services Special Pay Act of 1972, which addresses areas which need to be addressed in the transition to an all-volunteer army.

That legislative package consists of a number of special pays and is designed to meet specific manpower needs in critical skill and low-retention positions. It is my sincere hope that it will receive prompt, serious consideration and early passage so that it might be of immediate benefit to our men and women in service and might encourage others to join.

But I recognize that the package I introduced is not enough—as the pay increases we voted last fall were not enough—when it comes to improving the quality of life for our Nation's defense forces.

It is for this reason that I am introducing the Volunteer Military Manpower Act of 1972. This bill, if enacted, would increase the attractiveness and feasibility of military service for thousands of young people.

Key features of the bill are these:

Extension of travel and transportation allowances to enlisted men and women in pay grades E-1 through E-4—under 4 years of service;

A study of military housing needs and proposal of 5- and 10-year plans to achieve adequate housing for all military personnel and their dependents;

Establishment of a fair housing allowance for military personnel living in substandard housing;

Further authorization for funding for recruitment and advertising;

Provision of discretionary funds for project volunteer programs; and

Manpower management and military compensation studies.

The need for enactment of these proposals is clear. On the most elementary level, the success of an all-volunteer military hinges on two factors—the number of men and women who volunteer and the number of them who reenlist.

The services have never really had to worry about this before. If the Army could not get enough men to meet volunteer or reenlistment quotas, it could increase the number of men drafted. And the other services relied on draft pressure to cause men to volunteer with them.

Thus, the manpower supply was always there. The Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force did recruit—they did try to convince young men and women to spend some time in the military—but it was not a make or break situation. And if a

serviceman or woman did not like his or her barracks, food, or poverty conditions after joining, tough luck. He or she was stuck with it for a few years, and had better realize it; 2, 3, or 4 years later somebody else would take their place, and that person too would have to realize that military life was not supposed to be easy, pleasant or in many cases just plain livable.

TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

Furthermore, low-ranking enlisted men and women simply did not deserve better, according to the old rationale. Payment of travel and transportation allowances were seen as unnecessary—a man in the lower grades had no business being married. After all, how could he afford a wife and family on the money he got as a private, or even as a specialist?

Now, though, things are different. With the recent pay increases, men are earning enough in most cases to support a wife. More importantly, the number of married men in the military's lowest ranks has increased, and we must make provision for them.

The strikingly large group of married enlisted men and women in grades E-4 and below dramatizes the seriousness of the problem. Recent survey data shows, in the Army alone, some 202,000 enlistees in grades E-1 to E-4 are now married. This number equals about a third of all Army E-1 to E-4's. The total marks a dramatic 30 percent increase in married junior enlistees over the past 2 years. More strikingly, it is slightly less than a fourth of the projected Army strength level by mid-summer of this year.

Serviceswide, figures suggest an E-1 to E-4 married group of about 465,000. Generally, these men receive none of the necessities sought under the amendments of section 3 of this bill. These necessities are already accorded all other servicemen. A general's expenses for moving family and effects anywhere in the world are automatically paid. Meanwhile, low-ranking men and women—who make a spendable salary averaging less than \$110 per week—must somehow meet the cost of a move forced by PCS orders transferring them to another unit and base. They are forced to do so, or face separation from husband or wife and family of up to 2 years. The inequity of not allowing junior enlisted personnel allowances for dependents' travel transportation or separation is apparent.

The justification given for this double standard is that recognition of the existence of dependents of first-term enlisted members would encourage marriage and "distracting" family obligations among junior enlisteds. The services have traditionally felt that the demands of the enlistee's service life at this point—irregular hours, continuous training, mobility requirements and the need for supervision and close control—are such that he or she ought not to be married. Hence, allowances have been structured to provide a negative incentive for married men enlisting, or marrying during an initial enlistment. An unspoken reason for not extending the allowances is that it saves money—and money not spent on

low-ranking enlisted personnel can be spent elsewhere.

As the statistics I cited earlier show, though, absence of the allowances has not prevented hundreds of thousands from marrying. Rather, because of being drafted or simply because more young people marry earlier be they draftee or volunteer, it has forced them to live in hardship—and in many cases, especially prior to the pay increases, poverty.

Living under poverty conditions, of course, can only detract from the kind of job a serviceman or woman does. But perhaps even more debilitating to job performance is forced separation from family. Family separation is recognized by all services as one of the most serious irritants in military life and as one of the biggest reasons careers terminate prematurely. The Army's command and job stabilization program, the Navy's efforts to homeport Sixth and Seventh Fleet ships overseas to decrease family separations, and DOD's increase in the number of and decrease in the cost of overseas dependents' flights evidence attention to the problem.

A 1971 study of Army inservice living conditions by the Human Resources Research Organization—HumRRO—found a significant number of surveyed members citing family life problems as a most serious impediment to continuation of Army careers. Because of pay levels and the glaring absence of dependents' allowances, the problem is most acute and troubling among married junior enlisteds. The office of the Secretary of Defense notes that about half of surveyed youth have indicated family separation as a deterrent to potential enlistment.

My proposed amendment of the United States Code will entitle E-1 through E-4 enlisted personnel with PCS to transportation of dependents and effects to their new duty station or to reimbursement in lieu of Government-provided transportation. It will greatly reduce family separations by easing the onerous financial problems now faced by married junior enlistees who must move under orders. Similarly, amending the Code will ensure junior enlistees nearly the same financial set-off already granted all other military members moving under PCS orders where Federal housing is unavailable—a dislocation allowance equal to 1 month's basic allowance for quarters.

The code now authorizes payment of a nominal family separation allowance, designed to assist with dependents' living expenses, to service men and women separated from their families by assignment—excepting enlistees in grades E-1 through E-4. The amendment will make more equitable those necessary family separations bound to affect some men.

Amending the code to provide family separation allowances for all military members will remove financial prohibitions of marriage and dependency from junior enlisted personnel. Most importantly, it will ease severe financial and marital burdens on numerous already-married E-1's to E-4's in service. The amendments will reduce a significant barrier to enlistment and reenlistment and will demonstrate legitimate concern

for the needs and problems of the many married junior enlistees.

HOUSING

Of real importance to both married and bachelor personnel in the lower grades is housing. Some personnel, living in substandard Government housing, feel their living conditions should be improved. Others have occasionally found themselves wishing they had housing—any housing. When the Military Intelligence School was moved from Fort Holabird, Md., to Fort Huachuca, Ariz., some men reportedly found themselves renting trailers in neighboring Sierra Vista for up to \$250 a month, while others had to commute each day from Tucson—some 75 miles away—because of the housing shortage.

Like being with one's family, living in adequate housing is one of the highest priorities for service men and women. I do not feel that our service personnel are expecting too much when they request quality housing.

The study specified in my bill would specifically: establish the present inventory of adequate off-post housing; conduct a unit-by-unit analysis of the adequacy of all on-post housing; establish criteria to determine the extent personnel without dependents, particularly junior enlisted personnel, will be given the opportunity to live off-post; and establish alternate 5- and 10-year plans designed to achieve adequate housing for all military personnel and their dependents.

DOD housing officials have estimated a housing-deficit of 110,000 units services-wide. In addition, there are estimated to be some 20,000 to 25,000 inadequate or substandard units presently occupied by military personnel. This statistic points up a twofold need: First, to build sufficient numbers of new housing and to upgrade or replace substandard housing, and second, to provide a fair-housing allowance for those living in less than acceptable conditions.

Furthermore, why cannot low-ranking bachelor enlistees live off-post when living on-post means living in a bay with perhaps 50 other soldiers in a barracks which has not been renovated in years? The total fiscal year 1973 construction and rehabilitation program for bachelor housing amounts to some \$387 million, but in many instances a preferable solution to the housing problem would be to allow personnel to live off-base.

Equally important for personnel living in less than ideal conditions is the fair-housing allowance. They deserve to be paid the difference between the basic allowance for quarters—BAQ—and the determined rental value of the place in which they are living.

Housing officials in the Department of Defense have proposed a plan which would give all officers and senior NCO's the option of living offpost, the March 29 Army Times reported. This recommendation is admirable, in that it would open up bigger, more adequate housing for thousands of lower and middle grade enlisted men. But, a preferable alternative would be to provide this off-post option to all servicemen. The old

attitude toward the junior grade enlisted man seen within the military in all too many instances must be tempered if we are to have a truly cohesive defense force with a high morale factor.

Reducing the housing deficit, lowering the number of substandard and inadequate quarters, increasing the housing options for military personnel, and insuring that they are not penalized by the absence of a fair housing allowance while living on base—all of these things are important. All of these things can be done under provisions of this bill. We must have the study, for through that we will be able to get a greater understanding of what we must do to meet the housing requirements of our military personnel.

ADVERTISING AND RECRUITING

A third key facet of the legislation is section 5, which recommends authorization of outlays for Armed Forces radio and television advertising and for improvement of the mobility and effectiveness of the recruiter force. The relatively small expenses authorized are primarily designed to assist DOD in reaching and having an impact on the June graduating classes, especially from high schools. This section addresses a critical and immediate need for stimulating voluntary enlistments at a particular time—it deserves the highest priority.

The recent history of Armed Forces advertising to stimulate enlistments is well known. Prior to 1971, the services had been relying, with little success, on radio/TV public service promotion time, which was generally available in relatively scanty amounts and was often given when commercial time was not selling. A study done by Broadcast Advertisers Reports, Inc., in the top 75 TV markets during a full week in August of 1969 revealed the following:

Only 32.5 percent of the TV stations ran any Army commercials.

An average of less than three commercials per market were telecast.

Only 4 percent of the spots telecast were on VHF network-affiliated stations during prime time—7:30 to 11 p.m.

The vast majority of all commercials were on during light-viewing periods.

The Army's Recruiting Command has noted that even if all TV stations increased the amount of public service time donated to the Army, they still would not likely approach the level needed. It reported that if every NBC-TV station carrying the "Tonight" show ran an Army commercial between 12 and 12:30 a.m., less than half as many men between the ages of 18 and 24 could be reached than would be with a single insertion in McCalls. This statistic hardly inspires confidence in the effectiveness of a strictly public-service-reliant advertising campaign.

Meanwhile, we have seen what a concerted advertising effort can do. From March to May 1971, the Army was permitted to purchase "prime-time" radio/TV advertisements in an attempt to reach as many enlistment-age people as possible to stimulate voluntary enlistments. Advertising time was purchased on something of a "crash" or saturation

basis, and the shortage of time the Army had to prepare for the program limited its overall effectiveness. Still, careful study of the test's results showed it the most effective single method ever used to stimulate enlistments. Examples of that effectiveness:

TV alone impacted on 18- to 34-year-olds during the test period some 9,000,000 times per month—20 times as effective as public service advertising;

Radio coverage reached 18- to 24-year-olds some 109,000,000 times per month—500 times more effective than public service time;

Paid electronic advertisements produced 10,000 calls per week to the Army's toll-free "LISTFAX" number—70 times more than public service advertisements;

Awareness of advertised Army options among the target group skyrocketed 118 percent;

Eight thousand enlistments were directly attributed to the paid radio/TV advertising campaign;

True volunteer enlistments increased 28 percent;

Delayed entry enlistments increased 95 percent;

The 17- to 18-year-old enlistments increased 35 percent; and

Combat arms enlistments boomed 702 percent.

The need, then, for paid radio/TV advertising is obvious. It has proven its ability to produce dramatic results. The Army has made an effort to stimulate the amount and quality of free public service time granted it by the Nation's broadcasters, but there has been little positive response. And even increased public service time cannot have nearly the impact of a concerted advertising program. Such advertising has been tested under fire and has proven itself effective. It deserves promotion, to use the military vernacular, not a discharge or an early out.

Also important is a step-up in recruiting appropriations. Significant progress has been made in improving the structure and effectiveness of the U.S. Army Recruiting Command. Congress has recognized the need in this area. But again, problems persist in the face of the special effort needed this summer.

A particular problem at present, for example, is mobility of Army recruiters. Currently, one vehicle is available for transport per two recruiters. This limits effectiveness, especially for recruiters working outside of, or on the periphery of, cities. Providing more transportation for the 6,000-man recruiter force is necessary to insure the maximum utilization of personnel.

The effect of improved recruiting efforts is already evident. Lt. Gen. George Forsythe, General Westmoreland's special assistant for the modern volunteer Army, has pointed out that in December 1971, enlistments were up 20 percent over the same month the previous year, with an 80 percent quality improvement and 88 percent of enlistees high school graduates.

The Honorable Roger Kelley, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, has said that seven of 10 enlistees thus far in 1972 have been

true, nondraft-motivated volunteers. Further, enlistments for combat arms have risen from only 200 a month in 1970 to over 3,000 a month in 1971-72. He attributed this dramatic increase to the variety of enlistment options and improved recruiting efforts. We must continue and increase this effort. It is one of the most integral of components in the volunteer army program. Without a good recruiting program, we are not going to have the number of good, high-caliber volunteers who must rely on to defend the Nation.

This bill will give us maximum results of money expended. Radio/TV advertising will be purchased on the basis of careful market research, buying only from stations specifically programming to the target group, with time purchased during segments when the target group is known to listen or watch—not necessarily prime time—and with the amount of time purchased controlled by previous results measured against the services' specific enlistment goals.

The importance of authorizing outlays to assist the Armed Forces, recruiting effort cannot be overstated. Radio/TV advertising has proven itself to be an effective medium for stimulating enlistments. Recruiter mobility is an essential prerequisite to recruiter effectiveness. The most important single period of the year for a maximum recruiting effort is just ahead, as young men plan their activities after school graduation.

The number of involuntary inductions required in the next fiscal year and the ability to build a base of true volunteers in the services depends heavily on congressional support for this strong mid-year advertising program.

DISCRETIONARY FUNDS

Provision of funds for Project Volunteer discretionary funds is another key section of the bill. The funds authorized for appropriation can be applied to those areas which the Secretary of Defense deems most important. The ability to use the funds selectively will increase their impact and be of far greater long-range benefit than would be moneys allotted for a specific program whose worth has not been effectively measured.

The first year of Project Volunteer funding has shown that what works at one military installation will not necessarily work at another. And what is desperately needed at one base may well be taken care of at another. If one fort needs improved recreational facilities, while another needs barracks improvement, why lock both into a job civilianization program that may be instituted on a serviceswide basis? Why not address each specific problem with a specific program? That is what this bill would make possible.

Commanders at installations where the Project Volunteer experiment has been instituted have come to a substantial consensus on where the bulk of their resources should go: 33 percent of VOLAR funds have been devoted to freeing soldiers from nonmission, nonmilitary, specialty related duties such as KP; 23 percent to repairing and maintaining

troop facilities such as barracks and mess halls and community support facilities; 8 percent to avocational and recreational special services programs; and 4 percent to individual and unit training initiatives. The remainder of their funds, though, went to a variety of things commanders saw as necessary to enhance professionalism and improve Army life.

Maj. Gen. Orwin C. Talbott, commanding officer of Fort Benning, Ga., has been successful in making use of the VOLAR funds at his fort. Among the 10 highest ranked funded actions at Benning among first-term enlisted men were civilianization of KP, revising commissary operating hours, establishment of a shuttle bus service, and improvement of medical services for military servicemen and their dependents and of Special Service facilities. The general and his staff, after seeking out the programs which most needed being done, instituted those improvements. Creation of a discretionary fund would enable this kind of effort to be extended to posts and units throughout the world in all branches of the services.

General Forsythe said of the initial VOLAR experiments—

Each VOLAR post commander has been charged to conduct his own evaluation of the usefulness of the measures he institutes. No rigid criteria of effectiveness have been provided, and none seem necessary or helpful at this time.

As the general said, no rigid criteria seem helpful; hence, no rigid plan should be established. Let us not increase defense costs; rather, let us get the most for our defense dollar.

MANPOWER MANAGEMENT

The goal of section 7, calling for a manpower management study, is basically the same, to insure maximum effectiveness per dollar spent. This section requires the Secretary of Defense to explain to Congress, in detail, the composition of the Armed Forces in terms of how its personnel are occupied. It is a report long overdue.

Congress needs to know the composition of the Armed Forces—and in considerably greater detail than is now available. Many Members have questioned the need in various offices, commands, or installations for the number of military personnel actually required for the national security mission. It is important to keep in mind that every slot occupied unnecessarily is a slot which only drives up defense costs while doing nothing for the defense cause itself.

At the advent of an all-volunteer force, and in the face of increasing military personnel costs, the Nation needs to be assured that it is protected by a trim and efficient national defense force. Any areas with surplus personnel must be identified to insure that excess troop strengths do not drain off scarce national resources while serving no good purpose and accomplishing nothing of substance.

Each year, the Secretary of Defense details to Congress the national security requirements as currently perceived and recommends whether or not American military resources need to be applied to

meet problem or potential threat areas. The report is designed to promote, as currently described, a posture of realistic deterrence. This section does not propose to term it inadequate or to question its conclusions, for the report required herein does not address the merits of where the Nation applies its military resources. Rather, assuming the legitimacy of the varied worldwide applications of military resources, this study insists instead on justification to Congress of how many military personnel are actually needed to perform the required national security functions.

As proposed here, the section requires a report to the Congress once every 4 years which:

Specifically contains a position-by-position analysis of the function of each and every military job slot;

Specifically identifies those positions which might be filled by civilian personnel;

Enumerates in detail which positions might be filled by civilians, but which need to be reserved for legitimate military rotational requirements, along with a justification of the need for such rotational posts;

Earmarks those positions which might be amenable to staffing through the direct hire of skilled personnel into the Armed Forces; and

Outlines the manner in which any change in force size is to be accomplished, and which projects quarterly estimates of the number of personnel per pay grade and the number of expected accessions.

This mandated report will give Congress, for the first time, the information it needs to make the best education decisions in response to legislative requests for strengths and appropriations. It will be of great assistance to DOD in determining their areas of strength and weakness, better enabling them to meet their goal of fullest utilization of personnel. Most importantly, it will, as I have stated, insure by congressional scrutiny the maximum possible national defense for the tax dollar applied.

MILITARY COMPENSATION

Section 8 is another study proposal. Conjecture has been that members of the military undervalue their pay because of unseen factors such as the invisible tax advantage and certain allowances. Convert to salary, some say, and DOD would be money ahead.

My proposal is for a report, required to be submitted to the Secretary of Defense not later than the end of 1973, to recommend a modern structure for disbursing pay in the services. This section does not impose a new requirement—it merely reemphasizes the directive issued by Congress 7 years ago to complete the modernization of military pay.

The Military Pay Act of 1965 required the President to order a complete review of the military compensation system, and to forward to Congress results of that study, with any recommendations for changes.

The first report, delivered in 1967, was the first quadrennial pay review—commonly known as the Hubbell report. This analysis, conducted by the Office of

the Secretary of Defense, with representation from all services, was clearly the most exhaustive study to then of the relative benefits and considerable deficiencies of the piecemeal military compensation system.

DOD's first quadrennial pay review found an enormously varying system of disbursing compensation to military members, including basic pay; quarters or quarters allowance, if eligible; various special, hazardous, unusual, hostile duty, scarce skill, superior performance, or incentive pays, if eligible; a host of other benefits, some visible and some invisible; with the entire sum of it partially exposed and partially protected from Federal income taxes.

As the 1967 draft study by Senators—then Congressmen—STAFFORD and SCHWEIKER and colleagues HORTON, SHRIVER, and WHALEN emphasized:

Compared to civilian pay procedures, the military system of compensation appears to be inefficient and confusing. It defies concrete comparisons between civilian and military pay scales.

From surveys conducted by the Hubbell group, the confusion generated by the system became apparent. For example, survey data showed both officers and enlisted men with an average of 3 years on active duty, and leaving service, were consistently underestimating their then very low military earnings by 10 to 24 percent. In a series of queries to banks and finance companies to determine how they valued military compensation for lending purposes, salaries were underestimated at an average of 50 percent for an E-3; 34 percent for an O-1; 13 percent for an E-7; and 4 percent for an O-6.

As a result, the Pay Review recommended a new and simpler salary system for the Armed Forces, one which consolidated in a fair manner all variant income elements of the present system, but which, above all, made the compensation paid understandable to the military member.

In summarizing the recommendations, the DOD report said:

Increased visibility and equity will be attained by replacing a confusing array of pays, allowances, and benefits that depend in part on family size, with a single taxable salary based on pay grade and longevity step. Increased credibility will come from adopting an objective, quantitative standard for deciding what salary levels should be and how they should be adjusted to keep pace with salary levels in the private sector.

These general recommendations—including revamping the retirement program into a cash contribution basis and establishing Federal comparability scales—never reached Congress in terms of proposed legislation. Observers said that despite executive branch enthusiasm for the concepts, too few dollars kept the report recommendations from the fiscal year 1970 budget proposals.

In February 1970, the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Force reported its findings on key elements to eliminating reliance on the draft. In their report was a strong endorsement of the recommendations of the first quad-

rennial pay review, and for essentially the reasons the DOD report advanced.

DOD officials have estimated that it would cost some \$2.6 billion to make the conversion to the salary system. Increased Federal income tax collections of \$1.65 billion would reduce net Government cost to \$95 million.

But the long-range effect would be economical:

By making military compensation more visible, more men and women will likely be influenced to remain in the military. Net savings in terms of recruitment and training of replacement personnel are considerable.

Bachelors will be paid the same as married service personnel. Present allowance criteria very definitely discriminate against single service men and women.

Adjustment of military pay can be done on a standard that is visible and credible. Congress will have a tool to measure the adequacy of pay and the need for pay boosts.

But we do need a final and authoritative report recommending a new structure for disbursing military pay. Strong congressional action has increased military pay to respectable levels. The amount now given in military pay must be seen and understood by persons in the service, and especially by those considering military service. Basic recruit pay of \$288 a month, while double the level of a year ago, does not really sound like very much. Over an entire year, it comes to about \$3,450. That is hardly enticing, even in these days of a tight job market. What the prospective enlistee probably does not realize is that a recruit's total military compensation comes to \$5,407. And in half a year he is likely to make Pfc. That is worth \$5,881 annually. These are the figures America's young men and women need to know.

As the reports have recommended, and as this section proposes, its key elements should include, in the framework of a volunteer force, a single taxable cash salary system, based on pay grade and longevity step which specifically:

Takes into account tax advantages now realized by servicemen because of "protected" allowances and fringe benefits, thus being visible and understandable to those who receive it;

Employs the Federal comparability scales, and concretely and competitively defines various stages of job responsibility and authority, hence is competitive; and

Provides for cash contributions to a retirement system similar to that for Federal civilian employees, thereby not penalizing those who do not fulfill some specific obligation period, such as 20 years, to attain eligibility.

In addition, the report is required to consider the advisability of what may be an even more appropriate system for uniquely military needs, one which is a three-dimensional pay table, varying compensation by rank, longevity step and skill differentials.

A report recommending such methods for disbursing military pay will directly address the pay problem areas today: credibility—military personnel understanding their salaries, and more

importantly, Congress and the American people understanding them; visibility—military men and women seeing the amount paid them; and hence, true competitiveness—as the military can be on equal ground with the civilian sector in the employment market.

The entire package, then, with its mix of studies, discretionary and concrete programs, is the kind of legislation needed by and for the military. We can enact programs that need to be enacted and measure the feasibility of programs that it might be advisable to enact.

The combination will provide equity for all members of the uniformed services and will do so in a truly cost-effective manner. Conversion to an all-volunteer military is like putting together a puzzle. When you begin, you simply look for pieces that fit together, until finally you begin to get a feeling for the total shape and substance of the puzzle. Then, the pieces are put together more carefully, with the singular goal of effectively completing the whole. This bill can help to complete the whole.

A copy of the Volunteer Military Manpower Act of 1972 follows:

H.R.—

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

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the Volunteer Military Manpower Act of 1972.

SEC. 2. POLICY AND INTEREST OF CONGRESS.

Section 1(c) of The Military Selective Service Act of 1967 as amended is hereby amended to read:

The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations of serving in the Armed Forces should be enforced through the provisions of this act only when necessary to insure the security of this nation, and the opportunities and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces and the reserve components thereof should be shared generally in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

SEC. 3. TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES, DISLOCATION ALLOWANCES, AND FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCES FOR ENLISTED MEMBERS IN LOWER GRADES.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 406(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting "including a member in pay grade E-4 (four years or less service), E-3, E-2, or E-1," immediately after "A member of a uniformed service."

(b) Section 407(a) of such title is amended by striking out "uniformed service—" and inserting in lieu thereof "uniformed service, including a member in pay grade E-4 (four years or less service), E-3, E-2, or E-1—".

(c) Section 411 of such title is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no member of a uniformed service shall be denied an allowance authorized by the sections of this title designated by subsection (a) of this section on the basis of rank or time in grade."

(d) Section 427(b) of such title is amended by striking the words "(other than a member in pay grade E-1, E-2, E-3, or E-4 (under 4 years or less service))".

SEC. 4. HOUSING AND QUARTERS ALLOWANCES.

SEC. 4. (a) The President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretaries of the military departments shall exercise the authority vested in them by law to provide adequate

housing for every member of the Armed Forces and his dependents.

(b) As soon as practicable, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall commence a joint study of military housing needs to be completed and transmitted to the Congress and the President no later than 1 October 1973. This study shall specifically:

(1) establish the present inventory of adequate post housing,

(2) conduct a unit by unit analysis of the adequacy of all on-post housing,

(3) establish criteria to determine the extent to which personnel without dependents, particularly junior enlisted personnel, will be afforded the opportunity to live off-post. These criteria shall be designed for general military requirements, and for the specific nature of the branch of service, duty station, and military occupational specialty,

(4) establish alternate 5 and 10 year plans designed to achieve adequate housing for all military personnel and their dependents. In making these plans, the adequacy of housing in the private sector, the relative costs of subsidized private construction, anticipated developments in experimental means of construction, and the use of mobile trailer facilities and relocatable housing in areas of possible significant fluctuation in the number of personnel should be considered. Such plans should be designed with annual increments so that members of each and every pay grade shall have an equal opportunity to obtain adequate family and bachelor housing. Such plans shall specify the annual budgetary requirements per installation by unit cost.

(c) The following criteria shall be used in defining "adequate" housing:

(1) LOCATION.—The distance from administrative area of the installation can be transversed by privately owned vehicle in one hour or less during rush hours. Lesser time limits may be applied where clearly warranted by military necessity.

(2) COST.—The average total cost—including rent plus utilities and other operating costs, except telephone, plus allowable transportation costs—per month does not exceed an estimated schedule of maximum allowable housing costs. Such schedule shall be estimated on the basis of 20 to 25 per centum of regular military compensation, plus the housing portion of station allowances where applicable. The cost of transportation to and from work will be considered only when the housing is located more than ten miles from the installation; costs will be computed at least at 7 cents per mile for round trip miles in excess of 20 miles for 20 days per month.

(3) CONDITION.—The unit must be a complete dwelling unit with private entrance, with bath and kitchen for sole use of the occupants, and so arranged that both kitchen and bedrooms can be entered without passing through bedrooms. The unit must be well-constructed and in a good state of repair, with heating and kitchen equipment provided, and it must be located in a residential area which meets acceptable standards for health and sanitation and which is not subject to offensive fumes, industrial noises, and other objectionable features. The unit must be adequate in bedroom count for military families. With respect to net floor area, one bedroom unit normally should not be less than 550 square feet, two bedrooms—750 square feet; three bedrooms—960 square feet; and four bedrooms—1,080 square feet.

(4) Bachelor housing shall meet the same criteria as family housing as to Location and Cost. In addition, the unit must be well constructed and in good state of repair, with heating and reasonable privacy and access to bath facilities. It must be located in a residential area which meets acceptable standards for health and sanitation and which is not subject to offensive fumes, industrial noises, and other objectionable features. Two persons per bedroom shall be

considered the maximum occupancy for enlisted bachelor housing, with a minimum floor space of 270 square feet for one person occupancy and 135 square feet each for two person occupancy.

(5) The housing must be available to all members of the uniformed services regardless of race, creed, or national origin.

(d) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and Public Health Service, with or without dependents, may occupy on a rental basis, without loss of basic allowance for quarters, military housing under the jurisdiction of a military department notwithstanding that such housing may have been constructed or converted for assignment as public quarters. The net difference between the basic allowance for quarters and the fair rental value of such housing shall be paid from otherwise available appropriations; however, no rental charge for such housing shall be made in excess of the basic allowance for quarters of a member of the mentioned services.

(2) The fair rental value of each unit of military housing shall be determined on the basis of regulations established by the Secretary of Defense.

(3) "military housing" as used in this section shall refer to both bachelor and family quarters.

(4) This section will become effective January 1, 1973.

(5) On the effective date of this section, section 407 of Public Law 85-241 (71 Stat. 556), as amended, (42 U.S.C. 1594j) is repealed.

(e) Section 403(c) of Title 37 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) A member of a uniformed service without dependents is entitled to a basic allowance for quarters while he is on field duty or sea duty. For purposes of this subsection, duty of a period of less than three months is not considered to be field duty or sea duty. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no member shall be denied such allowance on the basis of rank or time in grade."

(f) Section 403(f) is amended by striking the words "who is in pay grade E-4 (four or more years' service) or above."

(g) Personnel in pay grades E-4 and below with dependents shall become eligible for on-post housing on an equal basis with personnel in other pay grades not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. RECRUITMENT AND ADVERTISING.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$92,000,000, of which \$30,000,000 shall be used for recruitment activities of military personnel during Fiscal Year 1973. The sum of \$62,000,000 shall be used for advertising in the recruitment of military personnel, \$20,000,000 of which shall be restricted for the exclusive use of radio and television in such advertising program. The sums authorized by this section shall be in addition to any other sums which have been or may be authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for the purposes specified in the preceding sentences.

SEC. 6. PROJECT VOLUNTEER DISCRETIONARY FUND.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$40,000,000 as a discretionary fund for the Secretary of Defense to be allocated to the services for improvement of the condition of service life and management practices which are determined by the Secretary of Defense to contribute to the enlistment and retention of military personnel.

SEC. 7. MANPOWER MANAGEMENT.

SEC. 7. (a) Beginning with the fiscal year ending 30 June 1973, and every fourth fiscal

year thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a written report not later than 1 March of said fiscal year, which shall contain the results of a position-by-position analysis of each and every military position, to specifically identify—

(1) positions and services in the non-mission forces which might be filled by civilian personnel or by contract services;

(2) positions in the non-mission forces which might be filled by civilian personnel, but need be reserved for military personnel, primarily because of rotational requirements, along with evidence which supports these rotational requirements or any other requirements and continuation of the policies on which such reservations are based;

(3) occupations which might be filled through direct hiring of skilled personnel into the armed services at pay grades commensurate with their training and experience;

(4) all other non-mission forces and the basis for continuation of the policy of reserving these positions for military personnel; and

(5) any other information the Secretary determines relevant to a position-by-position analysis.

SEC. 8. MILITARY COMPENSATION.

SEC. 8. (a) Not later than December 1, 1973, the Secretary of Defense shall formulate and send to the Congress and the President a written report recommending a new pay structure for the uniformed services.

(b) The pay structure designated in subsection (a) of this section shall—

(1) be constructed by making an analysis of military and civilian incomes at various stages of responsibility and authority, including top management, management entry, and work force entry levels. Such analysis shall not only use the federal comparability process as a basic guideline but shall also specifically consider competitive wages at entry levels in the civilian labor market, and shall establish a salary schedule sufficient to maintain an armed force on an all-volunteer basis.

(2) provide salary schedules of pay which combine basic pay rates and allowances for quarters and subsistence;

(3) provide for cash contributions to a retirement system similar to the civil service retirement system provided for Federal civilian employees;

(4) take into account the amount lost as a result of the termination of separate allowance for quarters and subsistence and the amount which will be contributed to a retirement system, including the loss of any tax advantage realized under current law;

(5) include such other features in the new pay structure as necessary or appropriate to make such pay structure fair and equitable and to attract qualified personnel to the uniformed services. The Secretary of Defense shall consider and report to the Congress on alternative salary systems, including a three-dimensional pay table which would vary compensation by rank, time in grade, and skill differentials.

(6) The study shall include the preparation of final drafts to all legislation and regulations required to implement the amended changes.

(c) The report designated in subsection (a) of this section shall be initiated as part of the Department of Defense's regular quadrennial review required by Paragraph 1008, section 2 (a) of Chapter 19, Title 37, United States Code.

THE NEW FEDERAL GUIDELINES RELATING TO METHADONE

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, this month the Food and Drug Administration lifted the investigational status of the synthetic narcotic, methadone. Although there are presently some 450 methadone clinics in the country—all operating on temporary, investigational new drug permits—the decision to reclassify the drug legally establishes, for the first time, its safety and effectiveness as an agent for treating heroin addiction.

Ever since 1947, when methadone was officially certified as an investigatory new drug, it has proven both efficacious and safe as a maintenance drug when correctly administered. In fact, as the new FDA guidelines acknowledge, methadone is the only drug for which there is "substantial evidence of effectiveness" in heroin addiction treatment. Experiences reported by methadone maintenance treatment programs have shown that, on the balance, the successes far outweigh the failures. A majority of the patients complete their schooling or increase their skills and become self-supporting. Their pattern of arrests decreases sharply. Only a very small percentage of the patients who remain in these programs revert to regular heroin use. Now the new Federal regulations have paved the way for the creation of many more methadone clinics and for the recognition of methadone as a major tool in the battle against heroin dependency.

On the other hand, while the new plan does represent a major expansion of the methadone system, the FDA has wisely included guidelines to eliminate its diversion to illicit use. Under the new regulations, methadone will be available only through Government approved treatment program. Private physicians will be prohibited from prescribing it unless they are program participants, and it will be removed from all drug stores where it is now available as a prescription drug. The dual purpose of this new Federal initiative, then, is to disrupt illegal trafficking in methadone while at the same time making it available to an estimated 25,000 heroin users who have been denied the drug because of lack of facilities.

The FDA's new proposals are, of course, reasonable, necessary, and an important step forward—there are few authorities that will not now concede that methadone has a valuable role to play in the treatment of many addicts. However, we must not ignore the fact that, despite its tremendous usefulness, methadone still does not adequately solve the problem. It is deficient in that it creates its own addiction and dependence similar to that of heroin addiction. Research also indicates that accidental use of methadone is potentially more dangerous than accidental use of heroin. And authorities concede that the drug's long-range effects are unknown. Finally, in our enthusiasm for methadone maintenance programs, we cannot afford to ignore other antidrug procedures such as detoxification, counseling, psychotherapy, and vocational rehabilitation. So while methadone is an important weapon in the war against heroin addiction, it certainly is not a panacea. A vari-

ety of treatment methods should be supported. Research to develop a nonaddictive heroin antagonist should be expanded. And all methadone maintenance programs should include rehabilitative and supportive services. Above all, we must not allow these programs to consign a segment of American society of lives of permanent addiction.

WHY HANOI FIGHTS ON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, according to the New York Times, a hundred thousand South Vietnamese have been driven from their homes by the recent invasion from the north. They have all fled south—away from the invading Communist forces. They have fled only because they fear the invading forces.

It is as amazing to me, Mr. Speaker, as it was recently to Senator BUCKLEY that there are those among our colleagues who condemn not North Vietnam but President Nixon.

To those who say Vietnamization is a failure, let them explain why it is North Vietnam's Regular Army and not the South Vietcong which is carrying the battle. Let them explain how after more than a week of intensive fighting the South Vietnamese Army, without any U.S. ground support, is fighting vigorously to defend their people and their major cities.

To those who would say that the current invasion spells the doom of the Vietnamization program, let us await the outcome of the battle. The South Vietnamese Army is fighting the ground actions alone, whereas in 1968 the United States had 550,000 ground troops there. Today the United States has fewer than 90,000 and none of these ground forces are engaged in the combat, and further reductions are continuing on schedule.

To those who ask why President Nixon has not ended the war by now, let them consider how their statements have influenced Hanoi to continue the war and in their analyses of the recent massive invasion by the North Vietnam regulars, let them consider the following statement, "Why Hanoi Fights On."

The statement follows:

WHY HANOI FIGHTS ON
(By Edmund A. Gullion)

While Hanoi broadcasts its thanks to the Americans who march in protest against the war, there are other Americans who see the repetition of a grim and familiar pattern. Hanoi moves by the same calculations which paid off for it in the defeat of the French in 1954.

As the late Ho Chi Minh once told the French: "You will kill ten of our men and we will kill one of yours. And in the end, it will be you who will tire of it." French power was shaken but not shattered by the defeat at Dienbienphu. What broke France was the collapse of will on the home front. The French were fighting to preserve a hold in Vietnam. The Americans fight to preserve the right of the South Vietnamese—the vast majority of whom fear and reject Hanoi—to choose and live by their own government. But North Vietnam, having seen one Western power worn down by sapping tactics on

the home front, is sure the same strategy will pay off again. Indeed, this is what the declarations in the Hanoi press and radio are all about.

In Vietnam today, the enemy grows weaker as our side grows stronger. The situation is still precarious but President Nixon's Vietnamization plan shows real signs of working. The bitter paradox is that Hanoi grows more resolute as American will seems to waver here at home. (This would appear to be wishful thinking on the part of Hanoi, in view of the recent Gallup poll and the resolution by the House of Representatives strongly supporting the President's plan.) If the enemy believes that public opinion will force an immediate American pullout, he has no reason to negotiate at Paris or anywhere else. So long as he believes the "peace-marchers" are marching not for peace but for him, he will carry on the fight, and more American and Vietnamese men will lose their lives.

Another article which I wish to bring to the attention of those who are one-sided in their condemnation of American efforts in Vietnam is a study I have of how to serve to prolong the war.

This article traces from 1966 in a condensed form the abundant evidence from North Vietnam's own information sources. The record shows that the enemy not only is closely informed about the demonstrations in the United States, but is also counting on them to help him win the war.

Mr. Speaker, the article from Reader's Digest follows:

FROM HANOI—WITH THANKS—A STUDY OF HOW AMERICAN ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATIONS SERVE TO PROLONG THE WAR

February 27, 1966: The North Vietnamese newspaper *Nhan Dan*.

"In America the debates on the Vietnamese problem will become increasingly fiercer. The U.S. imperialist rear will be the scene of great confusion, which in turn will exert great influence upon the morale of the U.S. servicemen on the front line. That is why the Johnson clique is very perplexed and afraid, faced with the ever stronger anti-war movement which, like a sharp knife, is stabbing them in the back."

November 6, 1966: Radio Hanoi.

"The Vietnamese people hail and support the struggle waged by the American people against the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam," said Dr. De Dinh Tham, chairman of the Vietnam Peace Committee. "This struggle is a valuable encouragement and backing for the Vietnamese people, who sincerely thank the American peace fighters for their efforts to strengthen their solidarity with the Vietnamese people and coordinate their struggle with them."

November 8, 1966: Radio Hanoi.

"The Vietnamese people highly value the protest movement of the American people. We praise the American peace champions who courageously turned the courts which were trying them into forums to condemn the war. We praise the American journalists and writers who, in defiance of repression and threats, valiantly exposed the crimes of the Johnson clique in Vietnam."

February 15, 1967: Radio Hanoi.

"It is clear that the American people's protest movement has become a real second front against U.S. imperialists on the very soil of America. It is the largest, most stirring, and best organized mass movement in U.S. history."

October 17, 1967 (four days before the "peace march" on the Pentagon): Radio Hanoi.

"The South Vietnam People's Committee for Solidarity With the American People has announced its program to establish relations with and contact all progressive organiza-

tions and individuals in the United States who want to acquaint themselves with the situation in Vietnam. The committee sent a message to the National Mobilization Committee and the Students Mobilization Committee in New York:

"We warmly hail your struggle from 16 to 21 October. Our struggle will certainly grow more powerful, and in coordination with your struggle it will certainly be capable of compelling the U.S. government to put an end to its aggressive war. May the October 21 struggle [the day of the march on the Pentagon] mark a new development in the American people's movement for an end of the U.S. war. We wish you brilliant success."

August 1968 (approximate): Speech by Truong Chinh, chairman of the National Assembly of North Vietnam and No. 2 man in the ruling party Politburo.

"We are currently taking advantage of the contradictions between the doves and the hawks in the American ruling class."

January 23, 1969: Radio Hanoi message to the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

"We were deeply impressed by the successful march on Washington during the Presidential inaugural day to welcome the victory of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation and demand the withdrawal of all American troops. We extend to you sincere thanks. We hope that we would further coordinate our activities for peace and real independence in Vietnam."

October 6, 1969: Letter to American students from Tran Buu Kiem, former head of the Vietcong delegation to the Paris peace talks.

"We greatly admire the active and massive participation of the American youths and students in this fall movement. You are entering a new, seething and violent struggle phase. We hope that you all will pool your efforts in achieving great success, thus further accelerating the common movement of the American people against the war."

October 14, 1969: Message to American people from North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong.

"This fall, the broad masses of the American people, encouraged and supported by many peace- and justice-loving American personalities, have again started a broad powerful drive to stop the war. The Vietnamese people fully approve and warmly hail your just struggle. We are firmly confident that with the solidarity and courage of our two peoples the struggle of the Vietnamese people will end in total victory. I wish your fall offensive a brilliant success."

October 14, 1969: Radio Hanoi.

"In response to Nixon's call for unity, the U.S. people have manifested a fierce opposition attitude. The U.S. people's autumn struggle is placing the Nixon Administration in an extremely difficult, embarrassing situation. We consider this struggle the most realistic support for the Vietnamese people's fight against the United States."

October 17, 1969: Message from Xuan Thuy, chief of Hanoi's negotiating team in Paris.

"I should like today to send warm greetings to all Americans and all persons who took part in the October 15 movement. We consider that these legitimate actions are of a nature both to make the Paris conference progress and to demand of the Nixon Administration the complete and rapid withdrawal of the GIs."

October 21, 1969: Broadcast from Hanoi to communist troops in the South.

"All deceitful tricks and threats of the Nixon clique cannot check the American people's will. In their valiant and persevering struggle, the American progressives will certainly win glorious victories. The Nixon clique will certainly be completely defeated in Vietnam."

November 6, 1969: Statement of the government of North Vietnam.

"The Vietnamese people hail the honest-minded Americans who, for the sake of peace, justice and the true interests of their people, have courageously denounced the plans for prolonging the war in Vietnam and strongly demanded a quick and total withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam."

November 11, 1969: Broadcast to the communist troops in South Vietnam.

"Deeply moved by the American progressives' struggle for the great cause, we can realize our great responsibility more clearly. The Americans are struggling for their own interests and Vietnam's interest right on American soil. As for us, what must we do to coordinate with the U.S. people's struggle? Let us further stoke the fire of victory on all battlefields. We must be determined to fight the U.S. aggressors until complete victory."

November 13, 1969: Broadcast to communist troops in the South.

"A struggle which took to violence on 15 October 1969 will break out even more fiercely on 15 November. It will be coordinated by the New Mobilization Committee to End the Vietnam War, one of the largest anti-war organizations in the United States. This struggle will have more violence and be on a much larger and more elaborate scale in all U.S. cities and state capitals. The seething struggle of U.S. youths, students and people is urging us to arise and win final victory for the fatherland."

November 14, 1969: Speech by Prof. Hoang Minh Giam, North Vietnamese minister of culture.

"We highly evaluate the great efforts of various U.S. anti-war organizations and well-known notables who had the initiative to organize the Moratorium Day, demanding the immediate return home of all U.S. troops with slogans suited to the American people's urgent needs and just aspirations. We enthusiastically welcome the peace-loving Americans who have stood up and struggled violently and bravely against the U.S. Administration's stubborn attitude in prolonging the war of aggression. Moreover, we regard the U.S. people as our comrades-in-arms, animated by the common goal of opposing the Nixon Administration's aggressive policy and war. The fall offensive drive of the American people has made more prominent our people's just cause and made our people more resolute."

November 15, 1969: Communist broadcast from South Vietnam.

"The 'fall offensive' is sweeping the United States of America. We express our militant solidarity with and gratitude to the true sons and daughters of the United States. With all of our hearts we wish to thank our American friends."

Mr. Speaker, the reasoning which impels congressional critics to interpret American resistance to the recent invasion as immoral escapes me. But I do know that on the occasion of the most blatant and clear-cut invasion of one nation by another since North Korea invaded South Korea on June 25, 1950, these critics did not condemn the invaders, they condemned the defenders; they did not condemn North Vietnam, they condemned the President as immoral.

At this point I would like to bring to their attention an outstanding editorial from the Washington Daily News which puts their election year political pandering in clear perspective:

BOMBING AND MORALITY

President Nixon's renewed air strikes against North Vietnam predictably have brought charges from the anti-war movement that he is acting in an "immoral" way.

For example, Sen. George S. McGovern, D-S.D., declared that Mr. Nixon is guilty of "a moral outrage" and has descended to "a new level of barbarism."

Since Sen. McGovern is now the left's leading contender for his party's presidential nomination his views on Vietnam deserve attention. We long have been disturbed by their one-sidedness.

Sen. McGovern and others in "the movement" behave as if anything the North Vietnamese do anywhere in Indochina is moral, patriotic and justified, but anything done to resist them is immoral, dictatorial and unjust.

The Vietnam War has roots going back a generation, and this isn't the place to discuss which side was "right" or "wrong" at the start—if it makes any difference at this stage.

What is clear is that there is a country called South Vietnam, whose sovereignty is recognized by most major non-Communist nations, and that its people have the right to be left alone. Whether they wish to be governed by President Thieu we're not able to say, but they obviously don't want to live under communism imposed by Hanoi.

If the Viet Cong had anything remotely approaching majority support in the South, it wouldn't need the services of almost the whole North Vietnamese army to defeat the Thieu regime.

For years North Vietnamese regiments have marauded where they don't belong—in the innocent-bystander nations of Cambodia and Laos and in regions of South Vietnam many hundreds of miles from the North.

They have shelled cities, mined buses filled with peasants, massacred villagers, mortared market places, murdered school teachers in front their pupils and committed many other crimes too sickening to retell.

In all this, Sen. McGovern and his backers in the "peace" movement, some of them wavers of Viet Cong flags, fail to see immorality.

But when anything happens to disturb the sacred soil of North Vietnam, it is "a moral outrage."

When Hanoi's regular army, with the most modern tanks, self-propelled artillery and missiles, crunched thru the demilitarized zone separating the two Vietnams, it threw away the fiction of a guerrilla war. It was an invasion, patterned on World War II blitzkrieg techniques.

President Nixon's agonizing decision to bomb the northern supply bases that support the invasion was entirely justified. It was not "a new level of barbarism." Sen. McGovern's charge, however, may be a new level of political hypocrisy.

AN ENTIRELY NEW KIND OF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, some thoughts on Secretary Rogers' April 17 testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which included the comment:

This is an entirely new kind of war.

Mr. Speaker, my honorable and learned friend has truly said that the present is a new era in the war. The Honorable Secretary of State feels the justice of the remark; for by traveling back to the commencement of the war, and referring to all the topics and arguments which he has so often and so successfully urged to the House, and by which he has drawn

them on to the support of his measures, he is forced to acknowledge that, at the end of a 7-year conflict we are come but to a new era in the war, at which he thinks it necessary only to press all his former arguments to induce us to persevere.

All the topics which have so often misled us—all the reasoning which has so invariably failed—all the lofty predictions which have so constantly been falsified by events—all the hopes which have amused the sanguine, and all the assurances of the distress and weakness of the enemy which have satisfied the unthinking, are again enumerated and advanced as arguments for our continuing the war.

What, at the end of 7 years of the most burdensome and the most calamitous struggle that this country was ever engaged in, are we again to be amused with notions of finance and calculations of the exhausted resources of the enemy as a ground of confidence and of hope?

Gracious God. Were we not told, 5 years ago, that North Vietnam was not only on the brink, but that she was actually in the gulf of bankruptcy?

Were we not told, as an unanswerable argument, that she could not hold out another campaign—that nothing but peace could save her—that she wanted only time to recoup her exhausted finances—that to grant her repose was to grant her the means of again molesting . . . and that we had nothing to do but persevere for a short time in order to save ourselves forever from the consequences of her ambition and her communism?

After having gone on from year to year upon assurances like these, and after having seen the repeated refutations of every prediction, are we again to be seriously told that we have the same prospect of success on the same identical grounds?

And without any other argument or security, are we invited, at this new era in the war, to carry it on upon principles which, if adopted, may make it eternal?

Mr. Speaker, those were not my words.

The above is in essence an address to the British Parliament on February 3, 1900, by Charles James Fox in his reply to Pitt concerning the war between England and France. Only names have been changed to reflect the situation of the United States on April 17, 1972.

One might add as a footnote to history that from that day and that speech and that eminent logic spoken by that member of the British Parliament, the unnecessary, unproductive, and thoroughly avoidable war continued for several years and was finally settled in India on precisely the same terms that had been urged that day by Mr. Fox.

END THE WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, for some time, we have all known that the President was taking his time getting us out of Indochina. With one excuse after another, Mr. Nixon has been proceeding

with a now familiar routine of procrastination.

Several weeks ago, I along with several of my colleagues, introduced a final end-the-war bill. That bill would terminate funds for all military operations and bombing in Indochina and do so immediately.

At the time the end-the-war bill was introduced, we were told it was not necessary. None of us can believe that now.

We woke up yesterday to read that U.S. forces bombed Hanoi and Haiphong. The end-the-war bill then became a necessity for peace and the eventual freedom of our POWs.

We woke up this morning and read that four Russian ships were hit by U.S. bombs. The end-the-war bill is even more than a necessity.

At the very height of the Cuban missile crisis—when all the world was a moment from a nuclear holocaust—not a scratch was made on Russian ships. But today, this administration has learned to swagger easily under the nuclear threat.

We may wake up tomorrow to read that there is no more choice.

We used to believe we were fighting for democracy. But Vietnam is not a democratic France overrun by the Kaiser. Vietnam is not a democratic England facing Nazi rockets. Vietnam is not a democratic Israel surrounded by petty, fanatical tyrants. Vietnam, North and South is dictatorship.

There are no moral principles in this war. Besides that, we now know from this administration's policies throughout the world—from ITT to China, from tax reform to Indochina—that morality is not its first concern.

So let us discuss the pragmatic side. In all the years the strategy of "bombing them back to the Stone Age" has been tried, it has failed. The more we bomb, it seems, the more it fails. When will Mr. Nixon learn?

Mr. Speaker, every day that the current Indochina policy continues, we wreck not only five Asian nations, but our own Nation as well.

Every bomb that falls on Hanoi rips our society apart—while it only damages their factories.

I am sure that Mr. Nixon is bent on proving that we can defeat North Vietnam. I have no doubt that in the long run we can destroy them. But in the process, we will also destroy everything that is worth fighting for in this country. We will destroy our peace, we will destroy our freedom, we will destroy our POW's, we will destroy our youth.

Mr. Speaker, the President has never called upon us to declare war in Indochina. Well, let's send him a message. Let us declare peace in Indochina.

RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY ON BOMBING IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, last week, I introduced House Resolution 918, a resolution of inquiry seeking informa-

tion on the bombing in Indochina. This morning, I had the privilege of appearing before the Armed Services Committee in support of that resolution, and I am appending the text of my remarks there at the conclusion of this statement.

Congressman MICHAEL HARRINGTON of Massachusetts also testified in support of the resolution, delivering an eloquent statement on the need to inform the public and to have the Armed Services Committee take a more adversary position vis-a-vis the Department of Defense.

Mr. Dennis Doolin appeared on behalf of the Department of Defense, and his testimony was remarkable, to say the least. In discussing the resolution, he delivered the same, old, tired administration line about how hard the President is trying to make peace. He went on to state that the DOD opposed the resolution, but that he could not state why in open session. Note—he was not saying that he would not give the information requested by the resolution, though he said that too, but that he would not even let the public hear why the DOD is opposed to passage of the resolution.

Under the Rules of the House, the resolution must be reported to the floor within 7 legislative days of its introduction, even if the recommendation of the committee is unfavorable. Accordingly, I expect that it will be considered sometime next week, and I hope that the House will pass it.

We must reassert our constitutional responsibilities to stop the bombing and to get out of Vietnam at once.

I am inserting House Resolution 918 and the text of the testimony at this point:

H. RES. 918

Resolved, That the President and the Secretary of Defense be, and they are hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives, within ten days after the adoption of this resolution, with full and complete information on the following—

(1) (a) The number of United States military personnel in South Vietnam at the present time;

(b) The number of these individuals who are combat personnel;

(2) (a) The number of sorties flown by United States military airplanes, for bombing purposes, in and over North Vietnam during the first ten days of March 1972;

(b) The number of sorties flown by United States military airplanes, for bombing purposes, in and over North Vietnam during the first ten days of April 1972;

(c) The number of sorties flown by United States military airplanes, for bombing purposes, in and over South Vietnam during the first ten days of March 1972;

(d) The number of sorties flown by United States military airplanes, for bombing purposes, in and over South Vietnam during the first ten days of April 1972;

(3) (a) The tonnage of bombs and shells fired or dropped into North Vietnam by the United States during the first ten days of March 1972;

(b) The tonnage of bombs and shells fired or dropped into North Vietnam by the United States during the first ten days of April 1972;

(c) The tonnage of bombs and shells fired or dropped into South Vietnam by the United States during the first ten days of March 1972;

(d) The tonnage of bombs and shells fired or dropped into South Vietnam by the United States during the first ten days of April 1972;

(5) (a) The cost of all bombing and shelling carried on by the United States in or over North Vietnam during the first ten days of March 1972, including the costs of bombs and shells, ships and airplanes employed in the transportation and dropping or firing of such bombs and shells, maintenance of such ships and airplanes, salaries of United States military personnel involved in operating and maintaining such ships and airplanes, and all other expenses attributable to such bombing and shelling.

(b) The cost of all bombing and shelling carried on by the United States in or over North Vietnam during the first ten days of April 1972, including the costs of bombs and shells, ships, and airplanes employed in the transportation and dropping or firing of such bombs and shells, maintenance of such ships and airplanes, salaries of United States military personnel involved in operating and maintaining such ships and airplanes, and all other expenses attributable to such bombing and shelling;

(c) The cost of all bombing and shelling carried on by the United States in or over South Vietnam during the first ten days of March 1972, including the costs of bombs and shells, ships and airplanes employed in the transportation and dropping or firing of such bombs and shells, maintenance of such ships and airplanes, salaries of United States military personnel involved in operating and maintaining such ships and airplanes, and all other expenses attributable to such bombing and shelling;

(d) The cost of all bombing and shelling carried on by the United States in or over South Vietnam during the first ten days of April 1972, including the costs of bombs and shells, ships and airplanes employed in the transportation and dropping or firing of such bombs and shells, maintenance of such ships and airplanes, salaries of United States military personnel involved in operating and maintaining such ships and airplanes, and all other expenses attributable to such bombing and shelling;

(6) List separately the number of United States military personnel (if any) killed, wounded or reported missing in action during (a) the first ten days of March 1972 and (b) the first ten days of April 1972, specifying how many in each such category were killed, wounded or reported missing in action in or over South Vietnam and how many in each such category were killed, wounded or reported missing in action in or over North Vietnam;

(7) Whether there is a target date for the achievement by the Army of the Republic of Vietnam of complete military independence of United States air, naval, and ground support and participation and, if so, what date;

(8) Whether there has been any bombing or shelling carried on by the United States in or over Laos or Cambodia since January 1, 1972, and, if so, the number of sorties flown by United States military airplanes, for bombing purposes, in or over Laos or Cambodia since that date, the tonnage of bombs and shells fired or dropped by the United States into or over Laos or Cambodia since that date, and the cost of all bombing and shelling carried on by the United States in or over Laos or Cambodia since that date, including the costs of bombs and shells, ships and airplanes employed in the transportation and dropping or firing of such bombs and shells, maintenance of such ships and airplanes, salaries of United States military personnel involved in operating and maintaining such ships and airplanes, and all other expenses attributable to such bombing and shelling;

(9) Whether there has been an increase in the movement of military airplanes, military ships, other military equipment, military supplies, or military personnel of the United States to Southeast Asia, including the islands of the South Pacific Ocean, since

March 15, 1972 (relative to the thirty-day period immediately preceding that date), and, if so, the nature and extent of the increase in each such category; and

(10) What actions, if any, have been taken to comply with the provisions of section 601 of Public Law 92-156, approved November 17, 1971.

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSWOMAN BELA S. ABZUG

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, four days ago, the Nixon Administration carried out massive B52 and jet strikes against Haiphong and Hanoi. Hitting late at night in the most densely populated areas in Indochina, these sneak attacks constitute the most dramatic proof yet that the Nixon Administration is entirely committed to a full-scale and long-term U.S. air war in Indochina instead of negotiating a full withdrawal in return for the release of our captured pilots.

I do not know if you will agree with me that such high-level saturation bombings of heavily-populated areas must necessarily have killed and maimed thousands of civilians.

Nor do I know if you will concur that these bombings serve no useful military end as we have learned from previous experience, that they lead to the capture of more of our airmen, the prolongation of the captivity of those already interned and endanger their physical safety, and that far from protecting our ground troops in the southern part of Vietnam, the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong will increase the danger to them.

And finally, I do not know if you accept my belief that these bombings—and the air war in general—represent a totalitarian indifference to the clear desire of the American people to withdraw from Indochina if our captured pilots can be released; that by continuing these acts of indiscriminate aerial slaughter the Nixon Administration will irrevocably split this country in the months to come.

But I am certain that we can agree on one basic point—the American people have a right to know what Administration officials are doing in their name.

There is no principle more basic to our democracy than the separation of powers among the executive, legislative and judicial branches, undergirded by an enlightened electorate with the right to select leaders who will represent their desires. Yet this concept of democracy demands that all branches of our society have access to the information on which policy is made. If Congress and the public are kept in the dark about matters of high policy, how can they participate in democratic decision-making?

The Vietnam war itself is one of the most dramatic examples of the horrors that can occur when this democratic process breaks down. The vast majority of the American people and their Congressional representatives are now agreed that our original involvement in Vietnam was a tragic error. The Pentagon Papers make it unmistakably clear, however, that our involvement in Vietnam did not arise out of the acts of Congress or the American people. It was, rather, top officials of the Executive branch who unilaterally plunged this country into Vietnam by systematically hiding the facts of our intervention from the rest of the country. Can anyone doubt that had Congress and the people been informed about the real nature of the regimes we supported in Vietnam, the facts of the Gulf of Tonkin incident, the popular appeal of our adversaries there, that we might well have avoided the Vietnam quagmire?

Of all the Executive deception about the war over the last decade, however, none has been more catastrophic in its consequences than the Nixon Administration's blatant management of information about its air war.

Since taking office, the Nixon Administration has dropped over 3.2 millions tons of bombs on Indochina, bombing more than any government has done in the history of warfare; it has doubled the bombing of Laos; it has initiated a full-scale air war in Cambodia; it had already bombed North Vietnam on 328 admitted occasions before the recent counter-offensive began in South Vietnam; it has spent well over \$10 billion on this bombing; well over 300 airmen who were alive and well when the Administration took office are now listed as captured or missing in action.

The evidence is overwhelming that this air war under President Nixon has destroyed hundreds if not thousands of villages, killed and wounded tens of thousands of other civilians underground or into refugee camps, and that it has altered the very land of Indochina itself. (See appendix). There can be no doubt that far from winding down the war, the Administration has simply substituted highly sophisticated automated war for the ground warfare of the Johnson years.

Despite the massive dimensions of President Nixon's air war, however, few of us in Congress and even fewer of the general public have received more than the scantiest of information about it from official sources. On the contrary, the Nixon administration has made strenuous efforts to keep the facts about the bombing hidden from the American public so as to diminish its effects on domestic opinion.

Some of the means it has used to manage news about the air war include the following:

1. It has prohibited newsmen from going out on bombing raids or being flown to the front outside of South Vietnam. Until recent months, the vast majority of U.S. air sorties, and some of the bloodiest fighting, has taken place outside of South Vietnam. Newsmen, however, are prohibited from going out on bombing raids in these countries, or from flying to the front when U.S.-supported Asian armies retake bombed-out villages. As a result, the war has been largely taken off the front pages and TV screen, thereby deluding many Americans into thinking it has been "winding down." This prevention of newsmen from observing the war does not appear to be for fear that they would violate military security. Reporters had always been allowed into the air and to the front in South Vietnam under President Johnson. Rather it is clearly an attempt to muffle domestic dissent by waging an invisible war. And a recent New York Times story revealed that this policy is not only continuing, but being extended; that the Nixon administration is even now attempting to limit access of reporters to the war in South Vietnam.

2. It has classified much important information, most of which is already known to our adversaries. Such crucial issues as the amount of bombing going on outside of South Vietnam in any given month, the incidence of use of anti-personnel and incendiary weapons, the real cost of the air war, the locations and circumstances surrounding our aircraft and pilot losses in the skies over Indochina, and a host of other air war information such as that requested in my resolution of inquiry had been kept secret by the Administration. Once again, this is not information which would help our adversaries. They know what kind of weapons are being used against them, when attacks are escalated, how and where they shoot down our pilots. The only people to whom this information is "classified" are the American people. This policy, too, continues until this very moment. An April 12 New York Times dispatch revealed that the Administration had extended its "classification" policy to any details of the bombing of North Vietnam, even the few that had been revealed under President Johnson.

3. It has deliberately created a false image of a sterile and antiseptic air war con-

ducted solely against military targets—Time and again administration officials tirelessly proclaim to Congress, the American people and the world that they do not bomb civilian targets in Indochina, that the only targets hit are military. They refuse to reveal any estimates of the civilian casualties caused by bombing, although the Pentagon Papers reveal that such estimates are available—as when Robert MacNamara estimated that the bombing was causing 1,000 civilian casualties a week in North Vietnam. They create such Orwellian terms as "protective reaction" strikes, implying that loosing 100's of tons of bombs on the rural society of North Vietnam is somehow defensive in nature. Even the massive Christmas 1971 bombings involving several hundred aircraft striking at North Vietnam for 5 days in succession, were classified as just one of these "protective reaction" strikes, termed a "limited duration protective reaction strike".

An authoritative study of the air war by the Center for International Studies of Cornell University noted that "in a strategic bombing campaign, strategic targets are located near predominately civilian areas". For the Administration to claim, as it has, that the recent saturation bombings of the Haiphong area, a region inhabited by over 300,000 people, were carried out only against military targets is more than just a half-truth. It is part of a conscious and Orwellian pattern of thought control about the air war which once again continues until the present moment.

Such management of information about the air war is antithetical to the principles upon which this country was founded. Such information control is not only unworthy of a great democracy, but presents a clear and present danger to it. Unless the American people and we in Congress can receive far more information than we are now getting about the air war, it will lead not only to even greater physical destruction of Indochina, but to an increasing trend to the destruction of democracy here at home as we now know it.

Accordingly, I have introduced this resolution containing a number of questions about the air war which I hope this committee and the House will in turn submit to the Executive branch for public answer.

These questions are simple and straightforward. They do not ask for information that could be of value to our adversaries. They do not reveal future plans that could endanger our pilots.

Indeed, these questions in and of themselves are but a minimal beginning to fuller public understanding of the air war. They deal primarily with the physical dimensions of our bombing and shelling and the areas in which they are being carried out. Far more important questions—such as the incidence of use of anti-personnel and incendiary weapons, the numbers of villages, schools and hospitals we have bombed, the estimated numbers of civilians who have been killed and wounded by the bombing and shelling—could and should be asked. But I have decided to begin with the rather basic and elemental questions in this resolution of inquiry, H. Res. 918.

I hope that you will assist me in attempting to get answers to these questions, not only for the sake of the people of Indochina, but for the sake of the continuation of democracy in this land.

Every word of every chapter of every book that has ever been written stresses that totalitarian control begins with the management of information. It is my belief that the present secrecy concerning the Nixon Administration's air war in Indochina is the most dramatic example of domestic authoritarianism in the history of this Republic.

Let us put aside partisan judgments and take this one small step to reverse this trend,

this beginning step towards reviewing the freedom of information of which this country has been so justly proud.

Let us realize that if history may pass a harsh judgment upon those of us who have supported indiscriminate aerial slaughter in Indochina, it will surely have no forgiveness for those who would not even fully inform the American people about it.

If we cannot agree that this bombing is wrong, let us at least agree that the secrecy surrounding it is wrong.

This is the least we owe to our country.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Ladies Home Journal consumer champion Ralph Nader devotes his column to a subject in which I have been interested for many years—youth-camp safety.

For almost 5 years we have been attempting to establish Federal safety standards to adequately protect children on their summer vacations. Parents send their children to camps believing that they will be safeguarded yet every year children drown, are injured and killed in bus and truck accidents and are allowed to participate in dangerous activities for which they have neither proper experience nor adequate supervision.

I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

[From the Ladies Home Journal, April 1972]

RALPH NADER REPORT

(NOTE.—In the last six years, Ralph Nader, 37, has become America's foremost consumer defender. He is credited with the passage of at least six major laws that imposed new Federal safety standards on cars, meat and poultry products, coal mining, gas pipelines, and radiation from electronic devices. In 1970 Nader founded the Public Interest Research Group, which investigates and researches consumer issues. He is also a trustee of the Center for the Study of Responsive Law.)

Several years ago, Mr. and Mrs. Mitch Kurman of Westport, Conn., sent their 15-year-old son David to summer camp in Maine. In August, they got word that his canoe had overturned on the Penobscot River. It was three days before searchers found the boy's body in the whitewater rapids of a river that even experts won't tackle in canoes. The parents were told that the counselor who led the canoe trip "didn't know" the river was dangerous.

The Kurmans, like other parents, had expected the camp they selected for their son to take reasonable precautions. But unlike most other facilities for children, camps operate with virtually no outside regulations to help make sure they meet parents' expectations. About the only people testing camps today are the eight million children who attend them each summer.

The deaths and injuries that occur at camps are usually as unnecessary as they are tragic—as in the case of the campers who died in the Canadian Rockies several summers ago. This group of boys perished trying to scale a peak that even skilled mountain climbers avoid in warm weather, but the boys were allowed to continue the ascent even after their counselor stopped climbing. Seven were swept to their deaths when an avalanche of snow rumbled over them.

You want your children to learn new skills at camp, but you want them to learn in an environment where the risks are reduced. Reducing risks may involve proper equipment or a counselor's attitude toward teaching children. As one mother said, "I don't want a camp that emphasizes achievement to the degree that children try to do more than they know how to do."

Another mother was worried about a large wooden meeting hall that had only two exits. "I couldn't understand how the place met the state fire regulations," she said. Then she found out there weren't any regulations.

If your child is going to camp this summer, you want to know:

- Are the counselors competent?
- Are clear safety rules observed in hazardous areas, such as the waterfront?
- Are buildings and grounds safe?
- Are medical personnel and facilities available?
- Is the food nourishing and the kitchen clean?

Are sanitation rules followed?

But in no state are you assured of all these safeguards and in many states you are guaranteed none at all. Nineteen states have no camp regulations of any kind. Only 26 states have sanitation requirements for camps. Only 21 inspect camp facilities. Only 13 require that doctors be on call or that the camp have medical facilities. Only 15 have any safety regulations for camps. And only four states have any requirements for counselors.

Most camps don't even meet the standards set by the camping industry itself; only one-fourth are accredited by the nonprofit American Camping Association. According to the ACA's president, Dr. John S. Kirk, about 3,000 camps have passed inspections by his organization. The ACA says that it evaluates camps on the basis of administration, programs, personnel, camp site, sanitation and transportation.

Drowning is the leading cause of camp fatalities. Approximately 40 children are known to drown at camps each year, and the true number is probably higher because no one keeps camp injury statistics and many accidents go unreported. Yet only 10 states have requirements for counselors in charge of water activities.

In 46 states there are no regulations for vehicles that transport campers or for the people who drive them. Yet tragic crashes have killed campers in recent years. In California three years ago, four children were killed and 58 injured when a flatbed truck driven at excessive speed overturned on an expressway. Last year, seven day-campers from Long Island were killed and 51 seriously injured when their bus turned over in western Pennsylvania. Parents later found out that the driver had seven previous violations of traffic laws and the bus had numerous defects, including bald tires.

Camps are a growing, \$3 billion business. There are more than 11,000 camps in America today. During the last eight years the overall number of camps has decreased slightly, but the number of campers has grown by more than 3 million—and it is expected to continue rising. Camps are an open field for anyone who wants to cash in on our children's need for outdoor fun. And there's nothing to prevent operators from increasing their profits by masking poor facilities as "rustic" or by hiring as counselors callow, untrained people who will work for low salaries.

For five years, Congress has ignored bills that would establish Federal camp safety standards. This year a bill is likely to be passed. But in accordance with the version of it already approved by the Senate, Federal standards would be merely voluntary, depending on a state's willingness to enforce them. To be effective, the law must require

all camps to meet safety standards and must provide adequate penalties for camp operators who violate them. (Giving credit where credit is due, the chief Congressional proponents of camp safety legislation are Sen. Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut, Rep. Dominick Daniels of New Jersey and Rep. Benjamin Rosenthal of New York.)

Since no law will be effective in time to help you this year, look carefully at any camp you consider. Find out the director's age and experience and the counselors' qualifications. Check the ratio of counselors (not total staff) to campers. (The American Camp Association says that a minimally adequate ratio is one cabin counselor for every 10 campers over the age of 8, with more counselors for children under 8.) Try to avoid camps not inspected by your state for safe facilities and proper diet and food handling. Ask specifically about safety precautions around water and near shooting and archery ranges. Make sure the camp has adequate medical facilities and requires medical examinations and records for all campers. Ask for the camp's accident record; if they won't give it to you, look for another camp.

No system can remove all the risks for your child—at camp or anywhere else. But it doesn't make sense to send children to places of which we know so little, either about their ability to keep children safe or their capacity for giving children worthwhile learning experiences.

PANAMA CANAL: LATEST INFORMATION ON PROPOSED BETRAYAL OF OUR TAXPAYERS HUGE INVESTMENT

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, from December 18, 1964, until completion of negotiations in 1967, the executive departments of the Governments of the United States and Panama were engaged in the formulation of three proposed new canal treaties to replace the existing 1903 Treaty under which the United States obtained full sovereign power and ownership of the Canal Zone in perpetuity for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection.

Because the magnitude of the investment by the taxpayers of our country in the Canal was not then known, I requested, and obtained, from the Secretary of the Army a statement of such investment from 1904 through June 30, 1966. In an address to the House of Representatives in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 10, 1967, volume 113, part 9, pages 12315-12319, on "Panama Canal: Betrayal of Our Taxpayers' Vast Investment Proposed," I quoted the indicated reports. That address, for the first time, gave our total investment in the canal enterprise—\$4,889,051,000.

Publication of the proposed 1967 treaties sparked violent reactions against them in both Panama and the United States with the result that they were ever signed and never submitted for ratification. It was the hope of many informed citizens of both countries that those proposed agreements would be allowed to die but that was not to be. The Nixon administration accepted the

Johnson administration canal policies and retained the same chief negotiator, Robert B. Anderson, who also headed the sea-level canal study panel under Public Law 88-609.

Following the submission to the President on December 1, 1970, of the final report of this study panel recommending the construction in the Republic of Panama of a vast and extravagant sea level undertaking and negotiation of a new canal treaty with Panama, the Nixon administration on June 29, 1971, resumed treaty negotiations with Panama for new canal treaties with the same Robert B. Anderson as Chief Negotiator and two other participants in the abortive 1967 treaties in crucial positions: John N. Irwin II as Under Secretary of State and Robert M. Sayre as Ambassador to Panama.

To bring the previously mentioned 1966 reports on U.S. investments in the canal enterprise up-to-date, I again requested the Secretary of the Army for the needed information and he has supplied it in two reports.

From the data thus provided, the following are the sums that have been paid by our government:

DEFENSE OF THE PANAMA CANAL

	1904-June 30, 1966	July 1, 1961- June 30, 1971	Totals
Army.....	\$2,874,361,000	\$461,034,000	\$3,335,395,000
Navy.....	853,190,000	93,126,000	946,316,000
Air Force.....	320,400,000	192,534,000	512,934,000
Total.....	4,047,951,000	746,694,000	4,794,645,000

ACQUISITION OF CANAL ZONE, CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, OPERATION, SANITATION, AND PROTECTION OF THE PANAMA CANAL

	1904-June 30, 1966	1904-June 30, 1971
Gross U.S. investment.....	\$1,951,600,000	\$2,247,100,000
Recoveries by U.S. Treasury.....	1,251,500,000	1,540,900,000
Unrecovered.....	700,100,000	706,200,000
Total investment.....	4,748,051,000	5,500,845,000
Retained earnings.....	141,000,000	194,900,000
Adjusted totals.....	4,889,051,000	5,695,745,000

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—COST OF PROTECTION AND DEFENSE OF THE PANAMA CANAL

[Dollars are in thousands]

Fiscal Year	Military strength	MPA	OMA	PEMA	MCA	Total	Fiscal Year	Military strength	MPA	OMA	PEMA	MCA	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1967.....	8,351	\$39,784	\$48,711	\$5,222	\$296	\$94,013	1970.....	\$8,427	\$53,137	\$37,717	\$1,267	\$1,453	\$93,574
1968.....	7,422	36,405	40,991	5,117	2,279	84,792	1971.....	7,082	53,189	37,375	2,909	7,006	100,479
1969.....	8,877	44,214	40,601	2,375	986	88,176	Total.....	40,159	226,729	205,395	16,890	12,020	461,034

Column headings:

2. Military strength in the Panama Canal Zone plus Department of the Army support personnel as of June 30, each year.
3. Military personnel, appropriation.
4. Operation and maintenance, appropriation.
5. Procurement of equipment and missiles, appropriation (PEMA replacement and training ammunition).
6. Military construction, appropriation.

In these connections, it should be noted that all the above figures do not reflect 1972 values. If the expenditures made in earlier years were converted into present day currency the total U.S. investment would be far greater, possibly by billions.

Mr. Speaker, the total book value of \$5,695,745,000, is far greater than was expected and this is the investment that our country will lose by the currently proposed treaty or treaties—a shocking assault on the taxpayers of our country who paid for the acquisition of the Canal Zone, purchased all land and property therein, and have borne the costs for the construction of the Canal and its subsequent maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection. No wonder the hidden architects of this betrayal are using the treaty process in an effort to bring about what could never be secured by forthright legislation.

But they have overlooked an important safeguard placed in the Constitution through the wisdom of the Founders of our country. Article IV, section 3, clause 2 vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in the Congress, which includes the House of Representatives as well as the Senate.

Apparently, U.S. treaty negotiators and other officials of the State Department have concealed and not made use of the indicated constitutional provision as regards a new treaty with Panama despite the fact that any surrender of territory or other property of the United States would have to be considered by the House as well as the Senate before they could be surrendered or disposed of.

Such concealment from Panama in this connection amounts to duplicity and, ultimately, a gross disservice to Panama.

From long association with the canal question in the House of Representatives, I am sure that I reflect the feeling of most of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say that they will never give their approval to the projected betrayal at Panama. It is obvious that those in the State Department

who, by their inept handling of the Panama Canal situation helped to wreck the Johnson administration, are yet in command of canal policy matters and are pursuing the same methods with the Nixon administration.

Mr. Speaker, as the latest information on the investment of the United States in the canal enterprise will be of special interest to all Members of the Congress and the Nation at large, I quote the indicated reports as part of my remarks and commend them for study by all concerned with the canal question, especially the House Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, which, under the able leadership of my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. MURPHY), is now engaged in the most comprehensive canal investigation by the Congress since 1906:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1972.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: On 8 February I provided you an interim response to your letter of February 2, 1972, to Secretary Froehke requesting tabulations on all sums paid for the protection and defense of the Panama Canal for the period July 1, 1966, to June 30, 1971. In a previous report dated April 10, 1967, we supplied you with similar information for the period 1904 through June 30, 1966.

The attached enclosures provide cost data relating to the protection and defense of the Canal in a chronological display as requested in your letter of February 2. You will note that these data cover all identifiable expenditures of the Department of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Sincerely,

G. E. BLAND,
Colonel, General Staff, Executive, Office
Deputy, Under Secretary of the Army,
(International Affairs).

COST OF PROTECTION AND DEFENSE OF THE PANAMA CANAL

CONSOLIDATED COST REPORT BY MILITARY DEPARTMENT [Dollars are in thousands]

Fiscal year	Army	Navy	USAF	Total
1967.....	\$94,013	\$13,118	\$34,476	\$141,607
1968.....	84,792	16,049	36,158	136,999
1969.....	88,176	20,168	41,882	150,226
1970.....	93,574	20,512	40,694	154,780
1971.....	100,479	23,279	39,324	163,082
Total.....	461,034	93,126	192,534	746,694

¹ Includes costs for operation and maintenance of family housing units, as follows: Fiscal year 1967—\$3,310; fiscal year 1968—\$3,653; fiscal year 1969—\$3,902; fiscal year 1970—\$3,867; fiscal year 1971—\$4,259.

² No funds were expended for family housing construction during this period.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—COST OF PROTECTION AND DEFENSE OF THE PANAMA CANAL

[Dollars in thousands]

Fiscal year:	Military strength	Military pay	Operation and maintenance	Procurement	Military construction	Total	Fiscal year	Military strength	Military pay	Operation and maintenance	Procurement	Military construction	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1967.....	706	\$3,236	\$8,963	\$840	\$79	\$13,118	1971.....	\$784	\$4,557	\$16,639	\$1,450	\$633	\$23,279
1968.....	764	3,622	11,513	669	245	16,049	Total.....	3,735	18,738	68,554	3,955	1,879	93,126
1969.....	714	3,445	15,216	609	898	20,168							
1970.....	767	3,878	16,223	387	24	20,512							

¹ Includes operation and maintenance of family housing units, as follows: fiscal year 1967—\$354; fiscal year 1968—\$475; fiscal year 1969—\$438; fiscal year 1970—\$521; fiscal year 1971—\$821.

² Represents the value of procurement contracts of \$10,000 or more awarded to contractors in the Canal Zone.

³ Includes family housing construction costs as follows: fiscal year 1967—none; fiscal year 1968—none; fiscal year 1969—none; fiscal year 1970—\$24; fiscal year 1971—\$132.

⁴ All cost data and military strength information includes the Marine Corps.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—COST OF PROTECTION AND DEFENSE OF THE PANAMA CANAL

[Dollars in thousands]

Fiscal year	Military strength	MPA	OMA	PEMA	MCA	Total	Fiscal year	Military strength	MPA	OMA	PEMA	MCA	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1967.....	2,919	\$16,442	\$16,790		\$1,244	\$34,476	1971.....	2,930	\$23,129	\$16,110		\$85	\$39,324
1968.....	3,148	18,550	15,147		2,461	36,158	Total.....	15,140	99,713	80,826		11,995	192,534
1969.....	3,101	19,662	16,404		5,816	41,882							
1970.....	3,042	21,930	16,375		2,389	40,694							

¹ Total for col. 2 is military man-years.

² Includes family housing management account, defense (57-970700), as follows: Fiscal year 1967—1,739; fiscal year 1968—1,730; fiscal year 1969—2,469; fiscal year 1970—2,140; fiscal year 1971—2,027.

³ Includes family housing management account, defense (57-970700), as follows: Fiscal year 1968—836; fiscal year 1969—4,154; fiscal year 1970—1,169; fiscal year 1971—9.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1972.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: On March 30, 1972 I provided you an interim response to your letter of 24 March to Secretary Froehke requesting information on the remaining investment of the United States in the Panama Canal enterprise. This office had previously supplied you with similar information containing data current as of 30 June 1966.

The attached enclosure is a statement of funds and property received by the Panama Canal enterprise from the U.S. Government, interest costs thereon payable to the U.S. Treasury and funds repaid to the U.S. Government by the Panama Canal enterprise from inception to 30 June 1971. The enclosure provides you the updated information requested in your 24 March letter.

Sincerely,

G. E. BLAND,

Colonel, General Staff, Executive, Office Deputy, Under Secretary of the Army (International Affairs).

PANAMA CANAL ENTERPRISE (1)

[Unaudited summary statement of funds and property received by the Panama Canal enterprise from the U.S. Government, interest costs thereon payable to the U.S. Treasury and funds repaid to the U.S. Government by the Panama Canal enterprise from inception to June 30, 1971]

[In millions of dollars]

	July 1, 1951	June 30, 1971
Gross investment of U.S. Government:		
Funds and property transfers (2).....	\$1,013.9	\$1,640.9
Interest on net investment of U.S. Government:		
From inception to June 30, 1951 (3).....	373.4	373.4
From July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1971: Panama Canal Company (paid to U.S. Treasury) (4).....		199.3
Canal Zone Government and Thatcher Ferry Bridge (5).....		33.5
Total gross investment of U.S. Government.....	1,387.3	2,247.1
Recoveries by the U.S. Government: Deposits and credit from all sources (6).....	784.6	1,540.9
Total unrecovered balance, excluding retained earnings.....	602.7	706.2

Note: The total unrecovered net investment excludes retained earnings recorded in the accounts totaling \$194,900,000. Of this amount, \$71,000,000 was carried over from the Panama Railroad Company at June 30, 1951, and \$123,800,000 was earned by the Panama Canal Company subsequent to July 1, 1951. If this amount is to be considered as an additional investment, it should be added to the amounts as follows:

	July 1, 1951	June 30, 1971
Totals as shown above.....	602.7	706.2
Add recorded retained earnings.....	71.7	194.9
Adjusted total.....	673.8	901.1

2. Funds and property transfers:

(a) Funds appropriated directly for the enterprise:	
Original construction.....	\$386,910,301.00
Maintenance, operation and additional capital expenditures.....	1,138,669,299.41
Total.....	1,525,579,600.41

(b) Funds appropriated for other U.S. Government agencies for the direct benefit of the enterprise:

Construction annuity to employees (and their widows) engaged in the construction of the canal.....	49,745,592.62
Increased annuity to Panama.....	24,000,000.00
Annuities to employees retired prior to July 1, 1951.....	15,091,000.00
Salaries of military personnel assigned to the canal prior to July 1, 1951.....	9,307,002.00
Injury and death payments, Bureau of Employees Compensation.....	5,316,517.98
Total.....	103,460,112.60
Total appropriations.....	1,629,039,713.01

(c) Property transferred from other U.S. Government agencies.....

U.S. Government agencies.....	19,428,280.94
(d) Property transferred to other U.S. Government agencies.....	7,536,287.57
Total property transfers, net.....	11,891,993.37

Total funds and property transfers.....

	1,640,931,706.38
--	------------------

3. Interest on net direct investment:

From inception to June 30, 1951:	
Interest at 3 percent to Aug. 14, 1914, and at individual annual rates thereafter, (as determined by the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury), has been calculated on net withdrawals (total appropriations less deposits of canal tolls and other deposits) from 1904 to 1951.....	373,442,987.50

4. From July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1971:

Panama Canal Company:
Interest at rates from 1.95 percent for fiscal year 1951 to 3.761 percent for fiscal year 1971 (as determined by the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury) has been calculated on the Company's net direct investment, established in accordance with sec. 62 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, charged to Company operations and subsequently deposited into the U.S. Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, as required by law.....

199,274,014.53

5. Canal Zone Government and Thatcher Ferry Bridge: Existing law specifically exempts the net direct investment of the Canal Zone Government and the Thatcher Ferry Bridge from interest charges. However, it is considered that this element should be included in arriving at the unrecovered investment of the U.S. Government in the Canal enterprise. The interest cost reflected herein has been calculated at the same rates used for the Company as shown under paragraph 3 above, on the net direct investment of the Canal Zone Government and Thatcher Ferry Bridge as of June 30 each year through June 30, 1971.....

\$33,458,660.95

6. Recoveries by the U.S. Government:

(a) Actual deposits into the U.S. Treasury:	
Canal tolls prior to June 30, 1951.....	643,883,520.78
Net profits from business operations (activities corresponding roughly to our present supporting operations).....	28,591,812.05
Licenses, fines, fees, and postal receipts.....	6,887,294.59
Proceeds from sale of construction equipment.....	6,990,681.75
Capital repayments and interest on public works in Panama and Colon.....	3,547,006.22
Dividends paid by the Panama Railroad from 1905 to 1950.....	23,994,905.00
Interest on net direct investment of the Company from July 1, 1951, to date.....	199,274,014.53
Capital repayments from July 1, 1951, to date.....	40,000,000.00
Net cost of Canal Zone Government, reimbursed by the Panama Canal Company.....	317,247,631.17
Canal Zone Government revenue and plant salvage.....	199,846,370.71
Total.....	1,470,263,236.80

(b) Deposit credits: Value of canal tolls on U.S. Government vessels to June 30, 1951.....	70,668,969.00
Total deposits and deposit credits.....	1,540,932,205.80
7. The Panama Canal enterprise consists of the Panama Canal Zone Government and their predecessor agencies. The enterprise does not include military agencies located in the Canal Zone.	

AIRLINE COMMENTARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting column appears in the April issue of Airline Management, written by the senior and distinguished aviation writer Eric Bramley, that I would like to share with my colleagues.

My namesake, General Adams, the subject of the article, is also a distinguished Seattleite, lawyer and aviator.

Returning from Okinawa and World War II he was appointed the first Director of Aeronautics for the State of Washington. In this capacity he saw the State of Washington appropriate money to match Federal airport aid funds in the construction of emergency air fields for general aviation in the mountain passes of the Cascades.

He came to Washington, D.C. in 1951 as a Truman appointee to the Civil Aeronautics Board. In his 6 years of service he initiated consumerism in his long fight for low air fares and on his departure from the Board was acclaimed as the "Father of air coach."

[From Airline Management, April, 1972]

AIRLINE COMMENTARY

(By Eric Bramley)

Gen. Joseph P. Adams is the local airlines one-man gang in Washington. For years, as executive director of the Association of Local Service Airlines, he has covered all the bases for his members—Congress, CAB, FAA and any other agency that gets into the aviation act. And for each of the past 15 years he has put together, in January or February, an annual "Congressional appreciation luncheon." Year after year, it produces the doggonedest turnout you've ever seen. This year was no exception—about 300 guests including Senators, Representatives, Congressional aides, agency members, press, and the like. Sen. Howard Cannon (D-Nev.), chairman of the Senate aviation subcommittee, attended along with three other Senators (all subcommittee members). The chairman, vice chairman and two members of the Civil Aeronautics Board showed up (the other member was out of the country). Rep. Harley Staggers (D-W Va.), chairman of the Interstate & Foreign Commerce Committee was there. It's probably the only aviation affair attended by William M. "Fishbait" Miller, the well-known doorkeeper of the House of Representatives. There are no formal speeches and there is no head table. At the conclusion of the meal, Adams paces the floor as he introduces the chief executive of each of his member airlines and gives about a one-minute resume of each carrier's activities for the past year. He also introduces members of Congress, agency members and a few others, and the luncheon ends. It's a fun affair and it seems safe to say that no other aviation organization consistently turns out so many important folks. As the powerful Rep. Staggers told the airline execs: "This is one meeting I never miss."

THE BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the bombing of North Vietnam authorized and directed by President Nixon is another outrage. I oppose the war in Vietnam, because I believe it to be immoral and unconstitutional. Those who support that war should have the courage of their convictions and introduce into the Congress a resolution declaring war. The Constitution specifically states that it is the Congress and only the Congress which may declare war. But Administration supporters on both the Democratic and Republican sides of the aisle are unwilling to introduce such a resolution, because they do not have the courage to stand up and vote for it and have their names spread upon the record for their constituents to see.

I am a sponsor of the Gravel-Drinan bill which not only would cut off funds for the bombing which is now taking place, but also would terminate all funding for U.S. operations in Indochina 30 days after its enactment, subject to release of our prisoners of war. Hopefully, that bill can be offered on the floor of this House as an amendment to the next appropriation bill containing money for continuing the war in Vietnam. And I would hope such an amendment will be supported not only by those who oppose the renewed bombing, but also by those Members who cannot bring themselves to openly oppose this new offensive, but who recognize the great damage done to our constitutional process by the President's escalation of the air war.

In the 91st Congress I was one of 21 Members to have voted against every appropriation bill containing moneys for the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. The 92d Congress is coming to a close and I hope that the American public will make it clear to its representatives that they want them to vote to end the war and to end it now. Innocent lives—American, Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian—are being destroyed every day. It is surely madness for the United States to continue to participate in this blood-letting.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT

(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 very hopeful that our colleague, DOMINICK V. DANIELS, chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor which has jurisdiction over the Williams-Steiger Occupational Safety and Health Act, will begin hearings so that my amendment to this act can be acted upon before we adjourn this summer.

I am in receipt of a letter from Newell B. Sargent, president of Fremont Beverages, Inc., one of the few large scale operations in the low populated State of Wyoming, in my District.

It again shows that virtually gestapo tactics are being used by the Department of Labor of this Government in enforcing what ought to be an altogether decent law bringing about safer premises for employees. Good employees, like Mr. Sargent, have no intention of seeking to repeal the law. They are just as interested in having a safe place as is anyone in Government. They generally approve of what Congress had in mind in passing the act 2 years ago, but there must be an amendment to its provisions to allow a year or two for an education period, and to allow the inspectors to enter the premises to help with conformance and compliance with the act, not to levy fines categorically and to treat innocent people as if they were guilty before a hearing. The act does need modification. There is no question of that. I hope each Member of the House will call or write to our good colleague, DOMINICK DANIELS, so that hearings can continue without delay.

The letter follows:

FREMONT BEVERAGES, INC.,
Worland, Wyo., April 12, 1972.

Congressman TENO RONCALIO,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TENO: I am today in receipt of your letter of April 7, addressed to "Federation of Independent Business Member", in which you enclosed a copy of an amendment to the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, which you introduced into the House of Representatives on March 20.

This is to advise you that two inspectors of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, regional office at Billings, Montana, made an inspection of the Fremont Beverages, Inc., premises on March 31, which resulted in citations and fines being assessed in the amount of \$170.00. For your information I am enclosing photostatic copies of the citation that was issued to us. I am not so concerned with the fine that was assessed to us but I am upset by the fact that we are making an earnest effort to bring our premises into compliance with the law, and a number of things were in the process of compliance when the inspectors arrived.

You will recall that two years ago we installed a new canning facility here in Worland, and our equipment purchases amounted to over \$300,000.00. It is highly automated and a high speed canning line requiring a number of electrical motors. At the time of the inspection, we were fined \$85.00 because we did not have guards around the shafts running from the electric motors to the pumps, and in addition to the fines, we are going to the expense of installing guards on equipment that is only two years old—equipment manufactured by and purchased from reputable manufacturers. True, these OSHA requirements were not in existence at the time this machinery was manufactured; but I am sure that had the manufacturer thought this equipment hazardous, that they would have installed guards at the time it was installed in our plant. In other words, we are being fined for an omission by a manufacturer.

I am just as interested in having a place that is safe for our employees as is the Government. I approve of what they are trying to do but I object strenuously to the way they are doing it. I firmly believe that if the Department of Labor is really interested in protecting the employee, that the inspector should first meet with the various companies and discuss these requirements with them and give them an opportunity, within a reasonable time, to bring their premises into conformance with the requirements of the Act. If you will examine the manual that is

furnished businesses, it contains about as many words as the Holy Bible, and it requires one man many, many hours to read it and to assimilate the information that is in it.

I think that there would be no opposition to what the Act is trying to do if it was presented in the light of assisting the various businessmen to conform rather than the Gestapo tactics now being used by the Department of Labor.

I am heartily in accord with your amendment and I hope that you can secure the support of other representatives as well as senators to secure a modification of this Act.

Yours very truly,

NEWELL B. SARGENT, President.

COMMAND DECISION A WISE ONE

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I for one would like to commend our President and Commander in Chief, for his "gutty" decision to "untie the hands" of the American Air Force and Navy who together maintain air superiority and close ground support in Southeast Asia, and permit the bombing of the supply facilities, in the port of Haiphong, of the North Vietnamese regular army aggressive divisions.

Mr. Nixon has obviously learned a lesson, propounded by General MacArthur, that the enemy can never be permitted the privilege of sanctuary.

Let us make it clear that the war is being waged in South Vietnam by an invading force from the north. This is not a civil war.

The government of Hanoi has committed at least 12 combat divisions, fully equipped primarily by the Communist U.S.S.R. with the most advanced weapons system, armor, artillery, and anti-aircraft. They struck across the demilitarized zone under a heavy cloud cover that denied the South Vietnamese Army close tactical air support by us, a situation that existed from 72 to 108 hours. During that time, the South Vietnamese bent, but held, and are now beginning to carry the battle back to the enemy, and throw them back. In wars for defense of freedom, success is paramount.

North Vietnamese tanks need oil and gas. We have bombed those supplies, since weather permitted, in line with the Nixon doctrine first set forth in Guam.

Their guns need ammunition, we have bombed those supplies.

Their troops need food and clothing, we have bombed those supplies. How appropriate if we could eliminate those transgressing regulars, since our C.I.C. has properly untied the hand behind the backs of our supporting military.

All of our sustaining efforts have been made at strategic targets, and the people of the North have not been made to suffer the ravages of war, as have the people of the South, because of the deliberate decision not to carry the war to them. In the past they have had it both ways. Now the invaders are suing for a resumption of the "peace talks" at Paris, and rightfully our reply has been that they should give us a demonstration of an honest desire

to negotiate. I remind you that our comprehensive eight-point peace proposal is still on the table, quod erat demonstrandum Vietnamization and defense of liberty is succeeding. Let us not again "muff it."

Mr. Speaker, our ground combat troops are being withdrawn. They will continue to be withdrawn because the program of Vietnamization is working. Our course has been set, we are withdrawing our troops while leaving the South Vietnam Army in the position to defend itself. No one can deny that in truth or full judgment.

I think it is time for the "armchair quarterbacks" to stop diagnosing plays, and get behind the Commander in Chief, and support his action.

TO REVISE THE BOUNDARY OF CITY OF REFUGE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, HAWAII

(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, I am introducing the bill to amend the act of July 26, 1955 (69 Stat. 376) which authorized the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, Hawaii, to give the Secretary of the Interior the authority to acquire additional lands and waters contiguous to the park.

The existing park, authorized in 1955, contains about 180 acres. It is the site of the best known and best preserved place of refuge in all of the Hawaiian Islands. A study made by the Bishop Museum in 1957 revealed that there are important archeological remains and historic values located outside the authorized boundary. The possibility of undesirable development inland but adjacent to the park threatens to diminish the values thought preserved by the 1955 act and threatens to destroy the archeological remains located by the Bishop Museum outside the boundaries.

This bill amends the basic authorizing act to add a fourth parcel for acquisition as part of the park.

This parcel includes 191 acres of land and 112 acres of water area. The land area extending inland will extend the boundaries sufficiently to protect the area thereby preserving the City of Refuge's setting in as nearly an original state as is possible. The water areas authorized for acquisition will serve to protect the City of Refuge's seaward approaches.

I am informed that the National Park Service has drafted a master plan for the City of Refuge National Historic Park and that the acreage here proposed to be acquired has been studied and recommended for addition to the park. I am also informed that the Park Service plans to hold public meetings on the master plan in Hawaii so that the public will have an opportunity to express its views.

My concern is that the unique values of the historical park, the superb interpretative facilities and the restoration completed by the Park Service be preserved for all to enjoy.

The text of the bill is as follows:

A bill to revise the boundary of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act approved July 26, 1955 (69 Stat. 376), which authorized the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, is amended by adding the following paragraph at the end thereof:

"PARCEL 4

"Being all those areas of land and water within the boundary generally depicted on the map entitled 'Boundary Map, City of Refuge National Historical Park,' numbered 415-20,007B, and dated March 1972, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, exclusive of Parcels 1, 2, and 3 described above."

CONGRESSIONAL CHARTER OF THE PACIFIC TROPICAL BOTANICAL GARDEN

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

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House voted approval of H.R. 9135, which would amend the Congressional Charter of the Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the charter of the garden to remove the limit as to the maximum number of persons who may sit on the board of directors. Presently, the charter limits that number to 15 members.

The garden was chartered by Congress in 1964, Public Law 88-449. The purposes of the garden as set out in the charter are to establish and maintain a tropical botanical garden for educational, scientific, research, preservation, and recreational purposes. The garden has made great strides since its inception in moving toward fulfilling the mandates of the charter.

Because of the comprehensive nature of the garden's undertaking, the board, originally consisting of five members, has added to its membership as needs dictated. The garden, through progressively increasing steps of organization and preparation, is conducting a functioning program and moving toward the day when it will be operating to the full extent of its original congressional mandate.

During the first 5 years of its existence, the full concept of the garden as a 20th-century creation was developed. It was decided that the garden could best be implemented in Hawaii as a series of gardens on the different islands, each displaying a differing ecological and geographical variety of plants, flora, and terrain, thus allowing for a greater overall diversity than might be possible at one permanent site.

Year 1970 marked the year in which the garden moved from planning and conceptual development to acquisition and operational status. Arrangements were made on the different Hawaiian Islands for acquisition of land. The permanent headquarters and main site of the

garden were begun on the Garden Isle of Kauai in Lawai Valley.

The staff concentrated on developing this site as the first phase of actual operations. Site preparations were carried out, headquarters buildings were constructed, and some actual collection and planting of tropical flora and fauna were accomplished, as well as beginning the access roads and trails for eventual development as the garden progresses to its full size.

As the garden has moved into these increasingly complicated areas of operation and planning for the future, the Board, now at full strength, has realized that these increasingly complex matters necessitate a greater knowledge and expertise from the Board itself. It finds that its membership maximum as set forth in the charter is proving to be a barrier to progressing at the desired pace in fully developing the garden.

The Board is presently geographically and professionally diverse. At each stage where the Board has found the need to increase its size, it has taken great care to do so in a manner that would appreciably enhance the quality of the Board and fill a recognized need. It has been most selective and cautious in doing so. The great progress the corporation has made since given its congressional mandate is evident proof of the Board's wisdom in expanding its own size.

Now the Board again realizes a need for further expansion in order to cope adequately with the myriad problems which inevitably confront such an ambitious undertaking. And that is the purpose of my bill, H.R. 9135. Section 5(a) of the congressional charter limits the Board to a maximum of 15 members. H.R. 9135 will merely strike out this clause and allow the Board to proceed in this matter as it deems desirable and consistent with the purposes of the garden. I am sure, that given such discretion, they will continue to display great wisdom and add only the number and diversity which will enhance the functioning of the Board, and ultimately the operations of the garden itself. When Congress chartered the garden, it was deemed to be a nonprofit organization which would finance itself through contributions, gifts, and endowments and not depend on public funds to accomplish its purposes. It has done this admirably. However, in order to continue to do this, the corporation has now reached the stage where far greater fund efforts are needed to finance its proposed program development. The ability of the Board to continue to raise sufficient funds for the garden is critical if the garden is going to achieve its potential.

The Board also strives to include members from as many different geographical locations in the country as possible. There are presently representatives from the mid-Atlantic States, the District of Columbia, the Midwest, California, the Southwest, and Hawaii. The Board feels that the national scope of the garden would be further enhanced by including members from additional areas of the country.

The Board also strives to present as great a professional and expert diversity

as possible among the members. Presently there are members from the medical profession, the industrial community, garden clubs, and other nonprofit institutions. The Board would also like to include representatives from botany, horticulture, agriculture, education, drug manufacturing, philanthropy fund raising, administration, and others. Again, this desire to add this expertise is thwarted by the present charter limiting the number of trustees to 15.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9135 allows the garden to continue its impressive gains and achieve the purposes for which Congress issued its charter: To provide a national tropical botanical garden. I am therefore especially pleased to note the passage of H.R. 9135.

INTRODUCTION OF THE WOMEN'S EDUCATION ACT OF 1972

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, America has come to a crucial time in its development. On the brink of our 200th anniversary as a nation—a nation founded on the principles of equality for all—we must pause to consider our goals for the future.

Certainly, we have had our growing pains, and among the most visible problems in recent years is the failure of our educational system to meet the needs of a highly technological society. Unfortunately, we still operate under assumptions of a self-contained family unit, involved mainly in agricultural or primitively industrial pursuits. Clearly, this is no longer true. Ours is a highly technical and complex society. Each man, woman, and child is dependent on a myriad of others for his or her very existence.

We need the input of every individual to continue the progress we enjoy. All persons, regardless of their sex, must have enough opportunities open so that they can contribute as much to their lives and this society as they can.

Among the most critical problems in America today is our outmoded attitude concerning the role of women in this society. One clear example of this "societal doublethink" is the fact that critics of our welfare system perpetually claim that welfare recipients are looking for a free handout—welfare people do not want to work. When faced with the fact that most of these recipients are women with children in their formative years, these same critics insist that women's place is in the home with her children and not in the work force.

It is my contention that these women do not want to continue receiving welfare, but they have been kept from any alternative choice. They want to have the opportunities to find employment that will support their children as well as attain their human dignity that any card-carrying member of the proverbial white middle class says is their right.

To accomplish this, they need realistic training opportunities for existing job markets. This means training and

retraining. All too often we expect women to be self-supporting, when their education, in schools, society, media, and other ways has been geared not to training but to finding a man who will support them.

I need not go into any lengthy dissertations about the abominable state of vocational training in this country, but it is especially bad for women. Indeed, it is almost nonexistent. Education costs money, a lot of money, but even if the money was there, the kind of education available is staggeringly inadequate.

Our educational system has divided the sexes into an insidious form of role-playing. Women provide the services and men exploit them. Women are the secretaries, nurses, teachers, and domestics, and men are the bosses, doctors, professors, and foremen. Textbooks, media, curriculum, testing, counseling, and so forth, are all based on the correctness of this division of labor, and serve to reinforce the sex-role stereotype that is so devastating for our postindustrial society. More importantly, this division of labor according to sex is a totally false assumption of roles.

Women are no longer going to accept being forced into a secondary role. Demands of family life in this century just are not all-consuming any more. Given the fact that our life expectancy is well into the seventies, that women live longer than men, they have fewer children than in an agricultural society, and that women will spend more than half their adult lives in the work force outside the home, it is essential to the existence of our country that sincere and realistic attention to the realignment of our attitudes and educational priorities be made. I suggest that education is the first place to start in a reexamination of our national goals.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the following measure, the Women's Education Act of 1972, to revise and improve our educational programs for women. I hope all my colleagues will give this legislation their attention and support. The bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning women and for other related educational purposes

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

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Women's Education Act of 1972".

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that present educational programs in the United States are in need of modernization of curricula, texts, vocational and physical education programs, techniques of teaching and counseling, and the administration and planning of educational programs, as they relate to women, in order that they shall fully participate in American society.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act, in order to enhance the status of women in this country, to encourage the development of new and improved curricula; to demonstrate the use of such curricula in model educational programs and to evaluate the effectiveness thereof; to provide support for the initiation

and maintenance of programs concerning women at all levels of education (preschool through graduate school); to disseminate curricular materials and other information for use in educational programs throughout the Nation; to provide training programs for teachers, other educational personnel, youth and guidance counselors, community leaders, labor leaders, industrial and business leaders, and government employees at the State, Federal, and local level; to provide for the planning of Women's Resource Centers; to provide for community education programs on the historical and present status of women in this society; and to provide for the preparation and distribution of all such materials by mass media.

(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as prohibiting men from participating in any of the activities funded.

Sec. 3. (a) There is hereby established within the Office of Education a Council on Women's Educational Programs (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") consisting of twenty-one members (including not less than twelve women) appointed by the President. The Council shall consist of persons broadly representative of the public and private sectors with due regard to their knowledge and experience relating to the role and status of women in American society, and with due consideration being given to geographical representation. The Director of the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor, and the Chairman of the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, shall serve as ex-officio members of the Council.

(b) The President shall appoint one member of the Council to serve as its Chairman. The Chairman shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the maximum rate prescribed for Grade GS-17 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) The remaining twenty members of the Council shall serve without compensation except that they shall be allowed travel and subsistence expenses while actually engaged in the business of the Council as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) The members of the Council shall serve for terms of five years each, except that the initial appointments shall be made in accordance with procedures designed to allow for the staggering of appointments so that the member or members whose terms expire in any year will be approximately the same as the number of members whose terms expire in any other year.

(e) The Council shall—

(1) advise the Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") concerning the administration of, preparation of, general regulations for, and operations of, programs assisted under this Act;

(2) make recommendations to the Commissioner and the Secretary with respect to the allocation of any funds pursuant to this Act, with due respect to the criteria developed to insure an appropriate geographical distribution of approved programs and projects throughout the Nation;

(3) develop criteria for the review of applications and their disposition; and

(4) evaluate programs and projects assisted under this Act annually, and disseminate the results thereof.

Sec. 4. (a) The Council shall be responsible for the administration of the programs authorized by this Act, and the coordination of activities within the Federal Government which are related to women's educational programs.

(b) The Secretary shall carry out a program of making grants to, and contracts with, institutions of higher education, State and local educational agencies, regional education research organizations, and other public and private nonprofit agencies, organiza-

tions, and institutions (including libraries and museums) to support research, demonstration, and pilot projects designed to fulfill the purposes of this Act; except that no grant may be made other than to a nonprofit agency, organization, or institution.

(c) Funds appropriated for grants and contracts under this section shall be available for (but not limited to) such activities as—

(1) the development of curricula;

(2) dissemination of information to public and private elementary, secondary, higher, adult, and community education programs;

(3) the support of women's educational programs at all educational levels;

(4) preservice and inservice training programs;

(5) projects including courses of study, fellowship programs, conferences, institutes, workshops, symposiums, and seminars;

(6) research and development of curricula, texts and materials, non-discriminatory tests, and programs for adequate and nondiscriminatory vocational education and career counseling for women;

(7) development of new and expanded programs of physical education and sports activities for women in all educational institutions;

(8) planning of women's resource centers;

(9) community education programs concerning women, including special programs for adults;

(10) preparation and distribution of materials;

(11) programs or projects to recruit, train, and organize and employ professional and other persons, and to organize and participate in women's educational programs;

(12) research and evaluation of the effectiveness of such programs;

(13) research and development of programs aimed at increasing the number of women in administrative positions at all levels in institutions of education; and

(14) research and development of programs aimed at increasing the number of male teachers in elementary and preschool education programs with the aim of obtaining and maintaining an adequate distribution of both sexes teaching in our educational institutions.

(d) In addition to the activities specified in this section, such funds may be used for projects designed to demonstrate, test, and evaluate the effectiveness of any such activities, whether or not assisted under this Act.

(e) Financial assistance under this section may be made available only upon application to the Commissioner. Any such application shall be submitted at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation and shall be approved only if—

(1) provides that the activities and services for which assistance is sought will be administered by, or under the supervision of, the applicant;

(2) describes a program for carrying out one or more of the purposes of this Act which holds promise of making a substantial contribution toward attaining such purposes;

(3) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this Act for any fiscal year will be used so as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in this section, and in no case supplant such funds;

(4) sets forth policies and procedures which insure adequate evaluation of the activities intended to be carried out under the application;

(5) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this Act;

(6) provides for making an annual report, and such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require, and for keeping such records, and affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

(7) provides that no grant can be made to any agency or organization specified by this Act which discriminates on the basis of sex.

(f) For the purposes of this section, the Commissioner shall require evidence that an organization or group seeking funds shall have been in existence one year to the submission of a proposal for Federal funds and that it shall submit an annual report to the Commissioner on Federal funds expended.

(g) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Secretary may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

Sec. 5. The Secretary in cooperation with the heads of other agencies with relevant jurisdiction, shall insofar as practicable, upon request, render technical assistance to local educational agencies, public and private nonprofit organizations, institutions at all levels of education, agencies of State, local, and Federal governments and other agencies deemed by the Secretary to affect the status of women in this society. Such technical assistance shall be designed to enable the recipient agency or institution to carry on education and related programs concerning the status and education and the role of women in American society.

Sec. 6. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, or enter into contracts with, public or private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and other institutions for planning and carrying out community-oriented education programs or projects on women in American society for the benefit of interested and concerned adults, young persons, community and business leaders, and other individuals and groups within a community. Such programs or projects may include, among other things, seminars, workshops, conferences, counseling, and information services to provide advice, information, or assistance to individuals with respect to discrimination practices, and vocational counseling, and will include information centers designed to serve individuals and groups seeking to obtain or disseminate information, advice, or assistance with respect to the purposes and intent of this Act.

Sec. 7. (a) In addition to the grants authorized under section 4, the Commissioner, from the sums appropriated therefor, shall have the authority to make grants, not to exceed \$15,000 annually per grant, for innovative approaches to women's educational programs.

(b) Proposals submitted by organizations and groups under this section shall be limited to the essential information required to evaluate them, unless the organization or group shall volunteer additional information.

Sec. 8. In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or private agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon. The Commissioner shall publish annually a list and description of projects supported under this Act, and shall distribute such list and description to interested educational institutions, citizens' groups, women's organizations, and other institutions or organizations and individuals involved in the education, status, and role of women.

Sec. 9. Payments under this Act may be made in installments and in advance or by

way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments.

Sec. 10. As used in this Act, the term "State" includes (in addition to the several states of the Union), the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Sec. 11. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 1976, for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

REESCALATION IN VIETNAM—THE LOOK OF MADNESS

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to justify its massive reescalation in Vietnam, the administration is also engaging in a massive reescalation of the hypocrisy that has been from the beginning one of the most degrading and demoralizing hallmarks of our Government's conduct in this miserable adventure.

Unfortunately, the Congress cannot escape responsibility for this tragic turn of events. Repeatedly in the last year, the House of Representatives has turned back every effort to force the administration to negotiate the complete withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam by a specific date, in exchange for the American prisoners of war. It may still seem convenient to some Members of Congress to try to pin the responsibility entirely on the President. But the public is well aware that Congress voted the money that is making it possible for the administration to carry out military actions in Vietnam.

Since they share the responsibility for these policies, it is understandable that some Members of Congress are joining the chorus chanting the same worn-out excuses that have been used from the beginning to justify escalations of American military activities in Vietnam. The people have heard all this before. They are not "buying" it. Is it not time we started leveling with ourselves and with the public?

Let us stop talking as though North Vietnam is a separate country that has committed aggression by invading South Vietnam. Every informed person knows that there is only one country, Vietnam, and that its division into north and south was recognized as temporary by the 1954 Geneva agreements and that the war is in fact a civil war. North Vietnam is no more guilty of "aggression" than were the Union armies that invaded the Confederacy in our own Nation's Civil War. The only foreign nation committing acts of violence against the inhabitants of Vietnam is the United States.

And while we are being honest with ourselves let us admit that, although Richard Nixon claims to be pursuing a policy of "Vietnamization," the Russians have followed such a policy from the be-

ginning. Such a policy involves supplying weapons and advisers but not men. The President has just denounced Russia for supplying the weapons which have enabled North Vietnam to carry out its latest military operations in the war. But if that is wrong, then it is likewise wrong for the United States to have supplied the weapons for equipping South Vietnam's million-man army.

While we are being candid, let us also admit that the new escalation has an additional aspect even more frightening than escalations in the past. To the barbarity and hypocrisy has been added a new spectre—insanity. I do not use this word lightly or in a rhetorical sense. I am not alone in feeling that the new bombing policy is so bereft of any rational basis, so disproportionate to any conceivable benefits, so fraught with risk to the far greater stakes of world strategic arms limitation, so provocative of possible counter-escalation, and so clearly contrary to the overwhelming desires of the people in an election year, that one must suspect that the mind that ordered it is dangerously removed from reality.

As the headline in yesterday's lead editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal so aptly expressed it, "Hanoi-Haiphong Bombings Have a Look of Madness." The editorial concludes:

It must make sense to somebody, but the outward look is murderous flailing in what seems like madness. This is no time to reescalate the war, spread death among Asian civilians, lose more Americans to prison camps and further endanger the men already held there—to no real purpose, as was established long ago. It's time to admit we were wrong and get out, with as little more loss of life as we can make possible.

The full text of the Akron Beacon Journal editorial follows:

HANOI-HAIPHONG BOMBINGS HAVE A LOOK OF MADNESS

This was Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, in a memorandum to President Johnson almost five years ago, in 1967:

"There continues to be no sign that the bombing has reduced Hanoi's will to resist, or her ability to ship the necessary supplies south... The air campaign against heavily defended areas costs us about one pilot in every 40 sorties. In addition, an important but hard-to-measure cost is domestic and world opinion: There may be a limit beyond which many Americans and much of the world will not permit the United States to go.

"The picture of the world's greatest superpower killing or seriously injuring 1,000 non-combatants a week, while trying to pound a tiny backward nation into submission on an issue whose merits are hotly disputed, is not a pretty one."

At the moment President Johnson was not impressed, and Operation Rolling Thunder rolled on for quite some time. Some of its results have never become entirely clear—but at least a couple of things are evident: Johnson was in substance driven from office by popular disgust with the bankruptcy of American policy in the war. And now in 1972 the foe Rolling Thunder and the rest were intended to force into submission has mounted its largest general offensive in the war so far.

And now the man who won the presidency on the strength of his assertion that he had a plan to end the war has massed American

planes once again bombing Haiphong and Hanoi.

This cannot be madness; these are all reasonable men. But on the basis of the explanations given so far—the President has been silent—it is certainly not easy for most Americans to understand the sense in it.

The purpose, we are told, is to demonstrate that American air power can still strike anywhere in North Vietnam. In other words, to "show them." It is hard to see how this was in any real doubt.

It is not in the hope of any immediate effect on the major battles now raging in the south, various Washington and Saigon spokesmen are explaining. The supplies affected would not in any case have a bearing on battlefield activity for several months yet.

Some were speculating, without official confirmation, that the strikes were intended to discourage the Russians from sending further supplies and equipment to their North Vietnamese clients, and to demonstrate to Hanoi's leaders that when they are busy in the South they are vulnerable at home.

But all these things sound as if the needle were stuck—as if the United States had not advanced one millimeter from the blindness carrying it to ever-swelling violence those years ago.

Further, at a time when it appeared that Washington was achieving some semblance of a breakthrough in getting signs of reasonable and peace-pitched responses from Peking and Moscow, it seems the move best calculated to induce a momentary truce in the hot hostility between these two Communist giants.

It would be no major logistical problem, once China and Russia agreed on it, to provide large-scale air support for North Vietnam—a "volunteer force" in the style of the Korean ground thing years back.

Chinese air force bases are as close at hand as Hainan, the island only 150 miles southeast of Haiphong—and within easy striking distance of American carriers operating in the Gulf of Tonkin. Even the B-52 base in Thailand would not be secure from a sudden skyful of "Vietnamized" Foxbats and other late Soviet aircraft.

The danger of this sort of reaction has no doubt been weighed at the White House; it must have been dismissed as too unlikely to trouble planners of the Haiphong-Hanoi raids. For the rest of us, guessing on less information, it doesn't seem that sure.

In any case, this new American fury addressed at North Vietnam's population centers seems an exact echo of the responses that built into massive escalation—in total futility—long ago, for all that Administration leaders insist this is no new Rolling Thunder.

It must make sense to somebody, but the outward look is murderous flailing in what seems like madness. This is no time to reescalate the war, spread death among Asian civilians, lose more Americans to prison camps and further endanger the men already held there—to no real purpose, as was established long ago.

It's time to admit we were wrong and get out, with as little more loss of life as we can make possible.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION RELATED TO DOLLAR DEVALUATION

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on April 4 the President submitted to the House an urgent request for an appropriation of about \$1.6 billion as a result of the re-

cent passage and approval of the dollar devaluation bill. The President's message reads:

SIR: I ask the Congress to give urgent consideration to a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1972 to enable the United States to maintain the value in terms of gold of the holdings of U.S. dollars of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank.

The details of this proposal are set forth in the enclosed letter from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, with whose comments and observations I concur.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD NIXON.

The Committee on Appropriations is scheduled to meet next Monday, April 24, to consider the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1972, and will, at the same time, consider a special House joint resolution relating to the dollar devaluation matter. As now drawn, the joint resolution provides:

For payments by the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain the value in terms of gold of the holdings of United States dollars of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Development Association, and the Asian Development Bank, to the extent provided in the articles of agreement of such institutions, as authorized by Section 3 of the "Par Value Modification Act," such amounts as may be necessary (but not to exceed \$1,600,000,000), to remain available until expended.

The explanatory letter of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget follows:

The proposed supplemental appropriation would enable the United States to maintain the value of its subscriptions in terms of gold in the International Monetary Fund and the four international development lending institutions. Maintenance of the value of U.S. dollars held by these institutions is required under the several articles of agreement. Specific provision was not made in the 1973 Budget for this item, because the question of par value was subject to international negotiation at the time the budget was transmitted. The Par Value Modification Act, S. 3160, 92nd Congress, authorizes appropriations for this purpose. Although the total amount needed cannot be estimated precisely at this time, it is expected to be not more than \$1,600,000,000.

This request will not result in budget outlays until after fiscal year 1973; the outlay estimates in the 1973 budget are not affected.

I have carefully reviewed the proposal for appropriations contained in this document and am satisfied that this request is necessary at this time. I recommend, therefore, that this proposal be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE P. SHULTZ,

Director.

Mr. Speaker, S. 3160, referred to in the foregoing, became Public Law 92-268. It reads as follows:

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Par Value Modification Act".

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to take the steps necessary to establish a new par value of the dollar of \$1 equals one thirty-eighth of a fine troy ounce of gold. When established such par value shall be the legal standard for defining the relationship of the dollar to gold for the purpose of issuing gold certifi-

cates pursuant to section 14(c) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (31 U.S.C. 405b).

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to maintain the value in terms of gold of the holdings of United States dollars of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Development Association, and the Asian Development Bank to the extent provided in the articles of agreement of such institutions. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such amounts as may be necessary to provide for such maintenance of value.

SEC. 4. The increase in the value of the gold held by the United States (including the gold held as security for gold certificates) resulting from the change in the par value of the dollar authorized by section 2 of this Act shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

Approved March 31, 1972.

Mr. Speaker, this material is included for the advance information of Members and others who may be interested.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. HENDERSON), for Monday, April 17 through April 20, on account of official business.

Mr. WRIGHT (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for Monday, April 17 and Tuesday, April 18, on account of official business.

Mr. KYROS (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GRIFFIN (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. McKEVITT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for April 19, 1972, and April 20, 1972, on account of official business.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LENT) were granted permission to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks:)

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 10 minutes, on April 19.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes today.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. JACOBS, today for 30 minutes.

Mr. PODELL, today, for 30 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. GAYDOS, on April 19, for 60 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. RHODES in five instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. DU PONT.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas.

Mr. SCHMITZ in five instances.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. LUJAN.

Mr. HOGAN in 10 instances.

Mr. PEYSER in five instances.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. WHALEN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. KYROS.

Mr. GAYDOS in 10 instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.

Mr. JACOBS in three instances.

Mr. BADILLO.

Mr. RARICK.

Mr. HAGAN.

Mr. WALDIE in six instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. SEIBERLING in 10 instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. RANGEL in two instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in two instances.

Mr. SYMINGTON in two instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. HAWKINS in two instances.

Mr. STUCKEY in three instances.

Mr. FULTON.

Mr. LEGGETT in three instances.

Mr. BEGICH in two instances.

Mr. MAHON in two instances.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee did on April 17, 1972 present

to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9395. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with teachers and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia for the purchase of annuity contracts; and

H.R. 9900. An act to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the entire amount of the compensation of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and of civilian employees who are prisoners of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 19, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1876. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 27, 1972, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on compilation of preliminary examination, survey, and review reports on rivers and harbors, flood control, and beach erosion control improvements, requested by an item on page 4 of House Report No. 91-1665, 91st Congress, second session (H. Doc. No. 92-191); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

1877. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize equalization of the retired or retainer pay of certain members and former members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1878. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of deliveries of excess defense articles at acquisition cost and at legal value, covering the quarter ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 8(d) of Public Law 91-672; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1879. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission on Materials Policy, transmitting an interim report of the Commission entitled "Toward a National Materials Policy—Basic Data and Issues"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1880. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 926. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 13591, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to designate the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases as the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-993). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 927. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12202, a bill to increase the contribution of the Federal Government to the costs of health benefits, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-994). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 928. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14070, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-995). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 929. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14108, a bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-996). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 930. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 13034, a bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 and the Standard Reference Data Act, and to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), to make improvements in fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of certain functions of the National Bureau of Standards (Rept. No. 92-997). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 931. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10488, a bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, to provide for financing the acquisition, construction, alteration, maintenance, operation, and protection of public buildings, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-998). 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 Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 14430. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 14431. A bill to make needed housing available for the elderly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 14432. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize grants and loans to private nonprofit organizations to assist them in providing transportation service meeting the special needs of elderly and handicapped persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCH-

ELL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 14433. A bill to provide a comprehensive program of employment services and opportunities for middle aged and older Americans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14434. A bill to establish a Department of Elder Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 14435. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and chapters 2 and 21 of the Internal Revenue Code, and to add a new title XX to the Social Security Act to provide for a minimum annual income of \$3,375 in the case of single individuals, and \$4,500 in the case of married couples, a 25 percent across-the-board increase with subsequent cost-of-living increases, to reduce social security tax rates and provide a more equitable method for their determination and apportionment, to increase old-age, survivors and disability insurance benefits to reflect the new tax and benefit base, to liberalize the earnings test, to eliminate the existing actuarial reduction in widow's and widower's benefits in cases of disability, to include within the term "disability" certain additional conditions requiring substantially continuous care, and to require that future social security benefit increases be disregarded in determining need under the various federally assisted public assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 14436. A bill to establish Federal reinsurance and portability programs to protect employees in the enjoyment of certain rights under private pension plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 14437. A bill to provide relief to certain individuals 62 years of age and over who own or rent their homes, through income tax credits and refunds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 11438. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate all the deductibles, coinsurance, and time limitations presently applicable to benefits thereunder, to eliminate medicare taxes as the method of financing hospital insurance benefits and premium payments as the method of financing supplementary medical insurance benefits (so that all benefits under such title will be financed from general revenues), to provide automatic enrollment in the supplementary medical insurance program for all hospital insurance beneficiaries (with open enrollment for all others eligible) and to provide payment for eye care, dental care, hearing aids, prescription drugs, prosthetics, and certain other items not now covered; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 14439. A bill for the relief of Cass County, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRADENAS, Mr. BURTON, Mr. DENT, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LINK, Mr. McKAY, Mr. MOLLOHAN,

Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 14440. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 with respect to workers' readjustment allowances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 14441. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 with respect to workers' readjustment allowances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 14442. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 14443. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 5-year carryforward for unused medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRINAN (for himself, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 14444. A bill to provide for the cessation of bombing in Indochina and for the withdrawal of U.S. military personnel from the Republic of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 14445. A bill to raise the present level of grades for U.S. deputy marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14446. A bill providing for minimum grades for U.S. deputy marshals under chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 14447. A bill to make use of a firearm to commit a felony a Federal crime where such use violates State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 14448. A bill to strengthen certain penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEMP, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. MINISH):

H.R. 14449. A bill establishing a commission to develop a realistic plan leading to the conquest of multiple sclerosis at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. POBELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. ROY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr.

SCOTT, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. WINN, Mr. WYATT, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. DAVIS of Georgia):

H.R. 14450. A bill establishing a commission to develop a realistic plan leading to the conquest of multiple sclerosis at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 14451. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning women and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 14452. A bill to continue for an additional year at current levels the authorization of appropriations for carrying out higher education programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POBELL:

H.R. 14453. A bill to modify the restrictions contained in section 170(e) of the Internal Revenue Code in the case of certain contributions of literary, musical, or artistic composition, or similar property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 14454. A bill to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to provide financial assistance to individuals suffering from chronic kidney disease who are unable to pay the costs of necessary treatment, and to authorize project grants to increase the availability and effectiveness of such treatment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 14455. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and revise the program of assistance under that act for the control and prevention of communicable disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 14456. A bill to revise the boundary of the city of Refuge National Historical Park, in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 14457. A bill to ban the usage of diethylstilbestrol (DES) as a growth promotant; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 14458. A bill to extend for 3 years the traineeship program for professional public health personnel, and project grants for graduate training in public health under the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 14459. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to Commissioners and Commission employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 14460. A bill: Volunteer Military Manpower Act of 1972; to the Committee on Armed Service.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.R. 14461. A bill to exercise the authority of Congress to enforce the 14th amendment to the Constitution by defining for the purposes of the equal protection guarantee the term "unitary school system," and to declare the policy of the United States respecting certain voluntary transfers by students among certain schools of any school system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14462. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 14463. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain activities of charitable organizations shall not be considered to be carrying on propaganda or attempting to influence legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZION:

H.R. 14464. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.J. Res. 1170. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. POBELL, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. JAMES V. STANTON):

H. Con. Res. 582. Concurrent resolution to stop the bombing of North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H. Res. 932. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the full amount appropriated for the rural electrification program for fiscal 1972 should be made available by the administration to carry out that program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 14465. A bill for the relief of Lena S. Tillman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of Illinois:

H.R. 14466. A bill for the relief of Edith E. Carrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 14467. A bill for the relief of John Raymond Witt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 14468. A bill to grant a Federal Charter to the Mid-Continent Railway Historical Society; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DRUG ABUSE TREATMENT PROGRAMS MUST BE EVALUATED

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 17, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article by James

M. Markham appeared in the New York Times of Monday, April 10, 1972. Entitled "Antinarcotic Programs Regarded as Another Business," the article describes the recent growth in what is called "the drug abuse industry." Much of this growth, as the article explains, is being fueled by the increase in Federal dollars going into drug abuse programming.

This increase in Federal funding is welcome. In fact, additional Federal funding for treatment and rehabilitation programs is desperately needed because overburdened State and local treatment programs are wholly unable to meet the great demand for treatment in States of relative high drug abuse incidence such as my home State of California. A recent inventory of California drug abuse treat-